University of Southampton Research Repository

University of Southampton

Faculty of Arts and Humanities

Modern Languages and Linguistics

English Language Policy in an English-Medium Instruction Setting:

A Qualitative Study of a Thai University

By

Parameth Lord-Asa

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

March 2020

University of Southampton

<u>ABSTRACT</u>

Faculty of Arts and Humanities

Modern Languages and Linguistics

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

English Language Policy in an English-Medium Instruction Setting:

A Qualitative Study of a Thai University

By Parameth Lord-Asa

English has become a global lingua franca in multilingual settings where speakers are from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. An English-medium instruction (EMI) programme is a good example of such setting where the multilingual communication takes place because the EMI participants not only use English to communicate among themselves, but also speak and use other languages as well. However, given such multilingual nature of the programme, EMI literature tends to ignore the multilingualism inherent in EMI setting, consequently shows a lack of understanding of how multilingual communication works in EMI classrooms. Also, the notion of English is often taken for granted in previous EMI studies, and/or when it is mentioned, it is often used to refer to the standard native English which is preferred and promoted by the top-down language policy in such multilingual EMI setting.

This study examines English language policy of an EMI programme in a Thai university in higher education from English as a lingua franca (ELF) perspective. Particularly, it explores the way in which English is actually enacted inside its EMI classrooms by both teachers and students at the bottom-up level. Also, the study looks into the teachers' and students' orientations towards the EMI policies and practices in the local Thai context, and the effects of these policies and practices that may have on EMI participants are also examined.

The study takes a qualitative or critical approach to study the EMI policies and practices. It mainly draws on classroom observation and interviews. This three-month study involved 34 EMI participants: 14 were teachers, 16 students, and four administrative staff. Regarding the classroom observation, I visited 10 classrooms featuring a wide range of different disciplines. I carried out

semi-structured interviews with teachers and students after I had observed their classroom interactions.

The findings reveal that English was used only and/or exclusively as the medium of instruction by the teachers when teaching inside their EMI classrooms. When looking into the kind of English that was practiced by both teachers and students, it showed that it was not the native English that was supported and promoted by the top-down policy, but it was English as a lingua franca (ELF) and/or English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF) that were actually used in EMI communication at the bottom-up level inside EMI classrooms. The findings also reveal that not only was English used, but also other languages were found to be used during the course of classroom interaction between the teacher and students. This means there was a mismatch between policy and practices. Translanguaging was mainly used to facilitate the overall comprehension of students who seemed to have a low level of English proficiency. Also, the analysis shows a wide range of roles of different languages such as English, Thai and Chinese in this EMI setting. While these roles were mostly positive, some were negative resulting in a kind of exclusion of some EMI student participants.

In addition, in terms of the participants' orientations towards their English and use of other languages, the findings show a strong negative attitude towards not only their ELF use, but also their use of other languages as well. As a result, the teachers and students seemed to suffer from self-doubt and show a lack of confidence in their own language abilities. Overall, the findings highlight the role of English as a global lingua franca in multilingual EMI setting, demonstrate the important roles of other languages in EMI teaching and learning, although the EMI participants seemed to perceive their use of these languages negatively.

The study contributes to both theoretical and pedagogical implications for EMI language policy in Thailand. From a theoretical perspective, it is argued for a new way of understanding and conceptualising English in EMI multilingual communications when other languages also present. This links to the change in EMI policy as it is argued that other languages should receive a formal and official role alongside English in EMI setting. This leads in turn to the pedagogical contributions that not only English should be emphasized, but also other languages should be given the importance in classroom teaching and learning, and be encouraged in EMI communication.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

List of Tables

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I, **Parameth Lord-Asa**, declare that this thesis entitled, **English Language Policy in an English-Medium Instruction Setting: An Ethnographic Study of a Thai University**, and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. None of this work has been published before submission

Signature:

Date: March 2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank several people for their help with this study. The completion of my dissertation would not have been possible without the unparalleled support and nurturing of my main supervisor, Prof. Jennifer Jenkins, who actively provided me with invaluable insights into, and extensive knowledge of the fields, Language Policy and Global Englishes, and many more. Her meticulous comments and feedbacks have shaped my experience and knowledge as a researcher. Thus, I am deeply indebted to her help and expertise. Also, I would also like to extend my gratitude to my second supervisor, Dr. Ying Wang, who many times gave me constructive advice and useful guidance during the reading and writing-up of this thesis.

I am also grateful to those with whom I have had the pleasure to work during my study. Each member of my Upgrade Committee has provided me with extensive professional guidance. Dr. Adriana Patino-Santos and Dr. Sonia Moran-Panero gave helpful comments and advice on how to improve my literature review writing. They showed me what makes a good literature review chapter, and this has constituted a profound knowledge in my research abilities.

Special thanks also to my sponsor, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, who financially made my PhD happen in the first place. Also, I would like to recognize the assistance that I received during my field-work. Many thanks to Dr. Jakarin Srimoon who helped me in many ways when I was collecting data. Sincere thanks to those teachers and students who participated in my study, and helped me gain practical research experience in the field-trip.

I would like to acknowledge the never-ending support provided by my family, mum, brothers and sister whose love and support have always been with me since day one when I started this project. I received incredible support from Keith Bill who never demanded my time, but always put my study first, and constantly gave me warm encouragement throughout my study. He is a real hero in this pursuit. Also, my appreciation goes to my sole Likhasit Thongphen who always provided constant assistance in many ways and many times along the journey.

I cannot finish my acknowledging without mentioning the contributions from my friends at the Centre for Global Englishes (CGE). I have greatly benefited from the round-table discussions with them which intellectually stipulated my thinking and shaped my understanding of the field of Global Englishes in general and ELF in particular. I have also greatly benefited from the informal conversations over dinner tables, and/or at the coffee shops, about various issues and different

Abbreviations Used

ACE	The Asian Corpus of English
AmE	American English
APEC	The Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation Group
ASEAN	The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BE	Bilingual Education
BEST	Business English Standardised Test
BM	Bahasa Malay
BrE	British English
CA	Conversation Analysis
CAE	Cambridge Certificate in Advanced English
CBI	Content-Based Instruction
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference
CGE	Centre for Global Englishes
CHC	Confucian Heritage Culture
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CoP	Community of Practice
EAP	English for Academic English
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EIL	English as an International Language
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELFA	English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings
ELT	English Language Teaching
EMF	English as a Multilingua Franca
EMI	English Medium Instruction
ENL	English as a Native Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
ESP	English for Specific Purposes
EU	European Union or European Economic Area
HE	Higher Education

Abbreviations Used

ICA	Intercultural Awareness
ICLHE	Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education
IELTS	The International English Language Testing System
LFC	Lingua Franca Core
LP	Language Policy
LEP	Limited English Proficient Students
L1	First Language or Native Language
L2	Second Language
MICASE	Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English
NEL	Native English Language
NESs	Native English Speakers
NNESs	Non-Native English Speakers
NSE	Native Standard English
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
StE	Stand English
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
VOICE	Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English
WE	World Englishes

Chapter 1   Introduction

1.1   Rationale for study

There are two main reasons why I would like to carry out this study. First, I was interested in English language policy in higher education (HE) in Thailand where I have connections with it. I was a university teacher before I came to the UK to study my PhD. The university where I work for offers an EMI programme and I wanted to know more about its language policy. I have friends and colleges who involve in this programme. I often had the opportunity to talk them, I asked them how they like or dislike the use English in this kind of education, they told me about the challenges, and the language issue often came up during the conversation. Although they seemed to enjoy using English when participating in the EMI setting because it offers a good place for them to mix with their Thai and non-Thai peers, they sometimes expressed anxiety, fear and great concern over their English language skills thinking that their English is not 'good' or 'native'. They seemed to lack self-confidence in term of English language, but still enjoyed the programme. I clearly noticed the tension there between their enjoyment and worries about their language. This was when I became interested to know more about why my Thai friends hold such a negative view on their language ability. I was also wanted to know more about other EMI related issues, like its policies and practices. In particular, I was interested to know how English is actually used in this setting and how it impacts on its users. I was motivated to develop a healthy EMI policy for my university, and to make it a better place for all teachers and students in terms of linguistic issues.

Another reason is that I have always been interested in the English as a lingua franca (ELF) phenomenon in general, and in my local contexts in particular. In Thailand, there are increasingly more and more English-medium instruction (EMI) programmes available attracting both local and international students and staff to take part in. Here, Thailand is not an English speaking country, so English is used as a lingua franca by people, in the sense that it is used by non-native English speakers (NNESs) who share different mother tongue coming from different linguistic backgrounds. My university is no exception. So, English at the university is used alongside with other languages of its multilingual speakers. I often observed teachers and students often shuttle across languages. This is a sociolinguistic reality of English plus other languages in this setting. However, I felt that such linguistic reality is poorly understood, and when speakers evaluate their English and their use of other languages they seem to show a strong negative attitude towards

their English and the use of other languages too. Therefore, I was interested to know more about this, I wanted to find out how teachers and students communicate when a range of languages are available. Also, I wanted to know what they think about the use of multiple languages in their multilingual communication whether they like or dislike it and its effects. Since I was as well interested in English language policy, it was my hope that the English language policies and practices are informed by the sociolinguistic fact of English, the topic I next discuss.

1.2 Globalisation and Internationalisation in Higher Education

Globalisation and internationalisation are two different concepts that have a cause – effect relationship: the former makes the latter happen (Maringe and Foskett, 2012). Before I explain this relationship and how the two give rise to the sociolinguistic reality in higher education, it will be helpful to discuss the definitions of these two concepts. Starting with globalisation, as Maringe and Foskett (2012: 1) note, it is broadly understood to mean 'the creation of world relations based on the operation of free market'. Central to its concept is the 'free market', so globalisation entails 'the opening up and coming together of business, trade and economic activities between nations, necessitating the need for greater homogenisation of fundamental political, ideological, cultural and social aspects of life across different countries of the world' (ibid.). Such processes have been taking place for a long time, but have been accelerated and intensified in the past few decades due to the developments in technology, computers and the Internets. The impact these changes are having on universities is profound and, within universities, the key strategic responses to the globalisation forces are known as internationalisation. So, internationalisation in HE constitutes 'a set of strategic responses to globalisation', but as internationalisation gathers momentum, so does globalisation become strengthened and intensified. For example, the intensification of student mobility that stems from the university strategy to increase overseas student recruitment (one strategic response of internationalisation process), strengthens further the intensification of globalisation. In short, these two concepts show a dialectical relationship of cause and effect, and tend to be mutually reinforcing ideas (Maringe et al., 2013).

In order to keep up with the globalisation process, universities around the world come up with some internationalisation strategies. In what follows, I will present a summary of some key strategic activities from the three studies including Knight (2013), Maringe and Foskett (2012), and Maringe, Foskett, and Woodfield (2013). There are four main and common strategic responses found in universities wishing to internationalise themselves:

1. Universities tend to emphasize the oversea student recruitment with the aim of increasing institutional financial revenues.

2. Institutions carry out regional curriculum reform programmes ranging from minor changes in content to fundamental redesign of objectives, teaching methods and assessment. This also includes the expansion of academic mobility schemes to embrace international dimensions. For example, EMI courses (either partial use of English or English-Only) become available (see a full discussion of the growth in EMI programme across the globe in Chapter Three when I discuss EMI education).

3. Development of international collaborative research project, cross-institutional networking and conferences

4. Development of partnerships for teaching and establishment of overseas campuses and distance learning. These include strategic activities like offering a joint programme, and setting up offshore campuses. Knight (2013) notes that academic programmes are being delivered across borders and branch campuses are being established in developing and developed countries around the world. In 2002, there were twenty-four branch campuses around the world, by 2012 the number increased to more than 200. This was a remarkable growth, but this was an estimate quite some years ago, now surely the number is much higher than that.

But what happens as the result of these changes? Maringe and Foskett (2012) provide some estimates of numbers of students emigrating for purposes of study. Globally, it is estimated that there are about 150 million students in HE across the world, up from 68 million in 1991. Also, in the year 2015 there were more than 7.2 million students studying outside their home countries. This figure is likely to increase by now as the number was given four years ago. The researchers also note that eight countries host 72 per cent of the world' international students. These include the US (20 per cent); UK (13 per cent); Germany and Franca each (8 per cent); Australia (7 per cent); China (7 per cent); Canada (5 per cent); and Japan (4 per cent). Although the accurate numbers are impossible and they vary enormously according to the sources, they are useful in the sense they provide an overall impression of how universities have now become key players in the global economy contributing significantly to the knowledge stock of the world and to the financial economy of their countries. For example, it is estimated that foreign students and their dependants contributed approximately US$15.54 billion to the US economy during the 2007-08 academic year. Similarly, in the UK, in the same period the revenue stream of UK HE was approximately £8.5 billion.

From a linguistic perspective, what are the implications of all these changes in HE? The answer to this question is that since English will be used in the processes of both globalisation and internationalisation, language contact situation is inevitable because of the people mobility. English will be used as a lingua franca because people are from different cultural and language backgrounds. Not only do they use English to communicate with each other on a regular basis, but also they speak other languages as well alongside English. English may be their second or third or fourth language in addition to their mother tongue. So, basically these languages constantly influence each other giving rise to a contact language situation and/or the sociolinguistic reality as mentioned above. So, higher education is a prime example of ELF/ELF(A) setting (see a full discussion of ELF, ELFA and EMF in Chapter Two). Next I would like to contextualise this study in an historical local and educational context in Thailand. I will provide a detailed overview on the Thai contexts, including several relevant educational English language policies that have been shown how Thailand has participated in the international economic order in the globalisation era. The following discussion will focus more on the history and current role of English, how it is taught, and the attitudes towards it.

1.3   English education policy in Thailand from past to present

Uniquely Thailand was the only country in the South eastern region that has never been colonised by the western power as its other neighbouring countries have been, like Singapore and Malaysia (Kirkpatrick, 2010). Consequently, Thailand does not have the legacy of English use from the colonisation such as when the language is used as a co-official or national language like in those once-colonised countries where English and one local language are officially used in various domains nationwide, and where the influential use of English is having a great impact on their people in terms of English language proficiency because the language is used in daily lives. In Thailand, English is used as a 'foreign language', and a low level of English proficiency can be expected among the general Thai population altgough a very small number of people who happen to use English daily can speak and use the language very well. Also, there are more than 70 other regional languages that are spoken in the country where 'standard' Thai is the de facto official language (Kosonen, 2007).

Throughout the Thai history, there have been a lot of efforts that the Thai authorities have put into in helping the Thai people to be able to use English effectively for communication with other foreign people. The history of English in Thailand has been written in various sources (Will Baker &

Jarunthawatchai, 2017; N. Galloway & Rose, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2010). English language teaching began in the reign of the King Rama III (1824-51). The king wanted to modernize the country known as Siam at that time, and thought that English was an important tool to communicate with the Western world and to access the advanced knowledge that could potentially help develop the country. The king also believed that English education and Western learning were extremely crucial in order to establish diplomatic relationships with many western countries, and to safeguard the country from the threat of colonization by these western countries (Will Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017). English in its early days was being taught at the Thai court through an invitation of a missionary. These perceived benefits of English language and its teaching and learning continued into the subsequent kings.

King Rama IV (1851-68), also known as King Mongkut, further modernised the country and actively encouraged the English education. He invited more and more American missionaries and other British tutors to teach English to the royal members and the king's officers, so that they could use the language to communicate with the western advisors and visitors. One episode during the reign of King Mongkut has become widely well-known. The king appointed an English governess, *Anna Leonowens*, to teach English at court. This was much romanticised in the novel *Anna and the King of Siam*, and the subsequent musical *The King and I* (Kirkpatrick, 2010).

The King Rama V (1868-1910) further continued to promote the importance of English for modernization and development of the country dealing with foreign traders and diplomats and learning advanced knowledge. He established the Ministry of Education to educate English and other subjects to Thai citizens. The 'King's Scholarships' were awarded to those who were proficient in English to study abroad to bring back the knowledge of modern advancements to develop the country (Will Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017). Also, a certain level of English proficiency allowed citizens to be exempt from military service. Essentially, English was afforded a high status and became the most prestigious 'foreign' language in Thailand (N. Galloway & Rose, 2015).

In the reign of King Rama VI (1910-25), in 1913 the King educated in the west introduced English as a compulsory subject from grade 5 onwards, and more hours had been devoted to teaching and learning English. Then, the National Education Act of 1996 put more emphasis on English education, and stipulated that English should be taught as a compulsory from grade 1 nationwide. This policy is still being enacted till the current era. In primary school, English is taught one hour per week from grades 1 to 3 (P. Darasawang & Todd, 2012; S. Keyuravong, 2010). Then the time will

increase to two hours from grades 4 to 6. After that at a secondary school level from grades 7 to 12, students study English more between three and four hours a week. Finally, the university students will have to complete 12 credits of English subjects covering six credits of general English and another six of English for specific purposes. This may generally mean English language is learned as a subject around three hours a week at the university students in general. However, Thai students in general are considered having a low level of English skills. English education in Thailand as a whole is fraught with lots of difficulties (e.g. lack of teachers, teaching/learning resources and teaching styles). The major problem is perhaps the lack of qualified English teachers with sufficient English language knowledge. Therefore, in 2006 the Thai government advertised for thousands for 'native' English speakers to apply for jobs as English teachers in the Thai schools. But since the salary offered was not vary attractive, and then the government received only eleven applications (Kirkpatrick, 2010). So, the lack of English teachers in Thailand still persists to the present time, and this results in the low level of English language proficiency among Thais students. These problems are further exacerbated by the idea that 'good' or 'best' English equates the 'native' English as revealed in the Thai government's recruitment policy showing the desire preference of native English speakers.

Furthermore, the work of constantly improving English language teaching and learning in Thailand has been an on-going process until the present time. The Thai government with the Thailand 4.0 policy wants the young Thais to have the English proficiency levels required for the labour market in this globalisation era. In 2010, there was a proposal to make English an official second language, but this proposal was rejected (N. Galloway & Rose, 2015). Also, in Thailand, the year 2012 was designated as an 'English Speaking Year' in an attempt to promote the use of English among the Thais, and to attract foreign teachers and students. The Thai government invited the Britain's former prime minister, Tony Blair, to boost the event acting as an honorary English teacher. Nevertheless, by inviting Tony Blair who was a 'native' English, the Thai government again showed the persistent preference of native speakers over other non-native users of English. This seems to indicate that the desire for such 'native' English speakers runs deeply rooted in the Thai society which has far-reaching consequences. Such attitude will reveal when I discuss my finding chapter of interview. Other initiatives or policies from the government that have been used to promote and develop the Thais' English language skills include the permission to open bilingual Programme, English Programme, and Mini-English Programme at primary and secondary schools across the country (A. Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatrick, 2016). These programmes using both Thai and

English as the medium of instruction are available for both Thai and non-Thai students who live in Thailand.

Another reason that perhaps explains why international students enrolled in EMI courses in higher education in Thailand is becauseThailand is now participanting in international academic affairs. Thailand is a member of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)[1], an organisation aimed at economic and social growth and reginal stability (Walkinshaw, Fenton-Smith and Humphreys, 2017). English is the de facto lingua franca of the ASEAN community (Kirkpatrick, 2010). Since Thailand is a member country of the ASEAN group, the Thai government is now encouraging all the Thai universities to streamline their educational policies and activities. Thus, many Thai universities including the one under question are now offering an EMI programme in a range of academic discliplines. They are also engaged in various forms of international collatorations with other Asian universities making the educational activities much simpler and readily available than ever before across the Asian region. For example, the university under question participated in several international activities such as offering two off-shore campuses in Myanmar and one (to be launched) in Iran, Global and International Networks programmes, students exchange scheme, and ASEAN Leadership Camp 2016 to name only a few (see Appendix Q for more information about international affairs). These international participations are not only encouraged and carried out in Thailand, but they are taking place across all the countries in the ASEAN region. As a result, students in Asian countries have become more and more mobile. Walkinshaw et al. (2017) note that there has been an explosive growth in outward bound students from Asia who are continuing to represent over half of the world's mobile international students, and who are also dominating by a large margin. In addition, as Walkinshaw and his colleagues indicate, there has been a sharp increase in domestic (home) enrollemnts in Asian universities over the last few decades from 20 million students in 1980 to 84 million in 2011. For example, in Thailand and Malaysia, postgraduate enrollemnts have increased by 300% and 400% respectively over the last decade. In short, the Thailand's international affairs are not only encouraging the local Thai students, but also their non-Thai counterparts to take part in EMI education in higher education in Thailand (more discussion about the growth and reasons for EMI education in Chapter three where I discuss various issues of EMI in global and local contexts). This is where my

---

[1] The ASEAN memner-states are Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Phillippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. An expanded body, ASEAN + 3, incorporates China, Japan and South Korea.

study comes in, I would like to study the English language policy of EMI programme on offer at a private Thai university and how it is implemented by the teachers and students in EMI classrooms. This links to the next topic where I will discuss my research objectives.

In my university and in its EMI programme curriculum, the policy clearly states that '*all programmes are offered in English*', because the university wants to attract the international (non-Thai) students who are usually from neighbouring countries, and consequently wants to generate its financial revenues. This type of EMI programme can be categorised as a 'selection Model' of EMI in Macaro's (2018) five models of EMI education. Although the stated language policy does not explain what kind of English is preferred, when examining further looking into the language requirements, I found the following criteria of language policies:

Entry requirements:

1. Applicants are exempted from English test if they have a minimum *IELTS of 5.5*, *TOEFL of 500* (paper-based test), 173 (computer-based test), and/or 61 (internet-based test).
2. *Applicants from overseas who use English as a first language are exempted from the English test.*
3. In case an applicant's academic qualifications do not meet the above requirements, the applicant may be reviewed and approved by the Committee of the International College.

The use of either IELTS or TOEFL tests as entry language requirement above are the examples of preferences of some native English, British and American respectively (more discussion about these tests, in the following Chapter Two). Not only these tests are used in this EMI setting, but they are used in all the universities all over the world (see a full review on this EMI language policy in the Chapter Three). Also, as clearly stated above (in bold and italic) native English speakers are exempted from the tests which clearly shows the superiority and inequality in terms of language (also more discussion in the following Chapter Two). Therefore, this seems to show that when universities advertise themselves as being 'international', and would like to attract international students, it is not at all clear what this actually means in practice when the only two 'national' Englishes (BrE or AmE) seem to be favoured and promoted as 'good' English, as far as language is concerned. Also, as the literature review will demonstrate in Chapter Three, the mainstream research on EMI seems to ignore the language issue. When language is discussed, it is only considered as a practical or technical problem that needs to be mastered or fixed in line with the favoured native English norms. The sociolinguistic reality and the language contact situation as

described above were completely ignored. This was where I became interested in the study of EMI programme in my local setting, and I wanted to find out more about what actually happens in practice given the cultural and linguistic diversities inherent in the programme. Therefore, I had some research questions to help me with this investigation, these questions will be discussed next.

1.4   Research question

As the above discussion revealed, in Thai contexts, there is a lack of EMI research in HE from a language and/or critical perspective, but there is an insistence on using native English language from the top-down policies. My main interest is on language issues. I am concerned about the kinds of English being promoted and/or required in EMI programme under question. Therefore, I would like to find out how this affects people and what they think about it. I have three research questions that guided my study.

1. **To what extent are the institution's language policies enacted inside its EMI classroom?**

2. **What kind of language ideologies inform teachers and students' orientations to EMI policies and practices?**

3. **How are the teachers and students affected by such EMI policies and practices?**

This study takes an ethnographic approach to the study of language policy and this will be discussed more in the Chapter Four. I will next discuss the structure of my thesis.

1.5   Structure of thesis

In my literature review chapters, I will discuss three key concepts on which my study is based. These are language policy, English language, and EMI. While the first two concepts will be covered in Chapter Two, the concept of EMI will be dealt with in Chapter Three. In Chapter Two, I will first discuss the development of language policy from past to present drawing on some critical aspects of language policy study that informed my study. Here I engage in the debate between the assimilationist and pluralist in the US. Although the context is different from the context in which I am investigating, the arguments provided by the pluralist view on language policy informed my study. After that, in the second part of the chapter two, I will move on to discuss specifically the notion of English language in a global context. Here I draw on the newest re-theorisation of English

Chapter 1

language when I conceptualise the kind of English in this study. I will be discussing ELF/EMF in general before I discuss ELF/EMF in academic setting in HE in particular.

Chapter Three will present another key concept that underpins my study, the notion of EMI. The main aim of this chapter is to identify a research gap in the local Thai context under investigation. In so doing, the chapter first explores the growth in EMI education in general starting from wider European settings where the EMI programme originally started, to Asia, Southeast Asia, and Thailand. Across these social and geographical contexts, I will present a range of EMI issues in current EMI literature including teachers and students' orientations to EMI policies and practices, whether EMI is a threat, and the tension and/or gap between macro- and micro- EMI policy levels. I will then examine the EMI studies in the local Thai context in higher education, in order to identify a research gap for my study.

Chapter Four will discuss methodology. The main aim of this chapter is to describe the research methods used in this study. Thus, the chapter first of all explores research approach used for my study. Here I will explain a critical ethnography of language policy. Then, I explain the research contexts, the university setting, the research participants (teachers, students, and staff), and different research methods of data collection including classroom observation and interviews. After that, I discuss the issues of trustworthiness, ethical considerations, and translation, before I finally explain the methodological limitations of my study.

There are two chapters of analysis for the two main sets of data. While Chapter 5 focuses on the classroom data, the Chapter 6 will explore the interview. The former will begin with a discussion of analytical techniques that were used to analyse the classroom observation. Here, a sampling technique was used to broadly examine how much English and/or other languages are used by EMI teachers in their teaching delivery. The sampling yielded two types of language policies, 'English-Only' and 'English pluses'. Regarding the second analytical framework, this is Conversation Analysis (CA). The CA was used to specifically examine the second type of classroom language policy. Here the CA was used to analyse the interactional strategies employed by both teachers and students in their co-construction of meaning inside EMI classrooms.

The second analysis chapter is Chapter 6. Chapter 6 deals with interview data. The chapter starts by discussing the theoretical frameworks for interview data. Here I will discuss two frameworks, Qualitative Content Analysis and Speech Functions Analysis. After that, I will explain how I coded the data and how I obtained a coding frame. I will then discuss the coding frame.

The last chapter is the conclusion chapter. Chapter 7 will first summarise the findings found in the two previous chapters. The findings are summarised with respect to individual research questions. After that, I will explore the contributions of my study. This includes the theoretical and pedagogical implication in EMI in general, and in ELT in higher education in particular. Then, the limitations of study will be discussed before I finally make some suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2   Language Policy and Global Englishes

2.1   Introduction

This chapter is going to discuss two theoretical frameworks that informed my research. Firstly, critical approach to language policy, and secondly global Englishes with the focus on English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF) (J. Jenkins, 2015b). These two notions on language have moved on a very long way from the early work on language policy and planning in the 1950s and 1960s suggesting that language was fixed and static, and there was always an end point of language (J. Jenkins, 2014; Ricento, 2006) while in reality language is fluid dynamic, and enmeshed in ideologies.

As Ricento (2006) notes, in early years of language policy and planning in post-colonial era, Western-trained linguists were engaged by many new nations of Africa, South America, and Asia to develop grammar, writing systems, and dictionaries for indigenous languages. The scholars trained in descriptive linguistics were eager to gather data on hitherto unstudied languages and advance theories of language structure and use. Their goals were to modernise and build a nation by standardising a national language. The national language was seen as a resource or tool for showing a clear identity of the country, and it was believed that the language would help establish a country. Therefore, much attention of early policy and planning was directed to standardising a language.

Then, early language planning scholars tried to propose different ways and theories on how to develop a unified language. The first and perhaps most famous framework was proposed by Haugen (1966) which subsequently influenced other models, like, Kloss (1969), Ferguson (1968), and Neustupný (1974) to name only a few. Haugen (1966) described standardisation process as having four subsequent steps: selection of a norm, codification of form, elaboration of function, and acceptance by community. In order to understand the early work on language planning, these steps are briefly discussed in turn.

First, in selecting a norm one language was chosen from a range of local languages. The selected language was to get standardised and given a new status as a national language. Therefore, this initial process is sometimes known as, as J. Jenkins (2014) notes, 'Status Planning' in Kloss's (1969) model of language planning. Second, in codifying the norm, the language was formally and strictly prescribed in terms of grammar, pronunciations and writing systems. The codifiers are usually

competent and professional linguists. The codification of form is similar to other terms, like 'Corpus Planning' by Kloss (1969), and 'Graphization' by Ferguson (1968).

After that, the third step in Haugen's framework is elaboration of function. The elaboration involves the development of new technical terms and vocabularies in specialised domains such as new science and new technology. New words and expressions are coined and put in a new dictionary. There are similar terms used to describe this process: Ferguson (1968) used a term, 'Modernization of Language' in his planning model, while Neustupný (1974) preferred to call it, 'Language Cultivation'. Finally, the last step in planning process is the acceptance of the norm by the new nation or country. The newly coined language needs to be accepted, learnt and used by its people in the country in order to survive. This is achieved by the strict implementation of laws and regulations imposing the production of books, leaflets, magazines, and newspapers in the standard language. Also, the rules prescribe the language as a medium of instruction in schools, universities, radio, and television.

However, this early work on language planning received both positive and negative criticism. Although it was beneficial to nation-building and national unification, selecting a language to be the norm resulted in, as Ricento (2006: 13) notes, 'stable diglossia'. According to this argument, when one language among other local languages is chosen to be the norm, this has the effect of lowering the status and regulating the roles of other indigenous languages to local uses, while at the same time elevating the status and extending the domains of the norm to national, political and educational sectors, helping to perpetuate the 'stratified', 'class-based' structures among languages and their speakers.

In addition, while the planning provided insights into an understanding of relationship between language structure and its functions, and how local languages relate to various forms of social organisation and interactions (communities, ethnic groups, and nations), the emphasis on the use of one-nation-one-language policy helps propagate assumptions that linguistic diversity is seen as obstacles for nation development and extensive multilingualism and bilingualism correlate with backwardness, poverty and economic underdevelopment (Lo Bianco, 2004). This leads to, as Ferguson (2006) points out, some kind of language policy and planning interventions that sought to subdue and tame such diversity (some of these planning measures, like, the English-Only policy in the U.S. contexts will be discussed below).

Moreover, Milroy and Milroy (2012) criticise the above planning process on the grounds that the four stages of standardisation do not necessarily follow one another in order. Some stages may overlap or precede others earlier in the sequence. Likewise, J. Jenkins (2014: 75) notes that while Haugen's elaboration involves the continuing work on codification of new words and expressions in line with the social development, the four steps 'tend to be interpreted as discrete and complete. This leads, in turn, to the impression that language norms are fixed, rather than dynamic and changing over time through contact among users of a language'. More and detailed discussion of how language changes and becomes dynamic in practice are discussed together with the latest conceptualisation of language in the second half of the chapter when ELF and EMF are discussed.

Last, but not least, Tollefson (2010) criticises early work on policy and planning on that it fails to analyse the impacts of national policies and plans on local contexts. This is because too much emphasis is placed on technical and practical issues/problems (e.g. how best to standardise a language, disseminate, use, teach and how to learn it) rather than ideological and political evaluation of plans. According to Tollefson, it ignores the ideological dimensions inherent in the policies and plans.

In short, while early work on language planning received strong criticism from critical views on language policy and planning as has been discussed, it arguably provided the basis for further development in the field, particularly the emergence of critical conceptualisations in the field of language policy and planning, some of which will be discussed in the first part of this chapter particularly those that informed my project. But, in what follows, there is one final point to mention in this introductory section which is how the terms, language policy and language planning are used in this thesis before we move on to the first part of the chapter. This is because the clarification of terms will greatly facilitate our discussion and enhance our understanding throughout the chapters.

Literature shows that there are no generally accepted definitions of the terms (language policy and language planning), and how these terms are used (Ferguson, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Ricento, 2000). For scholars like Kaplan and Baldauf (2003: 6), there is a clear distinction between them. From their views, language policy is defined as 'a body of ideas, laws, regulations, rules, procedures, and practices intended to achieve the objectives of a policy', while language planning 'leads to, or is directed by, the promulgation of a language policy'. As Kaplan and Baldauf elaborate, these definitions would suggest that a language policy should be stated at the highest

levels of authority before it is planned (or language planning) and implemented at lower levels to achieve the stated goal of policy.

However, language policy and its planning process are not that straightforward and sometimes become more complicated than originally thought as stated above. There are occasions when policies are formally stated at the highest levels of authority, but not (or cannot be) implemented at the lower levels in classroom by teachers (some examples are provided below when tensions between top-down policy and bottom-up practices are discussed). This means policies go without planning and implementing. In addition, sometimes language policies are found only in practice, which is sometimes called *de facto* policies. For example, inside classrooms teachers and students create and make their own policies as appropriate ways of teaching and learning. These policies are often different from the stated policies and rules (some examples of *de facto* language policies are discussed below). As Spolsky (2004, 2012) argues, it is the de facto policies that are the real language policies, and thus deserve more attention from language policy scholars than other types of policies (e.g. stated policies). Therefore, as Ferguson (2006) suggests while the distinction between policy and planning seems justified in some situations, it may be preferable not to overplay the discreteness of the two as separate categories, but instead regard them as so closely related. I follow this advice and I am in line with those policy scholars who combine the two into one, and use language policy in their discussion, such as, Ricento (2000), Tollefson (2013), Johnson (2013) and (Spolsky, 2004, 2012). Thus, I should use the term language policy (hereafter LP) to include the notion of language planning as used in the title of my thesis and will be used as such throughout the thesis.

As Ricento (2006) points out, although the monolithic view on language in general and on LP in particular was heavily criticised in the past as discussed above, such idea still continues to be influential in education policy to the present day as will be discussed below in the first part of the chapter. In this part, I will discuss critical concepts of LP. I will first of all engage in the recent LP conflict between assimilationists and pluralists over the L1 medium of instruction in the United States. This is because the critical views on LP expressed by the pluralists arguing for the use of students' L1 in classroom teaching and learning as part of their language right, informed my thinking about the crucial roles of L1 in intercultural communication in EMI setting, rather than the English-Only policy supported by the assimilationist arguments. After that, I examine the relationship between LP and ideology before I explain critical LP framework that I used. This includes the working definition of LP, different elements of policy, and how they are interrelated.

Then, I will move on to the second part of the chapter which is about global Englishes with the focus on the latest conceptualisation of ELF. In this part, I first begin by discussing the spread of English, its roles in different part of the world, and the implications of the spread in terms of language contact. I then evaluate different orientations to English. I will problematize some approaches in order to present my own. Then, I will discuss in detail the concepts of ELF and its conceptual development from past to present including the new reconceptualization of ELF that informed my study. Finally, I will end the chapter by elaborating ELFA in academic contexts showing how English is used in practice and how ELF/EMF/ELFA are so relevant to EMI contexts. In what follows, let us turn to the arguments between the assimilationists and pluralists.

2.2   The implementation of language policy from a ‘bottom-up’ perspective: The use of L1 in EMI classroom

For EMI programme, it is often understood that English should be the only language for medium of instruction inside classroom between teachers and students. However, when EMI practices are examined from a bottom-up approach, it is often found that such policy is not always adhered to as this section will go on to demonstrate, and also there is a lack of bottom-up policy study in Thai contexts. Therefore, this section will, first of all, discuss the notion of bottom-up approach that is currently used in this study. This discussion will also include Spolsky's framework of language policy that is currently used as the main theoretical framework of my study. Secondly, it will review some EMI studies exploring the use of L1 inside EMI classes. Here, the discussion will mainly focus on EMI contexts similar to the Thai one where this study is taking place. I will also critique on the methods that are used to study LP in this similar context. At the end of this section, I will argue for more research into EMI policies and practices from a bottom-up perspective in general and in Thai contexts in particular.

Language policies can be developed at different levels. If they are developed at a macro level by some governing or authoritative body, they are called 'top-down language policy' (Johnson, 2013). For example, English is sometimes officially stated as a medium of instruction at the university official level in some EMI universities like the one under question. However, whether or not this official EMI policy is enacted accordingly at a lower level by teachers and/or students is an empirical question to which this study is about to answer. Here, at the lower or micro level, language policies can be developed by and for the communities they are meant to impact.

Johnson (2013: 10) calls this type of policy generated at the micro level or grassroots as a ʿbottom-up language policyʾ. As Johnson explains, sometimes the bottom-up language policy can be covert because it is unofficial. Also, following Shohamy (2006), the bottom-up policy can be covert when it is collusive and in breach of the officially stated policy, and thus is often intentionally hidden or veiled. For example, Carrol and Hoven (2017) studied EMI policies and translanguaging practices in an Arab university in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), and reported that many EMI teachers commonly used Arabic in their content classroom where it was supposed to be English medium. When asked for why they used Arabic instead of English, the teachers mentioned that there was a lot of pressure for students to pass an exam and to receive a good grade, and for teachers to receive good evaluation from their students. And, one way to make sure that students do well and that they understand is by teaching in Arabic. Carrol and Hoven write that it is not advisable to document where Arabic was being used in what were supposed to be EMI classroom because doing so whould highlingt linguistic realities within the institution that were best left unreported. The researchers initially wanted to use classroom observation and interview to gather the information, but they were told that classroom visit would jeopardize the positions of teachers because the classroom teaching practice involved translanguaging between English and Arabic, and such practice may result in the teacher being fired. For that reason, the researchers and teachers agreed on the use of interview only. The researchers conclude that while the bilingual context of the UAE is ripe for translanguaging practices, these practices are often ʿstigmatizedʾ and not openly discussed. This means while many bilingual Arabic teachers and English teachers reported that they indeed used the studentsʾ L1 in the content classroom along with English because this helped students understand the content, the overt and public use of Arabic is ʿtabooʾ. In other words, the teachers understood that using the studentsʾ L1 can and does facilitate understanding of content and thus they used it, but their practices in this context are unethical to document because so doing could jeopardize the positions of both teachers and researchers. More discussion about EMI studies from a bottom-up approach is provided below. In short, the bottom-up approach to EMI language policy basically means the study of the implementation of language policy inside classroom and/or the study of language practices. In my study, I am interested in how English language is enacted inside its EMI classrooms. In other words, I am interested in language practices, or how teachers and students implement the policy and/or use English in their teaching and learning activities inside EMI classrooms (RQ1). With this aim in mind, I found Spolskyʾs framework of language policy very useful. This framework will be discussed next.

According to Spolsky (2012), there are three levels where LP can be found: in language management, language practices, and beliefs about language, all of which are interrelated. The first element of LP is language management or how language is managed or stipulated in terms of rules and regulations. Spolsky (2012: 5) defines language management as, 'efforts by some members of a speech community who have or believe they have authority over other members to modify their language practice'. This may be achieved by forcing or encouraging them to use a certain language or variety. A clear example of this, as Spolsky notes, is an official language law (the use of a national language) stated by the government at the top down level. In EMI contexts, language management will be the EMI rules and policies, such as the use of English as a medium of instruction. However, as Spolsky points out, 'just as speed limits do not guarantee that all cars abide by them, so a language law does not guarantee observance' (ibid: 5). In other words, although English is explicitly mentioned as a way of teaching and learning in EMI classrooms at the top-down policy, this rule is not always in place when it comes to the implementation process at the bottom-up level which refers to 'language practice', the second element in Spolsky's framework. So language practices refer to, 'what actually happens' in terms of language use. In other words, language practice means what actually happens inside EMI classroom or how teachers and students implement the EMI top-down policy which is the main focus of my study. The third element of LP is language beliefs or language ideology. This is a set of beliefs about the appropriate use of language that are shared by the members of a community. Beliefs, in this study, refer to 'propositions individuals consider to be true and which are often tacit, have a strong evaluative and affective component, provide a basis for action, and are resistant to change' (Borg, 2011: 370-371). To put it another way and as Spolsky (2004: 14) notes, language beliefs refer to, 'what people think should be done'. This is similar to language ideology which is defined in this study in broad terms, as 'the structured and consequential ways we think about language' (Seargeant, 2009: 26). Regarding the use of English in EMI programme, teachers and students often think and believe that it is only English that should be used inside classrooms because of the policy. Consequently, this belief and ideology tend to make some teachers feel guilty when they have to resort to the use of their L1 or their students' L1 when teaching the content subjects, while such use of L1 or other languages greatly enhances the students' overall comprehension of the content areas being taught and learnt. Also, the EMI participants often believe that native English language is the only appropriate way of communication in EMI setting. Such ideology has far-reaching consequences. Essentially, the use of Spolsky's three element framework of language policy goes so well with my qualitative research methods (e.g. classroom observation and

interviews) examining how language policy is enacted inside classroom (language practices) and the beliefs of teachers and students about their practices.

The tacit EMI policy often indicates that only English should be used as a medium of instruction. But when the policy is examined it often shows that L1 and other languages are also used alongside the English language among the EMI teachers and students (Abdullah & Heng, 2014; Haji-Othman, Yaakub, Ghani, Sulaiman, & Hitam, 2014; Kim, 2014; Ernesto Macaro, 2009; Ong & Zhang, 2014; Robinson, 2014; Stroupe, 2014; Tayjasanant, 2014; Tien, 2014). For example, Macaro (2009) explored EMI implementation regarding the use of L1 via survey and interviews, and categorised the use of L1 in three distinct ways. Firstly, the 'virtual position' is represented by teachers who believe that the exclusive use of English is desirable, and therefore feel that they have to use English only. Then, the 'maximal position' will include teachers who hold that the exclusive use of English is not possible because the perfect conditions inside classroom do not exist, and therefore these teachers believe that they should maximise the use of L2 (or English) and be flexible about using it, but doing so they feel guilty when they have to use both L1 and L2. The last type refers to the 'optimal position'. This represents those teachers who value the use of different languages in enhancing EMI teaching and learning, and who do not stick to the only use of L2 or English language inside EMI classrooms. In short, Macaro's categorisation of L1 and L2 use shows a continuum ranging from a monolingual (e.g. the virtual position) to multilingual (e.g. the optimal position) views on language (Doiz and Lasagabaster, 2017). However, in his categorisation, Macaro used the term 'codeswitching' which indicates a language or languages as a fixed and static entity, and the term has been problematized in the literature by, such as Canagarajah (2011) and Mazak (2017), on the grounds that codeswitching refers to language as a code, and changing between the code means switching between languages. My position is in line with Mazak (2017) and Canagarajah (2011) that bilingual or multilingual speakers use all of their communicative repertoire as an integrated system which means they use their entire linguistic repertoire in order to understand and communicate in multilingual interaction. Therefore, in this thesis, I theorise the use of different languages inside EMI classroom as 'translanguaging' rather than 'codeswitching' (CS). Here the term 'translanguaging' refers to 'the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system' (Canagarajah, 2011: 401). In a nutshell, translanguaging here means the communication that involves a range of different languages, and the communication is seen as fluid and dynamic, so the boundaries between languages have become blur. This concept is similar to the notion of 'English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF) proposed by Jenkins (2015) which will be discussed later in

the chapter. In the following paragraphs, I will review some studies of use of L1 in EMI classrooms with the main focus on studies in Southeast Asian contexts because these contexts are similar to the setting in which my study is taking place. I will first discuss EMI studies that used surveys or questionnaires. Then, those researches that used interview techniques will be explored. Finally, I will discuss studies with observational data. The discussion here also indicates that there is a lack of L1 study in Thai EMI contexts at the university levels.

Kim (2014) conducted a small-scale survey study at a university in Yongin, near Seoul, in order to explore the perceptions of codeswitching of some of the academic teachers who taught students majoring in English. The researcher circulated an anonymous questionnaire to 183 instructors, with the response rate of around 12%. The survey comprised 13 closed and two open-ended questions. The first five questions elicited personal information about the participants (etc. teaching experiences, their classes and their estimate of their own use of Korean in their classes). The findings showed that the teachers' use of Korean varied considerably: some said they used English almost exclusively (or the virtual position in Macaro's terms), while others reported that most of their classes were carried out in Korean (or the optimal position). Among the latter case, the use of Korean in classroom teaching and learning ranged from less than 30% to more than 70% of classroom language. For example, a third of the respondents said more than 50% of their classroom instruction was in Korean. The respondents said they needed to switch from English to Korean to help the students' understanding. Also, as noted, their use of CS was affected by factors like their personal beliefs, the instructional materials they used and their students' proficiency levels. In summary, Kim (2014) concludes that these instructors perceived that CS might help the students understand the content (etc. explaining difficult concepts) of the classes, and might reduce anxiety and raise motivation, but would not be beneficial for their students' linguistic development. However, while Kim provided useful findings of how L1 was used inside EMI classroom, the methodological design of her survey study was limited because of the number of respondents and a lack of observational data which could have validated the self-reported data from the survey.

Moving on from Korea to Malaysia, another similar small-scale questionnaire study was conducted by Abdullah and Heng (2014) in Malaysian context. The two researchers investigated how 14 teachers at Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) used L1 in their classroom via survey. When asked how often they used CS in their classes, 43% of the teacher participants responded 'seldom', 21% 'always' and 36% 'often'. Non of them said that they never codeswitched. The reasons for the

CS were mainly to facilitate English explanation and understanding, especially when vocabulary was a problem. This is similar to Kim's findings discussed above. A few participants said CS motivated and encouraged students to speak out. Also, some teachers mentioned that they codeswitched when they wanted to tell a joke. However, although the questionnaire technique may be useful in that it helps researchers easily and quickly gain useful information, as critique argues, this method is unsuitable for probing deeply into an issue and it usually results in rather superficial data (Dornyei, 2007). This is because, as Dornyei points out, the amount of time respondents tends to be willing to spend on reading and answering a questionnaire is rather short which consequently limits the depth of investigation. Therefore, using a questionnaire survey alone usually provides a rather 'thin' description of the target phenomenon. Next, I will review some relevant studies that employed interviews to investigate the use of L1 in EMI classrooms in other Southeast Asian contexts.

Using interview as the only research method, Haji-Othman et al. (2014) investigated codeswitching by Bruneian teachers who taught various language classes at a language centre at the Universiti Brunei Darussalam (UBD), the oldest and comprehensive university in Brunei. The researchers used interviews to examine how the teacher participants used L1 in their classrooms, and their beliefs about their linguistic practices. There were three tutors involved in the interviews. Two (T1 and T2) were bilingual who could speak Malay and English, and one (T3) trilingual speaking Malay, English and Tutong, an indigenous language. While T1 and T2 were teaching a compulsory English course at the language centre with the aim of improving the students' English proficiency, T3 was teaching an elective course of Tutong language which the students were free to choose and for which they could obtain credits towards their degree. The students taking language classes at the centre were mostly Bruneians with some international students. Tutors and students shared some language backgrounds, they both spoke Malay and English.

Regarding the findings, both T1 and T2 claimed that they did not codeswitch in their English lessons, whereas T3 admitted that he did codeswitch in class. As noted, T1 believed that the maximum exposure, or absolute exposure, to the target language (English) is the only way to improve the students' linguistic performance. Also, another reason that was shared by T1 and T2 was their personal beliefs that they felt comfortable in speaking English on most occasions, although they both spoke Malay as well. Meanwhile, the researchers pointed out another reason for such English-only policy. They note that there appears to be a higher expectation of using English when it comes to the university levels than at the primary and secondary schools.

However, T3 reported that he used Tutong (50%), Malay (20%) and English (30%) of his total classroom talk in his language lessons. The teacher participant stated his belief that he wanted to draw on the students' multilingual ability in order to help them with learning.

Another interview study with similar results was reported in Bhutan by Robinson (2014). Robinson used the interview technique to study CS by two Bhutanese university teachers (Sherab and Tshering) at the Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) which consisted of 11 member colleges located throughout the country. Sherab's classes were mainly aimed at improving the English proficiency of students while Tshering's classes were predominantly focused on content among the in-service adult learners who were health care workers. Generally, as noted, the medium of instruction at the university level in Bhutan is English, while the two teachers felt that the Bhutanese university students were weak in English skills particularly reading and speaking skills. The finding showed that teachers' practices and beliefs varied. Sherab claimed that she rarely used even a word of L1 (Dzongkha) in her English lessons. This reflects the 'virtual position' in Macaro's (2009) categorisation discussed above. Sherab reported that she felt more comfortable with using English in classroom teaching than using the student's L1. Also, the teacher felt that her students were expecting to hear and practice English during the English lessons, so she felt that she should be using English only. However, another tutor, Tshering, had a different approach to classroom teaching and learning. Tshering felt that it was not necessary to restrict language use to English only. So, she reported she sometimes used Dzongkha to explain some difficult English concepts and to stress the main points. She said she gave and explained some clinical cases in L1 in order to facilitate students' understanding. Also, as the teacher mentioned, the L1 was used to tell a joke to make sure everyone understood it, similar findings found in Malaysian context discussed above.

Moving from Bhutan to Japan, I will provide the last example of interview study of EMI practices at university levels in the Southeast Asian contexts, before I provide some critique of such interview technique. Unlike the above two interview studies that involved only a few interview participants, Stroupe (2014) interviewed 18 Japanese university teachers (12 males and 6 females), and examined how they used L1 in their classroom teaching. The findings in general showed that while some instructors reported that they used very little Japanese during their lessons, many instructors claimed that they never used Japanese but only English. Among the former group who used some Japanese, they mentioned that they used it less than 10% of classroom language with lower proficiency level students. For example, with students in elementary classes who had basic levels of English, the teachers said they used Japanese around 6% of classroom talk, while in more

advanced classes, the L1 was used as less as 2%. When asked for the reasons for the use of L1, the teachers mentioned that the Japanese was used for managerial purposes, such as, organising the classroom activities, providing instructions, and maintaining the pace of classroom teaching and learning. Additionally, many teachers reported using Japanese to lighten the atmosphere of the class, or to reduce the affective level of students through joking or to build rapport. L1 was also used to explain the concepts in English. However, as Stroupe pointed out, the limitation of his interview research is that all data were self-reported: the participants were asked to estimate the percentage of L1 use and there were no observations to validate the reported amount of codeswitching. In addition, as Dornyei (2007: 141) notes regarding the weaknesses of interview method, the respondents will be inevitably influenced by what is usually termed the 'social desirability bias'. The means when participants desire to meet the expectation, and they often know the preferred responses, as a result they may begin to provide the answers that they believe are expected of them. This is when participants try to meet social expectations and over-report desirable attitudes or behaviours while underreporting those that are socially not respected. This might be the case with the teacher participants in Stroupe's study, therefore the finding could have been validated by the observational data. Next, I will move on to discuss the studies that used observations to study the use of L1 in EMI contexts.

In a university in Taiwan, Tien (2014) used a technique called 'reflective practice' to study her own CS practice. She taught a subject called 'Introduction to Linguistics' for second year students. In this course, there were 76 local students (32 males and 44 females) who spoke Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese, and seven exchange students from mainland China. As noted, the department language policy was English-Only, but Tien would like to know how she implemented the policy. Basically, she wanted to find out, 'what do I do?', 'how do I do?', and 'what does this mean for me and students?'. Tien used audio-recordings of three complete consecutive weekly classroom lessons in order to explore the nature of her classroom talk with the focus on how she used more than one language to achieve the lesson objectives. Regarding her findings, Tien found that she used both Chinese and English in all the three classes with the amount of Chinese increasing over time. In lesson one, she used L1 7% of her classroom talk, this increased to 15% in the second lesson, and 30% in the last one. This meant, the amount of English use had decreased from 93% to 85% and to 70% of classroom language, over the three time periods observed. Tien observed that there were several functions of CS. CS was used to confirm that the students understood her message (etc. questions) in English. Also, she used Chinese to emphasise an important point, such as it was used to explain the course syllabus where the students should have paid attention to.

Also, Tien reported that she intentionally used Chinese in order to explain the three types of grammar for the sake of the students' overall comprehension. Also, she mentioned that L1 was used to banter with her students, 'I purposely used Mandarin to banter with the students about how they had not paid attention to my previous reminders regarding the quiz policy. The use of Mandarin enabled me, more easily than would have been possible in English, to express my disappointment in a jocular manner'. However, despite the benefits of CS, Tien felt bad about her use of L1, 'yet I was still caught in the dilemma of not meeting the departmental requirement, which is to use English-medium instruction only, and the adoption of the learners' mother tongue which produces better teaching and learning outcomes. Here, the researcher herself seems to approach the EMI language policy and practices from a deficit view.

Similarly, another study that used observational data to examine CS is by Ong and Zhang (2014) in Singapore. Ong and Zhang studied CS among 22 undergraduate students, how they used and formed determiners (Det) in both English and Chinese. The students spoke English and Mandarin Chinese. The two researchers used audio-recordings (137 minutes) to capture CS while the students were participating in task-based academic group discussions inside classroom where they discussed issues related to their academic study, brainstorming research topics etc. The researchers found that 19 out of 22 students codeswitched between English and Chinese Mandarin: the pattern was Mandarin Det+ English Nouns with the preference for Mandarin determiners over their English counterparts. Also, the students were found using fewer English determiners including articles ('a', 'and', and 'the'). The researchers then point out that, 'this (finding) is compounded by the noticeable deficiency in the use of indefinite articles in Singapore English, similar to the non-native variation in the use of English articles by Chinese EFL learners' (Ong and Zhang, 2014: 173). Then, for the pedagogical implications, the two researchers suggest that English teachers should reinforce teaching English determiners to students. Also, lecturers should explain and help students to understand how to use the English determiners for 'effective English' for communication. However, again the researchers themselves were taking a deficit approach to language policy and practices: they tend to think that the 'effective English' means the 'native English', therefore any different use of English that differs from the native norm is considered as an 'error' that is in need of improvement. The researchers never question the appropriateness of the native English. I will next more on to a Thai university context where CS was studied using a bottom-up approach.

There seems to be a lack of EMI study at the university level that used observational data. After some searching effort for this kind of study, I have found only one study which will be discussed next. Tayjasanant (2014) used classroom observations and interviews to study CS by two female Thai teachers (Elspeth and Bessie) who taught English language classes during the summer months. Two lessons delivered by each teacher were audio-recorded. Elspeth taught engineering students who were drop-outs and failed their previous English course while Bessie taught basic English to non-English major students. These two classes consisted of around 40 students with low English proficiency backgrounds. After analysing the classroom data, the researcher carried out semi-structured interviews with the two instructors. The findings showed an extensive use of Thai with little use of English. Elspeth used Thai over 80% of her total classroom languages while Bessie used it around 30%. The researcher listed a range of functions of CS from the analysis of both observational data and interviews. CS had both pedagogical and social functions. Regarding the pedagogical purpose, Thai language was used for questioning and elicitation (etc. to ask students about grammar rules, vocabulary items and correct answers in exercises), for translation from English to Thai to ensure that students understood, for clarification (to clarify meanings, give students feedback), and for comprehension check (etc. to check whether students could still follow the teachers or the lessons). Moreover, in terms of social functions of CS, the Thai language was used for compliment and praise (to promote positive self-esteem in students), for encouragement (etc. to give particularly weaker students' confidence in doing difficult activities, and for casualness (etc. to reduce the distance between the teacher and students by means of chatting and making jokes). However, the research context of the study by Tayjasanant (2014) is different from my current study. My thesis study examines the EMI contexts where content subjects are taught through the use of English, while Tayjasanant's study examined the English language skill courses where the aims of the lessons were to improve the students' English skills. Also, while Tayjasanant described the act of using different languages as 'codeswitching' which is being problematized in my study, my thesis is using the newer term, 'translanguaging' and/or 'English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF)'. I tried to search for EMI studies using these new concepts in Thai contexts in vain. This might be true as Mazak (2017: 6) rightly points out in his introduction chapter of the edited book on translanguaging, that 'almost no literature exists on translanguaging in HE, since most (through not all) of the existing literature explores translanguaging in primary and occasionally secondary classrooms in the US and the UK. Thus, there is also a lack of research on translanguaging in global bi- and multilingual contexts'. This is certainly true particularly in my Thai

contexts. Therefore, my thesis hopes to fill this gap by showcasing the complexity of the EMI policy and practices, and illustrating the various ways in which multilingual practices exist within the local higher education settings in Thailand.

2.3   Taking a critical approach to policy

The early LP work as described above is sometimes called ·positivistic· or ·technicist· by Ricento (2000) and/or ·neo-classical approach· by Tollefson (1991). This is because it is ·apolitical·, and ·non-ideological· in that languages were abstracted from their socio-historical and political contexts in which they are used, and that the early LP scholars were mainly concerned with technical, practical and descriptive aspects of language, rather than the ideological sides of it. However, there was a move towards a critical approach to LP. Scholars like Tollefson, Spolsky among many others, developed frameworks that examine the ideologies enmeshed in LP, and that I found useful when theorising EMI policies. Therefore, in what follows, I will discuss the relationship between LP and language ideologies in line with Tollefson (2002) and theory on language policy proposed by Spolsky (2004; 2009; 2012), all of which informed my research. I next turn to the ideological elements inherent in LP process.

2.3.1   The interface between language policy and ideology

Tollefson (1991, 2002) argues that LP is ideological because it favours some dominant groups or dominant interests in society at the expense of non-dominant ones. The non-dominant groups are controlled by some kinds of policies concerning the use of language made by the dominant powerful authority who have access to power. In social situations, individuals are influenced by discursive processes (e.g. common sense or some ideas) to construct realities (e.g. a kind of policy). The realities are designed to govern and control people·s behaviours in terms of language use or rules about language. As Tollefson (2002: 6) points out ·language is an instrument of control as well as of communication·. So language becomes ideological in the sense that it is used to control and manipulate people·s behaviours in order to serve the interests of particular political and social groups.

For example, Saarinen and Nikula (2013) examined EMI policies and practices in higher education in Finland through policy documents (e.g. language rules and requirements in admission process), universities· website, and interviews with teachers and students. The researchers found that, in terms of a proof of English language proficiency in admission process for new under and post

graduates, and according to the EMI rules and policies, applicants were required to show a proof of language skills, such as, one of the following requirements:

- TOEFL score of 550 on paper-based or 79-80 internet-based test
- IELTS score of 6.0
- Grade C in the Finnish Matriculation examination in advanced level English, equivalent to the B1/B2 levels of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)
- Skills level 4 in English in the National Certificate of Language Proficiency, equivalent to B1/B2 CEFR
- A Cambridge ESOL's Certificate of Proficiency in English (CPE) or Cambridge ESOL's Certificate in Advanced English (CAE)

In addition, the authors also found that students who completed upper secondary education or a university degree in English-speaking countries, such as, the UK, Ireland, the US, Canada, Australia or New Zealand, were exempt from the above language requirements. Moreover, those who obtained a Bachelor's or Master's degree conducted in English in a European Union or European Economic Area (EU/EEA) country, were also accepted as having sufficient English language skills, therefore, were not required a proof of those tests. Similarly, English native speakers from one of those countries above were automatically exempt.

This means, as Saarinen and Nikula inform us, 'education completed anywhere else than in the countries listed is explicitly not accepted. This shows that the emphasis is very much on recognised Anglo-American varieties of English' (ibid; 143) leaving the qualifications from other 50 countries (e.g. India, Pakistan, Nigeria, South Africa) outside the selection of accepted languages, hence creating a hierarchy of different Englishes. In turn, as Saarinen and Nikula argue, the language requirements not only create 'hierarchies between different varieties of English as accepted or non-accepted', but also 'produce categories of identity, creating social order that fuels prestige social trajectories' and 'may sustain a certain level of inequality among international students' (ibid; 146).

As illustrated above, the EMI policies favour certain kinds of Englishes and interests while marginalising others. These interests, as Tollefson (2002) notes, are often implicit and sometimes become widely accepted common-sense ideas. This leads to the goal of critical LP scholars interested in promoting social equality is to uncover these ideologies and related policies in order to bring about social change. As Tollefson (2006: 43) points out, critical LP study investigates 'the

processes by which systems of social inequality are created and sustained, with the aim of developing policies that reduce various forms of inequalities. Critical LP scholars must critically analyse LP, identify and characterise the underlying ideologies and provide analysis of the effects of LP on various parties involved (Tollefson, 2013). My EMI policy study was driven by these goals in that I wanted to explore the ideological processes inherent in EMI policies in the local Thai contexts (RQ2 and RQ3) with the hope that first I would like to understand and expose such ideological systems making people aware of it, and consequently I would be in a position to suggest some kind of EMI policies that perhaps reduce social injustices in my context in terms of language use.

In addition, other EMI rules and policies, such as IELTS, TOEFL, CEFR, are also ideological in the sense that they feature a certain kind of English. So, in the following discussion, these language tests are discussed in turn. J. Jenkins and Leung (2014) criticise IELTS and TOEFL on the grounds that they are standardised tests and based on native English variety. Also, J. Jenkins (2014) notes that, more and more universities describe themselves as 'international' and offer EMI to attract foreign students/academic staff and to increase and embrace linguistic and cultural diversity, but they require the students to take IELTS or TOEFL, 'all of which test their proficiency in native British or American English' (ibid.; 12).

Moreover, although these tests are widely used around the world, they produce unsatisfying results. J. Jenkins and Wingate (2015) report some negative experiences of both teachers and students regarding the use of IELTS score. Here are only some examples. In their study, most teacher participants felt that the IELTS tests are unreliable indicators of language competence that is needed in their EMI programme. Some mentioned that many international students, having gained the required IELTS score, arrived at university in their beliefs that they had the appropriate language skills, only to find that they struggled to a large extent with all aspects of academic communication. Also, students were not happy with the IELTS test, and criticised it on the grounds that it has limited relevance for academic study. For example, several students reported that the IELTS writing format was counter-productive to successful writing at university: despite learning the basic writing skills, if they continued to write as they did in IELTS writing exam, they believed they would achieve disappointing results in their university assignments.

Thus, Mauranen (2012) argues for a reconsideration of objectives and practices in assessment of language skills, pointing out that English is now increasingly used in environments where it is an international lingua franca in non-English-speaking countries, therefore, in such circumstances the

highest levels of proficiency cannot be defined by simply pointing to an ·educated native speaker·
or a ·near-native· level, as is traditional. Instead, she calls for the assessment that assesses those
features that make a ·good communicators· such as code-switching, intercultural sensitivity and
adaptation skills, rather than those that account for ·nativeness·.

Regarding the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), it is also used in
EMI language policy to measure both students and teachers· language proficiency (Ball & Lindsay,
2013; Klaassen & Bos, 2010; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). For example, Klaassen and Bos (2010)
report that teachers at Delft University of Technology wishing to teach any EMI classrooms, were
required to reach a C2 level of CEFR. However, the CEFR framework receives a lot of criticism on
the grounds that it is based on native English (J. Jenkins & Leung, 2014; Leung, 2013; McNamara,
2011, 2012). For example, J. Jenkins and Leung (2014) note that CEFR is based on a native variety.
The underlying assumption behind this framework is that the learner is learning the language in
order to communicate with its native speakers and the final goal is to achieve nativelike
proficiency in that language. So, it is entirely inappropriate to use it to assess language proficiency
when English is used as a global lingua franca.

Likewise, there are scholars who criticise the CEFR framework on the grounds that it has no
supporting empirical evidence (Hulstijn, 2007; Hynninen, 2014; Little, 2007; North, 2007). For
example, Hynninen (2014: 295) is concerned about ·the atheoretical nature of the CEFR
descriptors·. This means, as Hynninen explains, the descriptors are based on experts· judgements,
rather than on theories of language and interaction. In other words, the CEFR lacks empirical
support for what is minimally required for successful communication. In addition, while the CEFR
lacks empirically-based constructs, McNamara (2011: 500) points out that the standards-based
constructs in CEFR leads to ·inflexibility·, thus, it is not suitable for testing ELF communication in
international contexts. Meanwhile, McNamara (2012) calls for the articulation of the constructs or
features of ELF communication in such a way that it can act as the focus for language assessment.
Next, I will move on to the theorisation of LP that I use in this study.

2.3.2 Exploring different levels of policy

Positivistic or traditional approaches to LP often ignore the interactions between LP and its local
settings including the relationship between LP and practice, people·s beliefs or attitudes towards
such policy, and the impacts of policy on local communities. But critical perspectives on LP focus
on these issues in a contextualised way in local settings (Pennycook, 2004; Pérez-Milans &

Tollefson, 2018; Ricento, 2000). In order to study EMI policies accordingly, I found Spolsky's definition of LP relevant for my purpose. Spolsky (2009: 1) notes that 'language policy is all about choices' and 'the goal of a theory of language policy is to account for the choices' that are made by speakers who are the members of the community. According to Spolsky (2012), there are three levels where LP can be found: in language management, language practices, and beliefs or ideology about language. These three elements of LP will be discussed below.

2.3.2.1 Tension between policy and practice

The first element of LP is language management or how language is managed in terms of rules and regulations. Spolsky (2012: 5) defines language management as, 'efforts by some members of a speech community who have or believe they have authority over other members to modify their language practice'. This may be achieved by forcing or encouraging them to use a certain language or variety. A clear example of this is an official language law stated by the government. In EMI contexts, language management will include EMI rules and policies as discussed in the previous section, and also how language should be used inside classroom. For example, in EMI education English is formally declared as a medium of instruction (see the discussion of the formally stated EMI policy of my university under question in Chapter One, section 1.2, page 4). However, as Spolsky points out, 'just as speed limits do not guarantee that all cars abide by them, so a language law does not guarantee observance' (ibid; 5). This basically means although English is explicitly mentioned as a way of communication in EMI programme at the macro (or top-down) levels, this rule is not always in place when it comes to the implementation process at micro (or bottom-up) levels which refers to language practices, the second element in the framework. So, language practices are, according to Spolsky, 'what actually happens' (ibid,). There is often a gap between EMI policies and practices.

Costa and Coleman (2013) examined EMI policies and practices in Italian HE via the use of questionnaires survey, interview and classroom observation. They report that the provision of EMI education in Italy was driven by seven principal reasons including: to improve international profile, prepare Italian students for global market, attract foreign students, improve English language proficiency, promote interculturality, improve national profile of university, and to assist students from developing countries. However, Costa and Coleman found that although the explicit language policy for this kind of education was to use English in order to achieve the key goals, in the implementation process inside classroom, it revealed that English was not always used as such. Costa and Coleman suggest that there is a need for detailed study on language practices

inside classroom because it is difficult to predict what would happen when policy is implemented by teachers and students in relation to the stated policies in a specific context.

Moreover, a gap between the policy and practice was also found in Asian contexts. Ali (2013) studied the implementation of EMI policy at one university in Malaysia, and reports that a gap between macro (Ministry of Higher Education) and micro (classroom teaching and learning at individual universities) levels. This gap was due to the implicit nature of policies and the way in which it was transmitted from the authorities to teachers. As Ali notes, because there is no formally written policy statement, the language policy is subject to various interpretations by teachers. The teachers were found being confused because they did not know to what extent English was meant to be used inside classrooms. Although they knew that the classroom instruction must be English, they were not sure how they would use English in assessment and in their teaching: whether English was supposed to be used in informal conversations between teachers and students, among them during and after class. Therefore, the implementation of the top-down policy regarding the use of English is dependent on individual institutions and teachers. This, in turn, highlights the need to examine the language practices inside EMI classroom which are the real LP.

The last example of how policy does not match with practice was reported by Cincotta-Segi (2011). Cincotta-Segi examined a bilingual classroom teaching in three primary schools, in northern Laos, a district where a minority local language (Kmhmu) is widely spoken. The focus of her study was on how Lao as a medium of instruction was actually implemented inside classroom by local teachers. Cincotta-Segi used an ethnographic approach combining classroom conversation with classroom observation and semi-structured interviews to study classroom practices or the de facto language policies. Cincotta-Segi found that despite Lao being the official and national language of education, teachers employed both local Kmhmu and Lao to classroom teaching. The de facto policies could vary greatly from almost exclusive use of the official Lao to almost exclusive use of the local Kmhmu language. The reasons for these de facto policies, as Cincotta-Segi notes, were several, including teachers' own understandings and preferences around language use in classroom, the perceived needs of their students, and the expression of teachers' identities in relation to their students. Thus, Cincotta-Segi recommends that since classroom practices can be unpredictable and teachers do not always do what they are expected, it is important to examine local practices or the de facto policies in each particular setting rather than making assumptions of others or even extrapolating from research findings in similar contexts. Although Cincotta-Segi's context of

study is different from my EMI study, I followed her advice on the need to examine the de facto language policies or language practices through classroom observation (RQ1). Next, I will move on to the third element of LP in Spolsky's framework, that is beliefs or ideologies about languages.

2.3.2.2   Policy found in beliefs: standard language ideology

LP is also found in beliefs or ideologies. This is a set of beliefs about the appropriate use of language that are shared by the members of a community. As Spolsky (2004: 14) puts it, 'language beliefs refers to 'what people think should be done'. When English is used as the medium of instruction in universities, it is generally assumed to be the academic English of native English speakers, that is, standard English (StE) (Jenkins, 2019). According to Seidlhofer (2018: 86), StE is defined as 'unmarked, stable, and uniform' and 'presupposes a stability that is an illusion, and has proved to be elusive of any linguistic definition: standard languages are fixed and uniform-state idealisations – not empirically verifiable realities'. In the following paragraphs, I should describe briefly how StE together with beliefs and standard language ideology are established in the standardisation process which has the far-reaching implications on attitudes of teachers and students, EMI policies and practices.

As Seidlhofer informs us, StE is a product of standardisation process which aims to stabilize the language in order to establish effective communicative norms and a sense of common, often national, identity and security. The communicative norms will be used against which individual linguistic behaviour can be measured. Therefore, the standard language is equated with standards of linguistic behaviour and educational achievement.

Seidlhofer provides an example of standard English used in the UK, and points out that although it was not clear who or which institutions were actually involved in the process of standardising British English variety, in most part it is the work by language experts, such as, lexicographers and grammarians who decide what counts as the English standard language which is imposed by various institutional authority. Thus, StE is an institutionalised construct, and only possible when the language is written although, as noted, it would never be perfectly realised in spoken form because it is an idealised abstract. It is then used in writing, in exam, for teaching in schools and universities. Also, StE is set up as gatekeeping for the achievement of education, and hence social status. It is the variety with a history pedigree, which in turn is seen as legitimate by laypersons and many linguists. Ultimately, the standardisation process, as Seidlhofer notes, (wittingly or unwittingly) has given rise to the standard language ideology that is a particular set of beliefs

about correctness in language. This means there is a correct way of using a language, and to deviate from the standard is thought to be ·foreign·, ·uneducated·, ·criminal·, and ·deviant·. Seidlhofer provides some examples taken from the Cambridge Grammar of English which has on its cover a ·Real English Guarantee· and claims to be based on an international corpus:

·About· is not used with the verb ·discuss·:

We want to discuss the arrangements for Chinese New Year.

(We wanted to *discuss about* the arrangements for Chinese New Year.)

As Seidlhofer observes, this passage is marked with an ·error warning symbol·. Similarly, the Oxford Advanced Learner·s Dictionary suggests the following in ·Help· notes:

 You cannot say ·discuss about something·: I discuss about my problem with my patients.

As Seidlhofer notes, the graphic strike-out seems to suggest that there is, in the teaching and learning of English, a priori assumption that communicative success depends only on strict conformity to the norms of StE. This ·real English· although it is used only by a small number of people who actually speak it, is proclaimed to be what learners and teachers of English need: the English as described in standard grammars and dictionaries is proper and standard English. Teachers and students then have been well schooled in standard language ideology under the assumption that anything that does not conform to the standard language is by definition ·incorrect·, ·defective·, and ·undesirable·. So, as Seidlhofer argues, ·these pronouncements serve to maintain the institutionally sanctioned ideology enshrined in curricular, textbooks, and official examinations· (ibid, 93). The examples of such exams include IELTS, TOEFL and CEFR as discussed above. Although the ·discuss about· is proclaimed not to be used in those grammar books, it is actually found in ELF corpora VOICE, ELFA and ACE, and also in my classroom data too. I found my EMI participants could say this without causing any communicative problem, and this will be presented and discussed in my findings Chapter Five of classroom data analysis.

Consequently, such standard language ideology has influenced people·s attitudes towards the use of English. For example, in her study of EMI policies and practices in international universities in HE around the world, J. Jenkins (2014) reports that although most student participants expressed some interest in ELF, subsequently they changed their view to think of native English as best. Such as, one European student said that she did not want to lose her national identity in her English, but when discussing a native version of English, she still thought of it as ·best· and saw her own

English as 'bad' and 'very poor', and wanted to be native-like. Also, some regarded signs of Chinese, Korean, Turkish and suchlike in their English as 'errors' although much they liked ELF in theory. One example was an interview with a Saudi student. As reported, the student described ELF as a 'wonderful idea' several times during the course of interview, but this would not be for her because, as she observed, 'I care about English' and want 'perfection', and this, as Jenkins notes, means native English, not an English influenced by her first language. In line with Jenkins (2014), I was interested to find out how LP (in terms of language beliefs or ideology) has the effect on my EMI participants in the sense that how they perceive themselves regarding their language use whether they like or dislike it and/or what kinds of language ideology seems to influence their orientations towards their English (RQ2 and RQ3).

In short, according to Spolsky's theorisation of LP, LP can be found in, language management or rules, language practices, and beliefs about a language. These three elements are closely linked and intertwined: for instance, language rules will influence language practices which are influenced by a kind of belief or standard language ideology as illustrated above. So, these elements will be examined together in my study of EMI policy and practices (RQ1). Likewise, this theory on LP is similar to the notion of language policy proposed by Ricento and Hornberger (1996). Ricento and Hornberger described LP as 'a multi-layred construct' and introduced a metaphor of an 'onion' to describe the multiple layers where language policy is developed, created and implemented. They suggest these layers of LP should be examined thoroughly, and it was my attempt to do just that (RQ1, RQ2 and RQ3).

Methodologically, Johnson (2013) and Hornberger and Johnson (2007) propose the concept of ethnography of language policy as a method for examining the agents, contexts and processes across the multiple layers of language policy creation and implementation. Johnson (2013) notes that the ethnography of language policy helps researchers study the links or tensions across the multiple language policy layers from the macro to the micro, from policy to practices (more discussion of the ethnography of LP is discussed in the methodology chapter).

As well as critical approaches to LP as discussed above that inform my study, another key area that helps me conceptualise the kind of English in EMI polices is Global Englishes especially ELF/EMF. We will next move to the second part of the chapter. Here I will briefly discuss the spread of English and emphasise the implications of such spread in terms of language change, and the new conceptualisation of English that I believe can capture the dynamic and fluid use of language.

The focus will be on the conceptual developments of ELF/EMF and ELFA. Therefore, we first turn to the spread of English and its different roles at the global levels.

2.4   Global Englishes and ELF perspective on policy in higher education (HE)

As J. Jenkins (2015a) notes, from the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I in 1603 to the current years during the reign of Queen Elizabeth II, particularly in the early years of the twenty-first century, the number of speakers of English has increased from around five to seven million to possibly as many as two billion. While historically the English language was first spoken in the mid-sixteenth century only by a relatively small group of native people living only within the shores of the British Isles, it now spreads and is currently spoken in almost everywhere around the world by its majority users for whom it is not a first language. But why this is the case and what are the roles of English in the global arena, then? Also, perhaps more importantly, what are the implications of such massive change in the way that how English has been used nowadays? To answer these questions, let us first examine how English functions in various parts of the world before we move on to the implications.

Currently, English is used as a native language (ENL) or as a first language (L1) in countries like in the USA, Britain, Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. These countries are classified as an Inner Circle, in Kachruvian three circle model of how English spread (Kachru, 1985). In addition, and in a wider context, English is used as a Second Language (ESL) or L2, usually in post-colonial countries, in domains, such as, government, law, business, and education. As Crystal (2012) estimates, there are approximately over seventy countries, where English has an official status severing various country-internal functions, for instance, India, Singapore, Ghana, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and Vanuatu. These countries are categorised as an Outer Circle in Kachru's concentric circles of English. In terms of the current number of English users in both inner and outer circles, although it is difficult to provide a precise number, when comparing the two P. Seargeant (2012) estimates that while there are around between 350 and 380 million native speakers (L1) in the inner group, the number could nearly double in the outer one among L2 users, or there could be as many as 600 million ESL English speakers. To illustrate this more closely, let us have a look at one colonised country, and India is a good example with its vast population. As Crystal (2008) notes, India's population is now well over one billion, this means around 30 per cent of these population or a total of around 350 million of Indian people is thought to have a reasonable

command of English - this figure alone is as high as the total estimate of L1 English speakers in all combined English-speaking countries.

Moreover, the total number of L2 English speakers is considerably higher than the above figures if we include those non-colonial countries around the world where English is used as a Foreign Language (EFL). As Crystal (2012) notes, there are over 100 countries where English functions as a foreign language, chiefly in Europe, Asia, North Africa and Latin American. In these EFL contexts, English achieves a special role when it becomes a priority in country foreign-language teaching policy. While it has no official status, it is the main foreign language being taught in schools. Kachru (1985) put these EFL countries into the third group called, an Expanding Circle. However, it is important to note that the term EFL is problematic in the sense that it holds the assumption that L2 learners learn English in order to communicate with native speakers (more discussion in the following section). Also, as J. Jenkins (2015a) notes, since the mid-1990s, it has become increasingly common to find alongside EFL, the use of the term English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) or, less often, English as an International Language (EIL). For this reason, the term ELF has been used in this study. This is because it reflects the growing trend for English users across the three circles in the global contexts, and suggests that English is used as a contact language among themselves rather than with native English speakers as in the EFL situation (for more discussion about the differences between EFL and ELF, see the following section).

Although it is impossible to provide the exact number of EFL/ELF speakers in the expanding circle, J. Jenkins (2015a) and P. Seargeant (2012) similarly offer the same estimate of the total number of English speakers in this group which could be as many as one billion. Take a look at one country, China, as an example. According to Seargeant, out of the total population of around 1.2 billion, there could be around 350 million Chinese people who learn and use English nowadays which is more or less equal to the total number of L1 English speakers in all English-speaking countries combined. One possible motivation among many other factors, for the Chinese to learn English, as J. Jenkins (2015a) notes, is that the outcome of hosting the 2008 Olympic Games in China might have partly motivated the Chinese people to learn and use English.

In short, the current estimate of the number of English speakers across the three circles is around 2 billion, or, around a third of the world's population uses English nowadays. This means there is a major shift in its users. Crystal (2012: 155) notes that 'from a time (in the 1960s) when the majority of speakers were thought to be the first-language speakers, we now have a situation where the

ratio of native to non-native speakers is around 1:4'. Surely, regardless of whatever the estimates are, the number of L2 English speakers around the world will keep increasing all the time due to its important roles in global communications in the present days.

As illustrated above, English is mostly (if not exclusively) spoken and/or used among its non-native speakers from different language backgrounds, for whom English is not their mother tongue. The implications of this are immense in various aspects. In terms of language contact where English has interacted with other languages around it or vice versa, language change has been observed. Jennifer Jenkins (2000) observes how English gets phonologically adapted when it is spoken by ELF users from different L1 backgrounds while Seidlhofer (2004) reports some linguistic change in terms of lexicogrammar. Also, Mauranen (2012) and her team, working on ELFA corpus, observes language contact in phraseological sequences. More details of these linguistic changes will be discussed in when we consider ELF1 below.

Moreover, the use of English in global contexts also results in different views and orientations that are currently taken by scholars to study the global Englishes. Despite the observed language contact and change in progress, some of these orientations are traditional in their approach while others are not. Thus, in the following discussion, I will discuss some different approaches to English study and will explain my current approach (ELF) used for this study.

2.4.1   Orientations to English study

There are a few paradigms in which English is currently studied. Global Englishes (GE) is a general term that covers other paradigms like World Englishes (WE) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). WE takes a variety approach and focuses on the identification and codification of national varieties of English (Galloway and Rose, 2015). Therefore, WE scholars document the distinct linguistic features of different Englishes (e.g. Singapore English, Indian English) in the areas of phonology, lexis, grammar and pragmatics. However, the ELF paradigm describes a language or languages from a communication perspective. From ELF view, as J. Jenkins (2015b) notes, a communication focuses on multilingualism or the different languages that are employed by the multilingual speakers during the course of multilingual communication which is not a variety. Also, ELF examines English use within and across national borders, thus EFL scholars focus on the process of multilingual communication where a range of different languages are appropriated in the negotiation of meaning in response to situational demands. Despite the differences, there are similarities between the WE and ELF paradigms. Here, Galloway and Rose (2015) outline a few

points where the two share similar underpinning ideologies. First, they both view English as being pluricentric, and focus on the use of English by non-native English speakers emphasising the influence of linguistic contact. Also, WE and ELF focus on the global ownership of English independent of native English norms. Finally, the two have implications for teaching the language. I will later return and further discuss the points of differences and similarities between the two when I discuss the new (re)conceptualisation of ELF below that is English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF), and that is used in this thesis.

In addition, ELF is also different from the SLA approach and EFL. The SLA perspective considers any use of English by its non-native speakers that is different from native English use, as 'interlanguage' or 'learner language' and these terms are studied as such (Jenkins, 2018a). However, in recent years, there has been a significant increase in new SLA theories, and multilingualism has been at the centre of recent discussions in SLA researches paying more attention to the acquisition of additional languages (third language [L3], fourth language [L4], etc.), for a comprehensive review on these topics, see Rose and Galloway (2019) and Cenoz and Gorter (2011). This development has been referred to as the multilingual turn in SLA (Rose and Galloway, 2019). SLA studies with the multilingual turn focus on the process of acquiring the third or additional language acquisition, and their outcomes show the linguistic development of language proficiency of the new language. Nevertheless, Cenoz and Gorter (2011) criticise some of these SLA researches in their multilingual approach, for example De Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor (2007), on the grounds that their approaches to multilingualism are still traditional because they tend to focus on one language at a time, and multilingual individuals are seen as having three or four different monolinguals in one person. As Cenoz and Gorter (2011: 306) rightly point out 'traditionally, the multilingual person's competence in one language has been compared to the ideal native speaker of that language'. In short despite the multilingual turn, some SLA studies still see language as a discrete and separate item with such monolingual point of view.

Likewise, in line with the mainstream SLA, the EFL approach continues to prioritise an idealised version of native English as the norm of teaching and learning in global contexts. In this regard, J. Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey (2011) discuss some points of differences between EFL and ELF as the following. First, EFL and ELF belong to different paradigms. ELF research works within Global Englishes paradigm where most speakers of English are non-native speakers, and all English varieties are considered in its own right. On the other hand, EFL belongs to Modern or Foreign Languages paradigm in which most communication is between non-native speakers and native

speakers and the goal of non-natives is to approximate the standard native norm as closely as possible. Therefore, any differences from native English language (NEL) are treated as ·errors· from an EFL perspective, but are considered as ·being different· from an ELF approach.

Second, in terms of the underpinning theories, EFL and ELF are conceptually different. ELF is based on language contact and evolution while EFL is underpinned by the concepts of ·L1 interference· and ·fossilisation·. As a result, in EFL studies, code-switching is regarded as evidence of a gap in the NNSE's English knowledge, but in ELF research moving between languages is regarded as crucial bilingual/multilingual pragmatic resources. Consequently, code-switching is seen as a problem from the EFL point of view, but is greatly valued from ELF approach.

Last, but not least, the goals of communication are different among the two. ELF prioritizes successful intercultural communication between NNESs and NNESs, therefore, it focuses on intercultural communication and accommodation skills. For example, NNSEs may code-switch in order to promote solidarity and/or project their own cultural identity or they may accommodate to their interlocutors from a wide range of first language backgrounds. However, the EFL approach views successful communication with NESs with narrow notions of correctness, thus, EFL speakers are to aim at mimicking NESs as closely as possible in order to successfully communicate with NESs. For example, if a code-switching is used, this is called an ·error·, from the EFL perspective because the speaker fails to mimic the way the natives normally do.

Nevertheless, in what follows I will discuss in detail the new conceptualisation of EMF that underpins my study. To do so, I will further discuss the similarities and differences between the WE and ELF paradigms because ELF and WE share close conceptual thinking throughout the ELF development. My current conceptualisation of ELF is in line with J. Jenkins (2015b) who describes ELF developments as having three phases: ELF1, ELF2 and ELF3. Later, these concepts were written again in subsequent papers (J. Jenkins, 2018a, 2018b). Therefore, my following discussions will be based on these three publications. In what follows, I will discuss the ELF developments and how these ·emulate·, ·complement· and differ from the WE paradigm.

2.4.2   Taking an ELF approach to policy in higher education (HE)

Related ELF literature shows that there are two broad different approaches to the conceptualisation of ELF. Some scholars (albeit a small minority) such as Firth (1996) and House (1999) exclude NESs of English from their studies while the majority of ELF researchers do not

(Jenkins, 2007). Firth (1996: 240) defines ELF as 'a contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication'. Likewise, House (1999: 74) considers ELF communication as 'interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue'. However, as Seidlhofer (2011) observes, while these definitions highlight the main feature of ELF which is that the majority of its speakers are not English native speakers, it has to remember that ELF interactions sometimes include users from the Inner and Outer Circles, and take place in these contexts as well, such as, meetings at the United Nations headquarters in New York, tourist cruises around Sydney harbour, or academic conferences in Hyderabad.

Other ELF definitions that are more comprehensive and fuller than the above conceptualisations are that, for example, J. Jenkins (2009: 143), defines ELF as 'a contact language among speakers from different first languages', and Seidlhofer (2011: 7) considers ELF as 'any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option'. The key feature of these definitions is that they do not exclude NESs from interactions because it is natural to see them as part of the conversation although they have become the minority. As J. Jenkins (2007: 2) notes, 'ELF does not stop being ELF if inner or outer circle members happen to be present', but Jenkins cautions that research on describing ELF features should not contain too many English native speakers because they would confound the data with non-ELF forms and make it more difficult to identify emerging ELF features. Therefore, NESs are to a larger extent excluded from ELF corpus, for example, ELFA corpus allows only five per cent of data from NESs (more discussion below when ELFA is discussed). My own position is in line with Seidlhofer, Jenkins and the majority of ELF scholars that NESs are not excluded when they take part in ELF conversations, but I limit to a large extent the data received from the native English participants. I mainly collected data from NNESs participants although NESs participants were still present. We next move on to ELF research and its developments. I now turn to ELF1 next.

2.4.2.1   ELF1

As J. Jenkins (2018a) recounts, the early ELF developments during ELF1 period started from around the late 1980s and the mid-1990s to the first half of 2000s. During this period, ELF researchers like Jennifer Jenkins (2000), Seidlhofer (2001, 2004), and Mauranen (2003) were hoping to legitimise ELF as both phenomenon and field of research. They believed that it would be possible to eventually describe and possibly codify ELF varieties including German English, Japanese English

and others. The codification was seen as a necessary step to in the direction of legitimizing ELF use which would be taught instead of standard British or North American native English. Therefore, the focus of ELF research in this period was on linguistic features used by ELF speakers from different L1.

As Jenkins (2018a) explains, during the early ELF developments, there was no previous ELF research to draw on, but the early WE literature like (Kachru, 1992) and Smith (1983) which were arguing for the acceptance of the post-colonial Englishes (Kachru's outer circle) offered a helpful precedent. ELF researchers were then informed by WE and believed that an ELF approach involved applying WE principles to the English users from the Expanding Circle, whose Englishes, unlike those of the Outer Circle, were seen by the WE scholars as 'norm dependent', which means, following native English norms and also later following Outer Circle norms. Therefore, during this phase of ELF research, J. Jenkins (2018a: 16) describes ELF as an 'emulating paradigm'. The key ideological underpinning that ELF 'inherited' from WE is the 'Fallacy 1' of Kachru's 'Six Fallacies about the Users and Uses of English' which is 'in the Outer and Expanding Circles, English is essentially learned to interact with native speakers of the language. There are other basic assumptions that ELF and WE share, such as, the myths that non-native Englishes are 'interlanguages' or 'learner languages' and that the diversity and variation in English is a sign of linguistic decay. Next, we move on to ELF2 where nevertheless ELF turned away from WE.

2.4.2.2   ELF2

ELF2 roughly started in the second half of the 2000s and was considered as the mainstream ELF research. There were a series of four conceptual shifts that took place in this period all of which were interrelated.

The first and perhaps most prominent change was the shift in focus from specific features to fluidity of ELF communication. It was noted that this was because increasing amounts of ELF corpus data became available. It was found that although there were non-native features that were used regularly without causing communication problems as mentioned above, the situation was far more fluid and hybrid than was initially understood. ELF communications were then described as 'inherent fluidity', in ad hoc, situated negotiation of meaning', and ELF speakers make use of their multilingual repertoires in a way motivated by the communicative purpose and the interpersonal dynamics of interaction (J. Jenkins, 2015b, 2018b; Seidlhofer, 2009). Thus, ELF

research changed its emphasis from on form and variety to on diversity and variability as revealed in the co-construction of meaning among interactants with different multilingual repertoires.

Consequently, the second change in focus is related to the above. This was when ELF researchers began to realize the ·unsuitability· of the WE for ELF. Here, the fluidity and diversity found in ELF data resulted from the fact that ELF communication transcends first language boundaries while World Englishes varieties exist within national or local boundaries. Essentially, for ELF research, it would never be possible to identify bounded ·varieties· of ELF, let alone to codify them. Therefore, ELF researchers turned away from following or ·emulating· WE to, as J. Jenkins (2018a) calls it, ·a complementing paradigm· during ELF2 era giving more attention to linguistic variabilities across national/local boundaries at the global levels. But ELF researchers still share some basic assumptions (such as, the basic fallacy and myths as described above) with WE. In short, while WE could still be defined as non-native models of English that are linguistically identifiable, geographically definable (e.g. Singapore English, Indian English etc.), ELF shifted its focus from features of different local varieties to fluidity and online negotiation of meaning among interlocutors with varied multilingual repertoires. In turn, ELF could not be considered as consisting of bounded varieties, but as English that ·transcends boundaries·, and that is therefore ·beyond description (Jenkins, 2015b: 55).

The third conceptual change happening during this phase was the result of the disregard for the notion of varieties. This was concerned with the concept of community in which a language variety develops. Here, since ELF was no longer described as a variety, the concept of speech community where any variety takes place automatically became invalid from an ELF perspective although these concepts are still used in WE and traditional SLA studies. Instead, ELF researchers adopted a more suitable concept of Community of Practice (CoP) (Wenger, 1998) for their research. ELF was then receonceptualised as a social practice within CoP framework. ELF researchers began investigating how ELF speakers engage in these ·relatively stable· groupings co-constructing meaning among themselves in their communities. Some notable examples are Ehrenreich's (2009) study on business CoP, Kalocsai's (2014) research into an Erasmus community, and Smit's (2010) study of an ELF CoP in higher education. However, the notion of CoP was not offering a full satisfaction as a framework for some ELF scholars. Dewey (2009) found that it was not sufficiently fluid while Ehrenreich (2009) argued that it was not applicable to certain types of ELF communications, such as, one-off exchanges. Nevertheless, as J. Jenkins (2018a) notes, despite

these reservations about the CoP framework, it has remained the prevailing approach to ELF research across a wide range of domains over the past ten years.

The last conceptual shift that also took place during ELF2 was a new conceptualisation of variety. Related to the previous changes, while the concept of speech community was abandoned and replaced by a notion of CoP albeit some reservations, the notion of variety was problematized on the grounds that it suggests a settled, unified language form in a speech community (Seidlhofer, 2011). In response to this, Mauranen (2012) proposed a new concept of 'Similects' to replace the traditional term variety and to account for any English use with some L1 influence. The idea of similects was also further elaborated and explained in her recent publication (Mauranen, 2018: 9). In this paper, similects refer to 'the contacts of a particular L1 with English'. They are different from varieties in the sense that in WE research and/or SLA studies a local variety (e.g. Swinglish, Finglish, and/or Dunglish) is described within a specific geographical community (or a speech community) whereas, as Mauranen argues, similects have no community, but develop in parallel as speakers learn and use English with other speakers from different L1. This is relevant to my context, for example, when Thai students learn and use English, they will similarly develop similects, probably known as Thai-influenced English, to some extent albeit with varying degree of similarities and differences depending on where, when and how they learn and use English. This means the Thai participants will have different degrees of English language proficiency. Also, since they share the same L1 Thai, they normally use it to talk to each other. Thus, their similects remain 'First-generation hybrids', according to Mauranen (2012: 29), because they do not develop in interactions among Thai friends, but develop in the interactions with other international friends from different L1 through the use of English. So, the Thai speakers carry with them their own distinctive similects or specific English hybrids. The same phenomenon applies to other international students. Essentially, as Mauranen (ibid.) notes, 'because similects originate in cross-linguistic influence, they comprise a renewable resource for the mix that ELF is made of'. Mauranen then describes ELF communication in terms of 'second-order language contact' which is when different similects or 'first-generation hybrids' meet and engage in interactions with other different English hybrids. In turn, as Mauranen puts it, ELF becomes a site of 'an unusually complex contact'.

In short, during ELF2 era, the shift of focus from variety to variability indicated that ELF also changed from an 'emulating' to 'complementing' paradigm in the sense that ELF transcends national/local boundaries. Although ELF research moved from 'a partially varieties-based' to an

·unbounded· approach, their prevailing ideologies remains the same because the WE ideologies had so influenced them from the start. In this respect, ·ELF continues to emulate WE· and ·it continues to do so as we move on in the next section to current thinking about ELF·. We now turn to the latest conceptualisation of ELF, or ELF3.

2.4.2.3   ELF3

This research is mainly informed by ELF3. It was noted that there were two problems in ELF 2 that led to the new theorisations. First, it was felt that ELF·s multilingual nature was not sufficiently emphasized in most of ELF research. As Jenkins (2018a: 3) notes, while ELF is, by definition, a multilingual phenomenon, such ·essential multilingualism has been underemphasized and/or treated somewhat superficially in much of ELF research·, and that English was ·vastly overemphasized· at the expense of the multilingualism in the lingua franca component. This was the main reason for Jenkins to re-reconceptualise ELF concept. In her retheorisation, ELF is defined as ·Multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice, but is not necessarily chosen (Jenkins, 2015b: 73). Instead of using the same acronym ELF, a new one has been proposed, ·EMF· which stands for ·English as a Multilingua Franca·. As Jenkins notes, EMF involves multilingual interactions in which everyone present knows English, so English is always ·in the potential mix·, regardless of whether or how it is used. Or to put it another way, English is the only language that is shared by all the participants in any interaction, it then affects the use of other languages by the speakers. One key aspect of EMF is that it focuses on the multilingualism, not English, of communication. This means English exists within a framework of multilingualism rather than multilingualism being one of ELF characteristics. Or, as J. Jenkins (2018b: 7) puts it, ·EMF reduces the size of English in ELF and focuses more on the multilingualism of most ELF users·.

The second problem in ELF2 was concerned with the notion of CoP in most of ELF interactions. While CoP is useful as a framework to investigate ·permanent· and ·semi-permanent established ELF groupings·, such as, in domain of business ELF or BELF, where speakers engage in some kinds of activity and they often know in advance what to expect and achieve in interactions, the CoP is unable to account for the large amount of ELF communication consisting of transitory ad-hoc encounters (J. Jenkins, 2018a). Speakers often do not know from the start what language(s) each other speak and also they do not know how much or what kind of English will be involved. As Jenkins puts it, ·what is shared may not be shared from the start (nor do interactants necessarily know from the start what they do in fact ·share·)· (ibid, 22). This means in such transient

encounters what is important is not a priori ·resource·, but the ·resources· that are being discovered as they emerge during the ELF transitory interactions.

Taking everything (ELF1, ELF2 and ELF3) into account and considering my study, I should argue in line with Smit (2010b) and Jenkins (2019) that the ·E· of ·EMI· should be taken as ELF/EMF. This is, in EMI settings in HE, the participants including teachers, staff and students are from a wide range of nationalities and a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds (for example, see the summary of multilingual body of participants in the EMI programme under question as shown in appendix F). In classroom, I would like to find out the roles of different languages in interactions, how these languages interact, how the teachers and students switch from one language to others, and perhaps more importantly why they carry out such switch. Next, we now move to discuss a more specific setting of ELF/EMF that is ELFA.

2.4.2.4 ELFA in HE

English is currently used as the global lingua franca in a wide range of domains (e.g. politics, tourism, entertainment etc.), but the area of education is a major one. In education, the English used in academic setting is called English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Setting or ELFA. ELFA studies can probably be dated from Mauranen·s (2003) article, titled ·The Corpus of English as Lingua Franca in Academic Settings·. Here Mauranen argues for the need of corpus-based descriptions of academic English used as a means of communication among people who share different first language. Then, research articles on academic ELF started to become available. There were two edited volumes on ELF from ELFA corpus team (Mauranen & Metsä-Ketelä, 2006; Mauranen & Ranta, 2009). Moreover, the field of academic ELF has increasingly become a major area of research and there have been more and more publications with four monographs by Smit (2010b), Mauranen (2012), Björkman (2013), Jenkins (2014). Meanwhile, there were also a vast number of journal articles, book chapters, and PhD theses on the subject over the past years. However, as Jenkins notes, despite such increasingly available publications on academic ELF, scholars working within the mainstream EAP/academic English have paid little or no attention at all to ELFA, for instance, Hyland (2006, 2009) and Lillis and Curry (2013).

In the following paragraphs, I should restrict my discussion to ELFA corpus and its findings due to its importance of being the first corpus of academic ELF to be complied. The ELFA corpus has been described in several papers (e.g. Mauranen, 2003, 2006; Mauranen, Hynninen, & Ranta, 2010; Mauranen & Metsä-Ketelä, 2006; Mauranen & Ranta, 2008). In 2001, the ELFA team project

initially started gathering recordings on spoken data at the University of Tampere, then expanded to other universities in order to cover a wide range of disciplinary domains, first to the Technological University of Tampere, and later to The University of Helsinki and the Technological University of Helsinki. The project was completed in 2008.

The spoken data collected in various speech event types including research seminars, guest lectures, thesis defences, panel discussions, and conference presentations and discussions. Regarding the disciplinary domains in which these speech events were recorded, the corpus comprised both 'soft' and 'hard' sciences including Social Sciences, Humanities, Behavioural Sciences, Natural Sciences, Economics and Administration, Medicine and Technology. The language backgrounds of speakers spread considerably covering 51 different languages ranging from African languages (e.g. Akan, Dagbani, Igbo, Kikuyu, Kihaya, Somali, Swahili), to Middle Eastern (e.g. Arabic, Persian, Turkish), to Asian (e.g. Bengali, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Uzbek), and European languages (e.g. Czech, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Swedish, etc.).

In addition, native speakers of English were not excluded from the corpus, because their involvement is a normal part of ELF interactions. However, they were not recorded in dominant roles such as lecturers or PhD examiners. Therefore, they accounted for 5% of all the data. Similarly, sessions with speakers who all share an L1 were not included because they tend to switch to their mother tongue although the situation requires English as a medium of instruction. Likewise, any events where English is the object of study were not included. This means no language classes were recorded because English must be used as a vehicular language in normal communication. In short, as Mauranen et al. (2010) conclude, the ELFA corpus offers a valuable source of academic English data for research purposes, and covers a broad range of language backgrounds, genres, and disciplines.

Regarding the outcomes of ELFA project, different linguistic features have emerged from ELFA corpus and have been studied and published in various places, such as the two edited books mentioned earlier. To be more specific, Ranta (2006, 2009) studied the use of progressive form (-ing) while Metsä-Ketelä (2006, 2012) describes how ELF speakers use the vague expression (e.g. 'more or less', 'in a sense', 'to some extent' etc.). Also, Mauranen (2009, 2012) analyses other linguistic features such as 'in my point of view', 'as the matter of fact' and 'let me say a few words...' to name only a few. Findings from ELFA corpus showed that not only ELF speakers use new systematic linguistic patterns that are different from comparable native speakers of English,

but also they use such patterns without causing misunderstanding, but ensuring mutual comprehension.

Let us take a closer look at one of these patterns/phrases, ·in my point of view·. As Mauranen (2012) notes, this phrase is used when the speaker is about to give an opinion in any interaction. It is used with some minor variabilities of in/on at the beginning of the phrase (in/on my point of view). In terms of form, it is a blend of ·in my view· and ·from my point of view· in native standard forms. Mauranen argues that the phrase, in my point of view, is not an ·individual's idiosyncrasy· on the grounds that it recurs in ELFA corpus. It was uttered in five different speech events by speakers from four L1 backgrounds: Estonian, Flemish, French, and Somali. As Mauranen continues, the VOICE corpus also showed that two instances of ·in my point of view· were used by one Swedish L1 speaker and one German. There was also one case of a German L1 speaker saying ·in your point of view·. But the expression was not found in native corpus (MICASE). Therefore, it is argued that such form is not a random error, but it is systematic showing a sign of linguistic development or change in language contact when English is used globally by its non-native speakers. As Mauranen observes, ·it is clear that this phrase crops up in the speech of people from different and typologically distant first languages. It is not very common, but it occurs repeatedly. It is thus a parallel development in speakers of a variety of backgrounds· (ibid., 2012: 157). Thus this can be an example of similects as described above. In my study, I would like to find out the linguistic forms, or ELFA features produced by teachers and students inside EMI classrooms.

Moreover, in another paper, Mauranen (2009) provides some explanations of why ELF speakers choose to use the longer non-standard forms (in/on my point of view) rather than the shorter standard ones (in my view and from my point of view). The possible reason was probably that, as Mauranen notes, the longer form yields ·greater visibility· and ·expressivity· in communication. The form is a blend of two forms close in meaning. This process of could be called ·approximation· which means ·the tendency of ELF speakers to latch on to salient features of a phraseological unit, which they use in its established sense, but without exactly reproducing the standard form·. From this argument, the mixing of the two forms will yield more expressiveness and clarity than using only one. In turn, the mutual understanding and comprehensibility are greatly maximised in ELF interaction. In short, as Mauranen argues, ·it makes little sense to write this off as an inability of L2 speakers to master the target form in full, (let alone a learner's error), because the repeated use speaks against an error interpretation· (ibid., 230).

From the above discussion, it shows that the language pattern displays itself another variable use of linguistic forms or a sign of language contact between English and different L1s which is a natural and social phenomenon. However, any use of English different from the native norms is still considered as an error from a traditional view on language. This view is so prevalent and people with this idea often show negative attitudes towards ELF in general and ELFA in particular (Jenkins, 2007). This is why attitudes towards any language become very important for that language because whether a language will survive, thrive and/or get stigmatised is pretty much dependent on the attitudes of its speakers in society. As Jenkins (2014: 68) notes, 'what ultimately happens to ELFA will depend, above all, on the perceptions of users of academic English, both NNES and NES across all areas of academic life'. Therefore, in my study it is important to investigate the perceptions of ELFA users. I would like to know how EMI participants respond to (like or not like) their use of English and also how they orient or perceive their friends' use of ELFA (RQ2).

2.5   Conclusion

This chapter had two main parts: while the first part dealt with the critical views on LP, the second discussed the kind of English (ELF/EMF) that helped me conceptualise the language used in EMI setting under question. In conceptualising LP, I problematized the traditional views on LP before I discussed the critical theories on LP used in this study. I employed both Tollefson's view on LP and Spolsky's theory on LP. In the second half of the chapter, the concept of English was discussed. There, I examined the spread of English as a global language and its implications. I then considered different orientations to English and problematized some while I discussed my approach to English. Finally, I discussed the latest conceptualisation of English which was used in my study. In the next chapter, I will explore in detail the concept of EMI, its local contexts, current research and findings.

Chapter 3   English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education

3.1   Introduction

Not only EMI is a real challenge for various stakeholders like teachers and students, it also attracts a great deal attention from scholars and the literature on EMI is increasing. Scholars approach the EMI phenomenon from different perspectives in diverse settings through a wide range of research methods. While there are a lot of EMI studies in some contexts like in Europe, Asia and Southeast Asia, others like in Thailand research on EMI is largely unexplored. This chapter will explore a wide range of EMI issues in higher education in various geographical contexts. There are three broad aims of this chapter: to present different orientations to EMI policies and practices, to present the theoretical position taken in this study, and finally to identify a research gap in the current EMI literature in local Thai contexts.

Therefore, first I will explore the history of EMI, its exponential growth in various contexts and the reasons behind the increase in EMI provision. Then, I will discuss the different meanings of the 'E' in EMI taken to study the EMI phenomenon. After that, I will explore the current literature on EMI presenting different ways in which EMI scholars are grappling with various EMI issues. Here, EMI is received both positively and negatively by various stakeholders who have different views on EMI depending on their ideological dimensions and geographical local contexts. I will first start from the European contexts to Asia, Southeast Asia and finally Thailand where a research gap is identified. So, I will first turn to the increase of EMI education around the globe.

3.2   The growth of EMI programme

The provision of EMI in higher education sectors started in Europe in the 1980s (Barnard, 2018; Wilkinson, 2013). At the time, universities in the Netherlands were among the first to introduce EMI programmes for Dutch students to prepare them for the increasingly English-dominant world of business, technology and communication. The EMI popularity spread rapidly across the continent and subsequently stimulated by the top-down policies, like the Bologna Declaration and the Erasmus scheme promoting international student exchanges across the European countries.

Wächter and Maiworm (2014) summarised a series of surveys carried out in 2001 and 2007, and also the researchers carried out an institutional survey in 2014 to investigate the growth of EMI programmes. They surveyed 2,637 European universities in 28 countries. The researchers report that the number of EMI programmes increased from 725 in 2001, to 2,389 in 2007, and to 8,089 in 2014. Significantly, during the period of thirteen years (from 2007 to 2014), the 2014 survey saw an enormous growth of EMI programme. In terms of percentage, this period represents a 239% increase in the number of EMI courses on offer among the European institutions. Although accurate statistics are not currently available, in the period from their last study in 2014 to the present time, surely there will be a substantial growth of the number of EMI courses in Europe and around the world including Asia and Southeast Asia given the ongoing and widespread impact of internationalisation and globalisation across the globe.

In the European contexts, the main push factor for EMI has been the implementation of the Bologna Declaration signed in 1999 by all European and a few non European countries (Hultgren, Jensen, & Dimova, 2015; Smit, 2010b). The aims of the Bologna process are to stream-line academic education, to make it more comparable, and to increase mobility within the European higher education. The students could move freely between countries using prior qualifications in one country as acceptable entry requirements for further study in another. For example, under the Erasmus scheme some three million students have taken advantage of cross-border education. Staff mobility is also common with 300,000 staff teaching in different universities across Europe (Kirkpatrick, 2017).

In addition, there are other drivers for EMI as well. Wilkinson (2013) lists three principal reasons for the introduction of EMI programmes. The programmes are to attract international students, to make domestic students fit for the global or international market, and to sharpen the profile of the institution in comparison to others in the country. Likewise, A. Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2013) list four main objectives of EMI provision: to improve home students' English proficiency and their content knowledge, to improve students' work/career prospects, to facilitate students pursuit of postgraduate degree abroad, and finally to attract international students and teachers.

From Europe to Asia, a similar pattern has been observed where EMI provision is motivated by a wide range of supra-national, national and institutional policies across Asia and Southeast Asia. At the supra national levels, there have been two recent prominent top-down policies that are encouraging the offering of EMI (Kirkpatrick, 2017). The first is the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) group of countries. Similar to the Bologna process, the APEC group seeks ways

to facilitate staff and student mobility across the universities of the region. The second is the ASEAN Universities Network which comprises 30 universities in the countries of ASEAN, two of these are Thai universities. This ASEAN network is seeking to encourage staff and student mobility across the universities of the network.

At the national levels, the 'Global 30' and 'Super Global Universities' projects initiated by the Japanese government are good examples. In Japan, the Japanese government has launched a series of initiatives geared towards the globalisation and internationalisation among Japanese universities (Hino, 2017). These include the 'Global 30 project which has been succeeded by a more recent project called the 'Super Global Universities' scheme. The crucial part of these governmental initiatives is the promotion of EMI. 13 Japanese universities were chosen by the government to engage in the Global 30 plan. They were provided with special funding in order to promote and cultivate the internationalisation in their universities including updating degree programmes, offering EMI courses and attracting international students. Then, the Japanese government has continued with the new Super Global Universities project which is deemed to further develop the internationalisation among the selected universities as well as more Japanese institutions have been involved.

Similarly, another ambitious project to attract international students was launched by the Chinese government. In China the Ministry of Education 2010 has initiated a policy, the National Plan for Medium and Long Term Education Reform and Development, to promote the expansion of EMI programme (Perrin, 2017). The national plan comprises three strategic goals to achieve during the period from 2010 to 2020. These include achieving educational modernisation, forming a learning society, and transforming China into a country with competitive Human Resources. In addition to these goals, the Chinese government has planned to attract both home and international students to take part in higher education institutions, and their goal is to receive up to 35.5 million students by 2020.

Turning to Thailand specifically, perhaps the main driving force behind EMI education in Thai contexts is to improve the Thai students' English proficiency and their future work and career prospects for the international and global market (Kaur et al. 2016; Keyuravong, 2010; Darasawang, 2007). This reason is also found in European contexts discussed above. There have been reports that show Thai students' English language proficiency is very low compared to other countries, especially its neighbouring countries in the ASEAN community. As Kaur et al. (2016) write, in a 2013 report by the Education First (EF) English Proficiency Index, Thailand ranked 55th

out of 60 with a ranking of "very low proficiency". In the year 2010, the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) ranked Thailand 116th out of 163 countries (see topic 2.3.1 for how this test is conceptually problematic). Also, according to the British Council, indicators show that Thailand's English-language teaching and learning were falling behind other ASEAN countries. In addition, in the Global Competitiveness Report for 2012-2013, the quality of education in Thailand ranked worst among the eight ASEAN countries surveyed, and was described as "abnormally low". These reports certainly cause great concerns for the Thai government over its Thai people's English language skills in the era of globalization (Kaur et al., 2016.

In order to improve the English education in Thailand in general and the Thai students' language skills in particular, the Thai government have initiated various plans and policies across the country. To begin with, the 1999 National Education Act supports the opening of EMI education in various forms including Bilingual programme, English programme, mini-English programme, and International programme across all levels of education from primary and secondary to university levels (Keyuravong, 2010). These programmes use English as a medium of classroom instruction, and thus will expose the Thai students to the increased use of English which consequently will enhance and improve their English proficiency suited for the global market. In addition, The Office of Basic Education Commission (OBEC) established the Self-Access Learning Centres (SALCs) nationwide hoping to provide more English teaching and learning outside classrooms, and more English exposure, so that the Thai students are equipped with the necessary language skills (Kongchan and Darasawang, 2015). Other efforts by the Thai Ministry of Education include the opening of online Distance Learning and E-Learning programmes to teach English at schools in remote areas. For example, an online collaborative learning project called iEARN was launched in 2002 to help the Thai students gain more exposure to English language through digital technology (Keyuravong, 2015). Moreover, in 2012, the Thai government announced a project called English-Speaking Year 2012, as briefly mentioned earlier. The programme recommended English teaching and English conversation practice for at least one day per week in schools across the country. The project focused on English communication skills and aimed to reach 14 million students in 34,000 state schools from pre-primary to university levels (Kaur et al, 2016). As part of this drive, the government offered incentives such as trips abroad for English teachers who successfully created an 'English Corner' with books and CDs and other resources facilitating the acquisition of English although the 'trips abroad' were meant to go to an 'English speaking country' which basically means the Thai teachers were meant to study and acquire the 'native English' while they were abroad and before they came back to Thailand. Moreover, the Thai government also sought to

recruit English teachers from countries where English is spoken as a first language such as the UK. And the US (Kaur et al., 2016). This policy shows the impression that the government favoured 'native English' over 'other kinds of varieties of English used around the world.

Just to summarise the main driving forces behind EMI education around the globe in general and in Thailand in particular, N. Galloway, Kriukow, and Numajiri (2017) provide a comprehensive list of factors that drive the establishment of EMI. These include:

- ☐ Gaining access to cutting-edge knowledge and increasing global competitiveness to raise the international profile
- ☐ Increasing income and EMI can compensate for shortages at the domestic level, particularly in contexts where domestic enrolment is decreasing
- ☐ Enhancing student and lecturer mobility and attracting talented students and researchers
- ☐ Enriching learning, fostering international/intercultural competencies, and enhancing the employability of graduates
- ☐ Improving English proficiency
- ☐ Reflecting developments in English language teaching (ELT)
- ☐ Using English as a neutral language in multilingual environment
- ☐ Offering EMI for altruistic motives such as to contribute to the improvement of the developing world by providing high-level education for students

The implications of EMI education is that EMI programmes will become a site where international students and teachers from a wide range of language backgrounds will have to communicate and make regular contact with each other. English becomes the only shared language among them, but the EMI participants still carry with them other languages or different L1s. So the EMI settings offer a place where different languages meet and language contact is present. Thus, communication will become fluid and dynamic, and the mixing of languages is a reality and inevitably unavoidable. Basically, the EMI contexts will become an ELF/EMF setting where English is used as a lingua franca, and other languages are also used too. But the English in such setting is often interpreted from a native language perspective. I now turn to the different ways in which how the 'E' in EMI is conceptualised in literature.

3.3   Orienting to the 'E' of EMI

In EMI literature, there is no generally accepted definition of EMI, and I would like to present the following two definitions of EMI which have been oft-cited and perhaps the most recent:

1) 'The use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English' (Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, and Dearden, 2018: 37).

2) 'English-medium instruction conducted in the context where English is used as a lingua franca for content-learning/teaching among students and teachers from different linguacultural backgrounds' (Murata and Iino, 2018: 404).

Regarding the former definition, it essentially includes only EMI conducted in what Kachru (1985, 1992) terms outer- and expanding- circle countries, but not inner-circle ones. Therefore, as Murata and Iino (2018: 402) rightly point out 'the definition is slightly narrow, considering the increasing tendency of English being used in diverse situations as a medium of instruction the world over'. In addition, it seems to me that the first definition seems to hold a monolingual idea of language (or English) depicting a language as a fixed and separate entity. The authors clearly and geographically divide the use of English according to 'countries or jurisdictions' giving the impression that there are clear boundaries in English language use when in fact there are a number of empirical studies that show there are no boundaries in language use, see for example Seidlhofer (2011), Mauranen (2012) and Canagarajah (2011) to name only a few. However, the latter or second definition of EMI from an ELF perspective offers a more comprehensive view on the kind of language or English used in EMI settings around the world than the former or the first, because it includes the inner-circle contexts such as EMI studies conducted in the UK, US, and Australia to name only a few. For this reason, I opted for the second definition which is broader and therefore better in this study.

In addition, not only EMI is defined differently, but also there is an assumption that the kind of English that should be used in EMI setting is native English. Dearden (2014) is a case in point. Supported by the British Council, Dearden used interviews and questionnaires to gather teachers' experiences in EMI in 55 countries, but Murata and Iino (2018: 403) point out that, "Dearden's research on EMI has nothing to do with ELF, her 'E' in EMI being solidly and without any doubt based on native speakers' 'E'". Perhaps this is because Dearden never explicitly discussed the nature of 'E' in EMI or the kind of 'English' in her paper. Consequently, this seems to show that there is an assumption that the 'English' being discussed is one of the native English. Essentially,

different or conflicting views on EMI either explicit or implicit reflect the most important current debate regarding language policy and practices in EMI education in my Thai context. While there seems to have the assumption that native English is appropriate, others like Kirkpatrick (2010), Baker and Jarunthawatchai (2017) and Rose and Galloway (2015) argue for ELF that is more appropriate than any kind of native varieties in ASEAN and in Thai contexts because in these contexts the use of English is different from the contexts where English is used as a ·native· language. Also, in my Thai local context English will be used alongside other languages of speakers like Thai or Chinese. Such use of languages will reflect the most recent (re)conceptualisation of ELF which will be discussed later on in this chapter.

As Jenkins (2019) points out, the ·native-like assumption· and ·monolingual target· are inappropriate not only to learn as a second language in order to communicate primarily with their native users, but they are "deeply flawed when it comes to languages used as lingua francas, where it is often the case that few, if any, participants in an interaction are themselves native speakers of the respective language". Likewise, Smit (2018) notes EMI in HE is fundamentally a ·prototypical ELF scenario· and beyond monolingualism. Similarly, in her earlier publication, Smit (2010a: 61) argues that in tertiary educational settings the ·E· of ·EMI· should be taken to mean ·ELF·, not any native English. "Seeing that English is an additional language to most of the participants in these settings (that is, teachers and learners), the default concept of English as the language of monolingual English speakers will surely not work".

Next, in order to further conceptualise what EMI means in my study, it is useful to clarify how EMI is similar and different from other terms and concepts in general literature, such as, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE), Content-based Instruction (CBI), and Immersion education. I will start with CLIL. Dalton-Puffer (2011: 184) briefly defines CLIL as "a foreign language enrichment measure packaged into content teaching", and similarly Coyle et al. (2010: 1) describe it as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language". Teachers of CLIL are normally NNESs of the target language and are specialists in their own discipline, but not language experts. So they focus on curriculum design and assessment of the content subject rather than the language development of their students. With this regard, as Galloway et al. (2017) point out, CLIL is often thought to be different from CBI (content-based instruction) which is carried out by traditional language teachers and often involves teaching a series of content-based themes in English language learning oriented classes. Moreover, Met

(1998) provides a useful continuum of content and language integration explaining that at one end there are programmes that focus more on content such as (total) immersion programme, and another end of the continuum there are programmes that focus more on language skills classes with content-based themes such as CBI. CLIL can be placed in the middle of the continuum because it focuses on both content and language teaching and learning: CLIL lessons are usually timetabled as content lesson (e.g. biology, music, geography), but the target language (often English) normally continues as a subject in its own right taught by language specialists. However, terminology can be confusing and Galloways et al. (2017) note that CBI and CLIL programmes often share similar characteristics and sometimes refer to the same thing, therefore it is assumed that the terms can be used synonymously with CLIL being preferred in Europe and CBI in the US and Canada. Also, CLIL is often found in primary and secondary schools while in European contexts when CLIL is used at tertiary level, it is sometimes called ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) (Pulcini and Campagna, 2015). Also, sometimes EMI is an umbrella term which encompasses both CLIL and ICLHE (Macaro et al., 2018).

Moreover, Jenkins (2019) points out a major difference between CLIL and the ·classic· EMI. The major distinction among the two is that while CLIL always involves an explicit language development course to support the content teaching, EMI does not. This does not mean that EMI students are not expected to develop their language knowledge during their course of study. It is neither to suggest that the students in EMI courses never access language support. The point is simply that any language support is independent of the course in question, and thus is taken up by students on an individual basis, whether from personal choice or because a tutor or the programme recommends them to ·improve· their English. In the admission process, if the students have the required IELTS or TOEFL scores, they do not have to ·improve· their English by taking the EAP/ESP language support classes, but are exempt from these courses. However, if students did not show the required scores or if they think they need to ·improve· their English, there will be language support lessons available for them (e.g. English pre- or in-sessional courses). Many universities around the globe operate their EMI programmes in this way which reflects the ·Selection Model· in Macaro·s (2018) five models of EMI programme. This is certainly true in my case. The EMI programme under question did not ask all the students to attend the language support unit because some of them had the required English tests prior to their admission process. In the selection model of EMI, as Macaro (2018) notes, students still need language support in order to be ready to study the content effectively while some with the required TOEFL or IELTS scores are exempt from the language support classes. The selection model is seen

worldwide, but is quite common in East Asian contexts. Next, I will explore the current literature on EMI presenting different ways in which how EMI scholars are grappling with various EMI issues.

3.4   Grappling with EMI issues in HE

The spread of EMI around the world has been received both positively and negatively by various stakeholders who expressed different views on EMI. These different orientations and evaluations will be explored in this section. This section is divided into two main parts. While the first part will explore EMI issues in wider geographical contexts like in Europe where the programme started, the second will move on to specifically explore EMI issues in Asia, Southeast Asia and Thai contexts where a research gap is identified.

3.4.1   Problematic EMI issues in wider contexts

There are three problematic issues that will be covered in the following three sub-headings including whether the EMI is a good or bad thing for local people and languages, teachers' orientations towards the programme, and the ideological evaluations of EMI policy.

3.4.1.1   Is EMI a threat or opportunity?

The spread use of English as a medium of instruction in contexts where English co-exists with other national or local language(s) raises some concerns regarding whether the use of English poses a threat to the local people and their languages or it offers a new learning opportunity for its users who use it as a lingua franca. Those, who fear that the use of English in education, public and/or for personal matters will reduce the linguistic diversity, for instance Phillipson (2015, 2018), A. Doiz et al. (2013), Lasagabaster (2015) to name only a few, will tend to understand that EMI or English-Only will limit the function of the local language and eventually result in the loss of its functionality.

Phillipson (2018: xi) in his foreword of the edited book, titled 'English Medium Instruction Programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian Universities', discusses the increasingly hegemonic use of English in EMI settings and also emphasizes the importance of the use of national languages for academic purposes. 'I am stressing this point because any switch into English-medium higher education should not be at the expense of national languages'. Also, in his

earlier publication, Phillipson warns against the impact of English on the national unity. ʿEnglish can threaten local creativity and national unity if policies that allow English to expand entail the dispossession of the linguistic capital of their national languagesʾ (Phillipson, 2015: 37). However, in these two articles, Phillipson does not provide any empirical evidence to support his claims that English is a threat. Having said that other scholars like Doiz et al. (2013) and Lasagabaster (2015) investigated such concern. These two researches looked at teachersʾ and studentsʾ perceptions of English in EMI programme at the University of Basque Country (UBC), in Spain.

Lasagabaster (2015) explored how teachers and admin staff felt about the effects of the use of English on the UBCʾs bilingual policy whereby Basque and Spanish are officially stated language policy for classroom teaching and learning. The researcher used an open-ended questionnaire to ask 103 teachers and 50 admin staff about how EMI or ʿmonolingualʾ policy, as Lasagabaster calls it, affects the people, the bilingual/multilingual policy, and other local languages including Catalan, Galician, French and/or German. The results from the questionnaire revealed that the participants were not concerned about the negative effects of English on the local languages, instead they perceived English positively because they could learn content and language at the same time. Also, the teacher participants felt that EMI helped students improve their English skills, attracted foreign students and facilitated the co-existence between local and foreign students leading to the enrichment of experiences among EMI participants. Also, the respondents pointed out that EMI instills more open and enriching attitudes. Having said that, the following is the conclusion given by the researcher, ʿthe most striking result has to do with the lack of any reference to the detrimental effect of English on the presence of other foreign languagesʾ (Lasagabaster, 2015: 126). Here, the researcher appears to believe that the English used in his EMI settings is a native English. While Lasagabaster did not find any concerns among his participants that English is a threat, Doiz et al. (2013) does.

Doiz et al. (2013) used a five-Likert-scale survey to ask 608 undergraduate students who were both local and foreign about their experiences whether the use of English in classroom threatened their L1s or local languages. The results from their survey showed while international students felt positively favourable towards the EMI, the local students were averse to the role of English. However, the researchers do not provide any reasons why the local students felt negatively about English. Perhaps, this is due to the limitations of the nature of quantitative questionnaire research. While the questionnaire saw a high return rate (608 responses out of a sample of 632), it did not allow the researchers to explore in detail the real reasons behind the answers from their

participants. Nor did the researchers follow up their findings from the survey with any kind of interviews. It seems that Doiz et al. (2013) together with Lasagabaster (2015) and Phillipson (2018) are all driven by the assumption that the English, as they tend to understand, is a traditional standard English. They do not consider the changing role of English when it is used as a global lingua franca in EMI settings.

However, many studies report that participants felt positively about English. Inbar-Lourie and Donitsa-Schmidt (2013) studied EMI in Israeli context and report that teachers do not feel that the use of English will limit the functions of either Hebrew or Arabic. Likewise, Cots (2013) using a qualitative method notes that their EMI participants, both teachers and students, show positive attitudes towards the role of English in EMI setting in Spain with teachers consistently showing greater enthusiasm than students. Also, in Indonesian EMI contexts, Dewi (2017: 254) reports that 'English has the capacity to enhance the Indonesian people's national identity through its facilitation in communicating, building relationships, sharing knowledge and developing an international economy'. The same positive attitudes towards EMI is also found among EMI participants in Malaysia by Saeed, Varghese, Holst, and Ghazali (2018).

Moreover, as Jenkins (2019) points out the use of English as a lingua franca among the local and international students in EMI setting will create the linguistic diversity, rather than limiting it. This is because English will become the only means of communication among them who share different L1 and English will be used to explore and create the learning opportunity. So, the local as well as the foreign EMI students and teachers could learn their third or fourth languages extending their linguistic repertoire by using English as a medium of communication. There are plenty of empirical data that show how English with its changing role creates a situation where learning opportunity and contact between languages take place (see Mauranen, 2012; Palfreyman and van der Walt, 2017). In essence, rather than being a threat, English or ELF/EMF in academic settings is there to create and facilitate the mutual communication and linguistic diversity, but to what extent English functions in this way in the local Thai contexts under investigation is an empirical question that this study is set to investigate (see finding in Chapter Six, the analysis of interview). In the following section, I will explore how EMI teachers think about the EMI phenomenon and the challenges they think they are facing.

3.4.1.2   What EMI teachers think

In EMI education, the content teaching is usually or exclusively carried out in English. This involves using teaching and learning materials (e.g. textbooks), classroom discussion, reading and writing exams all in English. These activities often raise concerns among EMI teachers and students whether they have sufficient language proficiency to carry out these tasks. Scholars therefore investigate the issues around such concerns. They look at teachers' and students' perceptions of EMI policies, how they experience and deal with these difficulties in different EMI contexts through a range of research methods. Thus, this section will explore teachers' perceptions, but students' views on EMI will be discussed separately later on in the chapter. Also, studies that used a questionnaire survey will be discussed first to give a general finding on teacher's perceptions. After that, reports from qualitative studies that look at what goes on inside EMI classrooms will be dealt with. In the following discussion, the general EMI literature appears to show that English is usually dealt with in terms of difficulties that teacher participants encounter and they are expected to conform to a certain standard of native English. Thus, EMI teachers are never considered legitimate users of English.

Ball and Lindsay (2013) used a questionnaire survey including five-point Likert scale responses, self-assessed English language skill and additional open responses to explore language demands and support for EMI teachers at the University of Basque Country (UBC), Spain. The researchers found language proficiency is a problem among the teachers. In terms of teachers' beliefs about their English, while some teachers felt positively about their English abilities, most of them felt they had language difficulties, particularly pronunciation, and thus, they were unable to clearly elaborate complex concepts well in English.

In order to address the problems, Ball and Lindsay (2013) discuss how language assessment and language support are available for EMI teachers at the UBC. Initially, to become an EMI teacher, a teacher candidate will have to pass a language proficiency test called, TOPTULTE (Test of Performance for Teaching at University Level through the Medium of English). The TOPTULTE is used as a benchmark equivalent to the C1 level in CEFR which is deemed necessary for EMI teachers to teach their subject in English. Then, after the initial test, the teachers who have already passed the test and/or reached C1 are required to embark on a short three-day intensive support course. The course will focus on specific pedagogical and linguistic needs. These include the use of visual aids (e.g. powerpoint), body language and eye contact, and pronunciation practice covering supra-segmental rules of intonation, stress and enunciation, segmental 'exponential'

rules of how to pronounce high-frequency academic lexis 'correctly' through to the appropriate use of discourse markers and subordinators.

However, Ball and Lindsay seem to approach language issues from a deficit perspective. They tend to cast doubt on the language ability of their EMI participants. The researchers never question the appropriateness of the use of TOPTULTE test and/or the CEFR used as the benchmark which is based on native standard norm (see the discussion of the ideological dimensions of this test in the previous chapter). The standard norm goes without unquestioned.

A more recent and larger global world-wide study of EMI policies and practices has been carried out by Dearden (2014). Supported by the British Council, Dearden used written questionnaires and semi-structured interviews to investigate teachers' experiences of and views on EMI in 55 countries around the world. She reports a number of challenges facing the implementation of EMI programmes. Regarding the teachers' perceptions of their own English, similar to Ball and Lindsay's findings, Dearden notes that not only professors and teaching staff were not fluent in English, they also expressed concerns over students' language abilities. For instance, she found that in Turkey there is a preparatory year for students with a low level of English. The students, arriving in the preparatory year with sometimes CEFR A2 level, were supposed to reach a B2 level in just eight months. But, the teacher participants believed that many of these students were not motivated to learn English as they just wanted to get on with studying their subject at university rather than learning English. Dearden appears to approach EMI issues from a traditional perspective and never questions the kind of English that is appropriate in EMI contexts.

Similarly, the mainstream EMI scholarship tends to follow with the same traditional approach. In Italian contexts, Pulcini and Campagna (2015) observe another three problems among teachers. The researchers found that local EMI teachers showed no interest in EMI education from local teachers, mismanagement problems for EMI programme, and the teachers felt that there is a lack of teaching and learning materials. Moreover, Gürtler and Kronewald (2015) investigating EMI in German HE, note other three main problems including English language proficiency of teachers, a lack of institutional support, and a lack of incentive for local teachers to teach EMI classes. The researchers also mentioned other problems as well. These include teaching EMI gives teachers additional workload, teachers are unable to transfer the content knowledge in English, local teachers felt that there was a lack of student demands, a feeling of discomfort when speaking German with German students in classrooms, and a lack of personal motivation. Similarly, the language problems among students were felt by teachers in Iceland. Here, Ingvarsdóttir and

Arnbjörnsdóttir (2015) observe that students had problems with reading textbooks in English, therefore, the teachers had to translate the texts into Icelandic when teaching. In short, while traditional in their perspectives, the above studies are focused on practical, financial and technical problems while linguistic issues have been ignored.

Moving on to qualitative studies that explored the effects of EMI on teaching performance inside classroom, in Sweden Airey (2015) investigated how teaching the same content changes when the medium of instruction changes from Swedish to English. The researcher explored teaching practices between EMI and local classes delivered by the same teacher. The two classes were compared in terms of how the two languages were used in teaching and learning. Airey used a range of data collection techniques including video recordings of lectures, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and stimulated recall. There were eight teachers. The researcher notes that EMI teachers found it difficult to explain concepts in English and spoke more slowly and had shorter sentences in their English descriptions than when doing it in their L1. In EMI classrooms, it was also observed that teachers asked and answered fewer questions. The teachers were also found to be using a more formal style in English similar to the textbook than when teaching in Swedish.

Another qualitative study was carried out by Arkin and Osam (2015) in Turkey. The researchers report similar findings. They note that in EMI classrooms there were limited classroom participation between teachers and students and there was comprehension problem because of the language skills of both teachers and students. Arkin and Osam also observe that EMI resulted in surface learning of disciplinary content, or even misunderstanding. Again, these two quantitative studies cited above are traditional and deficit in their views. The researchers never ask what kind of English that is appropriate in EMI setting, but seem to hold the view that the suitable English is the native English.

Nevertheless, a case study by Kling (2015) who reports different and positive attitudes of EMI teachers towards EMI implementation. Using a multi-method approach including classroom observation, stimulated recall interviews, and semi-structured interviews, Kling studied ten Danish EMI teachers and how EMI affected their confidence. Regarding the perceived slow lecture due to it is done in English, the researcher found that the EMI teachers purposefully monitored their speech rate and tried to slow it down when teaching in English in order to make themselves understood. One participant, (Thomas) mentioned that, "I am very much aware of that. Earlier I have been told that I speak too quickly. And I definitely do that in English".

In addition, Kling also explored how teachers felt about explaining some terminology and/or concepts in English whether they found it difficult or easy. She found that the teachers preferred to do it in English rather than translating the terms into local language because the terms are originally in English. One participant (Jacob) said, "to some extent easier in English because the scientific terminology is in English" (Kling, 2015: 211). Also another teacher (Jon) mentioned that doing it in L1 might be more difficult. "Well, actually, I think that often explaining new terminology might be easier in English because the words are often derived from English literature and they make sense in English, whereas they may not always make as much sense in Danish. So, it could be actually a little more challenging to explain it in Danish than in English" (ibid.). The same findings and reasons were also expressed by EMI teachers in Malaysia in Hasim and Barnard's (2018) study.

Kling also reports EMI teaching affects teachers' confidence. When EMI teachers were asked about how the identified challenges (e.g. a lack of language skills) of teaching EMI affected their sense of themselves as a teacher, they responded that content is more important than language. They mentioned that when they were teaching they were more focused on content than their language weakness. One participant, Lise, said that, 'when I am standing there teaching, I don't think about [mistake] – to be honest. I am actually thinking more about what I am teaching' (ibid; 210). Similarly, another teacher, Bodil, mentioned that, 'Ooh, my grammar is so awful that it is embarrassing, and I just can't do anything about it. I can just get on with it. I just think as long as the discipline specific terms are OK, I am fine' (ibid; 211). Kling then concludes that his participants were not concerned about the grammar mistakes as long as the content knowledge can be transferred to the students. However, although the researcher observes that his participants tend to forget about their grammar or correctness while teaching because their focus is more on content, she does not explain why his teacher participants still hold such belief about the correctness in language use. Kling does not provide any ideological explanations of the implicit assumption that seems to underpin the teachers' belief about a language. The following section presents two critical EMI studies that have looked at the EMI issues from a linguistic perspective.

3.4.1.3   (Covert) EMI language policy

There are very few EMI studies that consider EMI issues from a linguistic perspective. Saarinen and Nikula (2013) and Jenkins (2014) are rare examples. Saarinen and Nikula (2013) study overt and covert EMI policy by analysing website degree descriptions, policy documents and interviews with teachers and students at two universities and polytechnics in Finland. They found that although English is used as a medium of instruction, the language is more or less "invisible" and not

explicitly discussed. At the general level, the policy documents use a general term, ·foreign language·, to mean English. This is also confirmed by a more recent research carried in Estonia by Soler-Carbonell (2015). However, when delving in more details of what kinds of English are being referred to and promoted, Saarinen and Nikula found that various versions of native English are preferable over other English varieties in language requirements for the EMI programme. On the one hand, the tests accepted are not only TOFEL, IELTS and CEFR, but also those applicants who are from and/or completed education in English in the UK, Ireland, the USA, Canada, Australia or New Zealand are exempt from language tests. On the other, the tests leave out other applicants from other countries like India, Pakistan, Nigeria, and South Africa outside the selection of acceptable languages. The policy is based on the assumption that certain kinds of English, usually the former groups of native English, are ·good· or ·sufficient· for all programmes. As the Saarinen and Nikula (2013: 146) point out, these covert language policies create ·hierarchies between different varieties of English as accepted and non-accepted· producing levels of social categories and prestige social order.

Moreover, a bigger and more comprehensive study was carried out by Jenkins (2014). Jenkins studied 60 EMI university websites across various countries within East/South-East Asia, Latin America, and Mainland Europe, as well as, three Anglophone countries (the US, the UK and Australia), and five US and UK branch universities. Jenkins explored how the international universities perceive academic English in their language policies and practices. From website study, as Jenkins found, English was mentioned overtly, but the version of English being referred to remained unsaid. Nevertheless, when analysing language entry requirements, it was found that TOEFL or IELTS are required. When examining audio-visual materials and English textbooks used by the universities, it revealed that these materials were produced by NESs and these native English is preferred. As Jenkins (2014: 119) notes, ·while a general preference for native English, especially in the Anglophone and branch institutions, was to be expected, it turns out to be far more widespread and entrenched than might have been predicted·. In short, from a linguistic perspective, EMI participants, policy makers, and language rules tend to prefer native English. This shows the influence of standard language ideology that the participants have in their thinking.

There is a lack of critical EMI research that examines policies and practices with the focus on linguistic issues. And worse of all these critical studies have been ignored and thus made little impact on mainstream EMI literature. The situation then calls for further research looking into how certain kinds of language ideologies impact on both policy and practices as well as on those

stakeholders, teachers and students in other contexts. With this regard, this study was an attempt to investigate such impact in local Thai contexts and hopefully the findings will have some impact and raise some awareness of the detrimental effects of certain kinds of language ideologies on various EMI parties. In the next section, the discussion will specifically move on to explore EMI literature in Asian, Southeast Asian and Thai contexts.

3.4.2 Problematic EMI issues in Asia, Southeast Asia and Thailand in HE

In Asian contexts, there will be three problematic issues covered including the tensions between top-down and bottom-up policies, students' orientations towards EMI, and the current EMI research in Thai contexts.

3.4.2.1 Tensions between macro- and micro- policy levels

This section explores problems that are often caused by either explicit or implicit policies at different levels. Sometimes tensions tend to occur when the language policy at the institutional level is not clear enough to be meaningfully implemented at the bottom-up levels. When implementing EMI policies, problems are sometimes caused by a lack of guideline of formal policy. This leads to a feeling of uncertainty among teachers who implemented the policy in various ways.

For example, in Malaysia, Hasim and Barnard (2018) used a case study to study EMI language policies and practices at two levels: institutional and classroom levels. They explored to what extent English is used as a medium of instruction, as well as what teachers think about English and how they implement the policy. The researchers used pre-lesson interviews, classroom observations and post-lesson interviews. Participants were seven teachers from different faculties. The researchers found that at the institutional level, there was no explicit policy about medium of instruction across the university's curriculum that acknowledges the status of English. Rather, English was hidden behind the provision of languages other than Bahasa Malaysia as the language of instruction.

Since there was no clear explicit policy statement concerning the role of English, the policy was subject to various interpretations when it was implemented inside classrooms. According to Hasim and Barnard (2018), the faculty of Education and the faculty of Arts and Social Science run courses in both English and Malay depending on a particular subject. The reason for this bilingual policy is that Malay should be maintained. However, the Physics lecturers said that the staff in his faculty were following the national policy that science subjects at graduate and undergraduate levels

should be taught exclusively in English. Likewise, in the faculty of IT and Engineering, all staff and students (graduate and undergraduate) believed that any EMI courses should be taught entirely in English. Nevertheless, as far as the examinations are concerned, the instructions should be provided in both English and Malay, and the students were allowed to write their answers in whichever language they preferred although code-switching within any answer was generally prohibited.

In addition to that there is no explicit guideline of how English should be used in EMI setting, EMI programmes often suggest English must be used only for teaching and learning. However, EMI participants are often bilingual or multilingual in the sense that they may speak English as their second or third or fourth language. Therefore, they often resort to their linguistic repertoires when interacting with their friends in EMI settings. This creates a dilemma between the top-down policy (English-Only) and real practice. Therefore, the role of L1 attracts some attention from EMI scholars.

Saeed et al. (2018) studied the role of Bahasa Malay (BM) in EMI setting at tertiary level in Malaysia. The researchers investigated the attitudes of undergraduate students towards the use of English-only and/or both L1 and English in EMI classroom. They used a questionnaire survey to ask 400 EMI students at four universities. The survey was administered in both electronic format and hard copy. The researchers found that the students were generally positive about the mixing between BM and English in EMI classes. BM not only facilitated students' understanding of the lectures, it also saved time in comprehending what they tried learn and motivated them to learn too. The permission of BM in the university exams also increased the possibility of passing the tests. The students also mentioned that BM strengthened their English.

However, Saeed et al. (2018) also report some challenges in EMI classrooms in terms of language practices. On the one hand some students felt that English-Only in classes is a challenge, on the other mixing English with BM also presents some difficulties among some students because the mixing of English and BM sometimes leads to some confusion and frustration when used by the teachers during the lecture. But the most challenging among students is that, according to the researchers, students felt embarrassed about their English mistakes. Nevertheless, while the authors provide crucial information about the role played by L1 in EMI classroom, they do not explore reasons of why the students were confused and frustrated when L1 or BM was used in lectures. Nor do the researchers explain why most students felt embarrassed about their English mistakes. This is perhaps due to the limitations of quantitative survey research that does not allow

the opportunity to delve into the emerging issues found during the investigation. Research with qualitative methods should be encouraged in order to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the roles of English and L1s.

While there have been observed advantages of L1 use in learning experiences among EMI students, such use is sometimes banned in some EMI settings. This also creates a tension between the top-down policy and real practices. In China, Perrin (2017) investigated students' orientations towards the English-Only policy and practices at an EMI university, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University (XJTLU). Perrin reports that students are encouraged to use English only in their social and daily lives while on campus because this is the only way that they can improve their English. But the students felt they were delimited their language choice and sometimes would like to use and practice their Chinese among international friends in informal social situations. Such policy never appreciates the linguistic diversities the local and international students bring with them, nor does the policy question the assimilationist approach to EMI education.

Moreover, another source of tension between the top-down policy and bottom-up practice is the use of teaching and learning materials that is not fit for purpose or not practical for students' needs. This leads to a feeling of resentment among EMI students as Nguyen, Walkinshaw, and Pham (2017) have informed us. Nguyen et al. using a qualitative case study to explore EMI implementation at a Vietnamese university. The university under their investigation is a partnership between local and offshore institutions. The EMI programme is designed and accredited by overseas university and delivered at local Vietnamese campus. Overseas qualifications are awarded upon completion. Thus, this allows students undertake a degree programme from an overseas university without having to leave Vietnam. The researchers looked at policy at top-down levels and how these policies were implemented at the bottom inside classroom. In particular, they studied textbooks that were imported from the overseas institution. They found that the EMI teachers and students were not happy with the English textbooks. One student expressed his frustration with the English textbook at the language support unit. 'I don't think the English lesson we have in this university are helpful to our disciplinary study in EMI context' (Nguyen et al., 2017: 44). The researchers explain that the English textbooks used in language centre are only designed for professional needs rather than academic study. So, they are focused on areas such as marketing, organisation, leadership, business vocabulary and negotiating strategies rather than the language skills needed to manage academic study in English.

In addition, another example provided by Nguyen et al. is that sometimes the course content was highly contextually specific with limited applicability to the local context. One EMI teacher teaching marketing said, 'the downside of using US or UK textbooks is that all cases are about the US or UK market. I have to integrate examples from the Vietnamese market' (ibid.). The researchers note that this is a cause for concern among local Vietnamese students who would like to work in Vietnam's rapidly-expanding business or financial sectors because the imported knowledge and content have little relevance to the local contexts, but only reflect the American curriculum.

However, while the researchers provide some practical and technical limitations concerning the applicability of the imported English textbooks, again linguistic issues have been ignored. The researchers do not question the kind of English being promoted in the textbooks while it appears to me that it is either British or American English being promoted. In the next section, I will explore students' orientations towards the EMI programme, their English and teachers' English.

3.4.2.2   What EMI students think

This section explores findings about how EMI students felt about their language proficiency and also their teachers' language ability. The following EMI literature shows that English is usually dealt with from a traditional perspective with a lack of problematizing the widespread standard native English.

Let us start from EMI in Indonesian context, F. A. Hamied and Lengkanawati (2018) carried out a case study to investigate various EMI issues including how EMI programme was conducted, how competent and confident EMI teachers felt and whether the students undertaking the programme were proficient in English skills. The researchers used a range of data collection methods including interviews, observations, study of documents (e.g. syllabi and lesson plans), and post-lesson discussion with teachers and students. The researcher found that students do not have enough language skills. The researchers provide some examples of 'inaccurate' sentences that the students were verbally producing during the course of classroom observations. For example, 'Anyone cut the beef?', 'what actually done in the process of eating …', 'people can eaten by eagle and another can eaten by people' (ibid.: 63). But the researchers do not explain why their EMI participants use English in that way, and fail to take into account the sociolinguistic reality of English when evaluating.

Similar findings were also found in Pakistani setting. Mahboob (2017) reports that students feel they have low English language, particularly those who had no previous EMI experiences before

they entered the university. But those students who experienced the EMI in their secondary schools tended to do well. Barnard (2018) discusses the same problem and points out that the lack of language proficiency among students, stemmed from the heavy workloads from other school subjects. Moreover, In Singapore, Bolton and Botha (2017) explain that in general EMI students feel that they have problems with all four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing in English. In particular, there are some differences between students from hard sciences (e.g. Engineering, Science) and students from Business and Social Sciences. Engineering and science students expressed higher levels of difficulties with understanding speaking and writing in English in comparison with students studying Business, Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. Again, these EMI studies cited above approach the EMI issues from a traditional and deficit point of view.

Moreover, moving on to a Japanese context, Hino (2017) studied attitudes of EMI students towards their teacher's accent. He used qualitative methods including classroom observation, video-recording, open-ended questionnaires for students, audio-recorded interviews. He found that students still oriented to native norm. The following response was from a student who commented on his/her Japanese EMI teacher. 'I felt that a native English speaker teacher is more desirable as to pronunciation and fluency' (Hino, 2017: 127). Hino then conclude that, 'considering the dominance of native-speakerism in ELT in Japan, it is no surprise that there are students who prefer native English as their source of linguistic input' (ibid). However, while Hino is questioning the native norm in his study, he does not provide any ideological explanations of such native preference. Instead, he attributes the source of the problem to the pervasiveness of native-based ELT teaching and learning materials, he does not analyse the ideological process that underpins the norm-oriented attitudes, nor does he offer the kind of English appropriate for the students if the native language is not the one he thinks.

However, while the students in Hino's study seemed to appreciate the native speakers, students in Jenkins's (2014) study did not. Jenkins (2014) reports that international students in her study felt that it was the NES lecturers who caused the greatest communicative problems due to their lack of intercultural awareness. The students were confused by the use of local idiomatic language, telling culture-specific jokes, and making local references that were unfamiliar to those international students inside classrooms. Doing so, this led to the exclusion of international students during the course of classroom discussion. In what follows, I will identity a research gap in my local Thai context.

3.4.2.3 Identifying a research gap in a local Thai context

Finally, I now turn to EMI studies in Thai contexts. Although there is an increasingly number of EMI research elsewhere, to my knowledge, in Thailand in HE research on EMI is almost non-existent. In a scholarly journal, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, a special issue was attributed to medium of instruction in Asia at all levels of primary, secondary and tertiary education, but there was no EMI study in Thai context. This issue covered ten EMI studies from various countries including Bangladesh, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Nepal, Vietnam, and Timor-Leste, but non was from Thailand. In a more recently edited book on EMI, *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific*, by Fenton-Smith, Humphreys and Walkinshaw (2017), there are 15 research articles in total: two from Japan, two from Australia, one from each of the following countries: Myanmar, Vietnam, Korean, Pakistan, Singapore, China, Cambodia, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Brunei. Again there is no EMI study exploring Thai contexts.

In addition, the latest book on EMI, *English Medium Instruction Programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian Universities*, edited by Roger Barnard and Zuwati Hasim published in 2018, features eight chapters in total. While there is no full chapter on EMI in Thai contexts, I found there is one chapter in this volume where Thai context is discussed alongside with other six countries including Cambodia, China, Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan and Vietnam. This chapter is written by Ryan (2018) and titled, Voices from the field: email interviews with applied linguistics in Asia.

Ryan (2018) used a series of email interviews asking EMI teachers in seven countries listed above. The researcher explored EMI policy, practices and perceptions of teachers regarding the implementation of policy. Ryan reports a wide range of problems with EMI teaching and learning and in line with other studies, like Dearden (2014). The problems include EMI teachers found it difficult to teach EMI course because they had limited language ability, but they employed some teaching strategies, such as, use of translation in powerpoint slides and memorising long sentences. The teachers felt the EMI curriculum was poorly designed with limited teaching and learning resources. Also, the teachers felt they need professional development programme because they do not know how to teach EMI whether to use English-Only or bilingual practices. They also need more teaching resources. Inside classroom, the teachers said that the students also experienced difficulties with listening to and understanding the lectures, therefore, classroom interactions were also limited. Students also had problems with writing skills. However,

Ryan tends to approach the EMI issues from a traditional and deficit perspectives and never questions the kind of English that is appropriate when it is used in EMI settings.

However, there are two critical EMI studies that not directly but partially explored EMI policies and practices in Thailand. These include W. Baker and Hüttner (2017) and Jenkins (2014). W. Baker and Hüttner (2017) carried out a multi site study to explore different conceptualisations of and roles of English and other languages in multilingual and multicultural settings. The researchers explored three EMI institutions in three countries including Thailand, Austria and the UK. In terms of data collection, they used a mixed-method approach comprising student questionnaire, interviews with students and teachers, document analysis and classroom observations. Their findings revealed diverse roles of English and other languages. While English is used as a tool in learning content knowledge, it is still based on standard and native-like English when used in language entry requirements. In particular Thai context, classroom observations showed that while EMI teachers generally adhered to English only, students tended to use other local languages like Thai when talking to each other during the lessons observed.

A more comprehensive and larger study has been conducted by Jenkins (2014). In her study of EMI policies and practices, Jenkins collected data from 60 university website across various countries within East/Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Mainland Europe, as well as three Anglophone countries including the UK, the US and Australia. In these contexts, two Thai universities were included (Chulalongkorn and Mahidol Universities). In addition to the study of website, Jenkins also administered an open-ended questionnaire to academic across the above geographical contexts. In order to explore in detail, the experiences of international students, Jenkins used semi-structured interviews with 34 postgraduate students at a UK university. Her findings showed that in general there is a very strong orientation to standard and native English in EMI policies and practices across the globe.

However, while the above two studies are critical and included some EMI programmes in Thai contexts, their main focuses were based on the UK university. Thus, research on EMI in HE Thailand is scant especially what actually goes on inside EMI classroom. This is the precise gap in the current EMI literature in which I would like to fill and hopefully the findings from this study will yield some insights into EMI phenomenon in Thailand.

3.5   Conclusion

This chapter has discussed first of all the history of EMI, the growth of the programme, the main push factors for the increase and the implications of the widespread of EMI. Then, the chapter explored the different meanings of the ꞌEꞌ in EMI taken by various EMI scholars including the meaning used in this study. After that, the current literature on EMI was discussed starting from EMI studies in Europe, to Asia, Southeast Asia and Thai contexts. Here the EMI issues covered included whether EMI is a threat or learning opportunity, teachersꞌ and studentsꞌ orientations of EMI, and the tensions between macro- and micro policy levels. Finally, the research gap in the local Thai context was identified. In the next chapter, I will explore research methodology that have been applied to investigate the EMI in the local Thai contexts.

Chapter 4   Research Methodology

4.1   Introduction

The main aim of this chapter is to describe the research methods that have been used in this study. To achieve this aim, I, first of all, explore the debate over the fact that whether the world or truths around us should be objectively or subjectively investigated. In this argument, my position is then identified which sets the discussion that follows about the philosophical assumptions that theoretically informed this qualitative research. After that, I discuss the research approach that I employed to study language policy before I explain the research contexts, the research participants, different research methods of data collection and how these were carried out. Then, I discuss the issues of trustworthiness, ethical considerations, and translation. Finally, I explain the limitations of study.

Just before getting into details of the above issues, at the beginning process when one thinks about research methodology, there is often a choice between quantitative and qualitative method. These two terms are conceptually based on competing views about how to get to know the world around us or how to conduct a research. While the quantitative method offers a tool to explore research questions in an objective manner, the qualitative one does the opposite. This difference leads to conflicts, called the paradigm war which will be explored in the following discussion.

4.2   The paradigm war: objectivity or subjectivity

Qualitative research is often criticised by the notion that it lacks objectivity. For example, Dörnyei (2007: 54) with quantitative background holds this view, and notes that 'a qualitative study is inherently subjective, interpretative as well as time- and context-bound; that is, in qualitative inquiry 'truth' is relative and 'facts' depend upon individual perceptions'. According to Dörnyei, the results of qualitative research are influenced by the researcher's personal biases and preconceived ideas. This is because the researcher is essentially the main measurement device in the study; the researcher's own values (e.g. gender, class and age) and personal involvements become integral part of the inquiry. However, P. A. Duff (2008) points out that this subjectivity is true to some extent, but it is involved in all types of research. According to Denzin and Lincoln

(2011), objective truth is impossible and all research is interpretive and is guided by a set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied. For example, in quantitative or structural study, it is arbitrarily and significantly subjective in the choice of categories and variables, such as, a structured questionnaire that is used across a large sample size (Flyvbjerg, 2011). Also, as Flyvbjerg notes, such subjectivity probably goes without notice because the quantitative researcher does not get as close to the researched as does the qualitative researcher. Many qualitative researchers question whether researchers can be truly objective in the human and social sciences.

Nevertheless, in qualitative research subjectivity is explicitly accepted and acknowledged. According to Blommaert and Jie (2010: 66), 'there is nothing wrong with such subjectivity; it cannot be avoided', and 'it is better to be aware of it and to question what you have seen, heard, and understood from within that context, than to pretend that this context was not there'. Indeed, the subjectivity and involvements of the researchers are important in qualitative study because they might provide 'the very source of learning' and clues to understanding the phenomena under question, particularly the ones that are nuance and subtle and impossible to be revealed through survey. Therefore, subjectivity should not be seen as a 'defect' to be eliminated, but qualitative researchers need to become sensitive to, and 'perceptive' about how they are seen and treated by others (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011: 4).

Although concerns over unprincipled subjectivity might arise, these concerns can be dealt with by establishing credibility and trustworthiness of research (trustworthiness will be discussed later on in the chapter). In short, in any qualitative research, the issue of subjectivity is a big issue that needs to be properly addressed because the research needs to be credible and reader's confidence in findings must be boosted. For this reason, the next topic will specifically explore what constitutes the nature of qualitative research and how it becomes inherently subjective. I am now turning to the concept of constructivism and its implication for this research.

4.3   Qualitative research: views of constructivists

Qualitative research, like this study, is typically informed by the notion of 'constructivism' or 'social constructivism' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011; Creswell, 2014). Social constructivists believe that individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work. These individuals establish subjective meanings (or realities) of their experiences. Such meanings are varied and

multiple, and are directed towards certain things, such as there were different views on the meanings of ·E· in EMI as discussed in the previous chapters. Then, this leads the researcher to deploy multiple research methods in looking for different interpretations rather than finding a single truth or idea. Often, these subjective meanings are socially and historically negotiated and are shaped in discussions and interactions with other persons. In other words, as Creswell (2014: 8) puts it, ·they [the subjective meanings] are not simply imprinted on individuals but are formed through interaction with others (hence social constructivism) and through historical and cultural norms that operate in individuals· lives·.

Thus, in order to understand the subjective meanings of research participants, constructivist or qualitative researchers often address the processes of interaction among participants, and focus on the specific settings in which people live, in trying to understand the historical and cultural contexts of the participants. Moreover, qualitative researchers triangulate data in order to better evidence their findings. For example, an understanding of how a particular language policy is implemented in a classroom might be collected through an interview with a teacher, but classroom observation might reveal a different story as might the study of a document (e.g. school language policy) which states something different from what is claimed by the teacher. It is not the ·objective truth· that the researcher is looking for, just a full account, which is better established with multiple sources of data. The use of different data collection methods and triangulation of information enable researchers to ·uncover the complexity of the social and linguistic practices of contemporary social life· (Martin-Jones & Martin, 2017: 5), and also reflect an attempt to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question. In short, constructivists or qualitative researchers ·stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry· (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011: 8).

This view of social constructivist has important implications for language policy research. It helps policy researchers study the policies in contexts documenting ·patterns of language use and social relations that sometimes serve to maintain and at other times to challenge the status quo in societal power relations· (Hornberger, 2015: 14). In what follows, I turn to the aims of this study and my research approach.

4.4 Research aims and research approach

My aims were to study language policies (LP) in their natural settings in order to make sense of what LP actually are, how they are implemented (if at all) by various agents (teachers and students), what people think about the policies and how they are affected by the policies. So, I had three research questions that guided my investigation as follows;

1. To what extent are the institution's language policies enacted inside its EMI classrooms?

2. What kind of language ideologies inform teachers and students' orientations to EMI policies and practices?

3. How are the teachers and students affected by such EMI policies and practices?

In order to answer these three research questions, I drew on a critical or qualitative approach to language policy (Johnson, 2013) which is primarily focused on grassroots movements and language policy agency. I chose this approach because there was a lack of critical language policy study in Thailand as discussed in the previous chapter, and also this approach suited my research purpose. In what follows, I will explain how qualitative data was collected. This involves the contexts of study, research participants, different research methods, different sources of data, and how data were triangulated.

4.5 Contexts of study

4.5.1 The wider setting

This study was carried out at a Thai university located in the heart of Bangkok, the capital city of Thailand. Thailand is a truly linguistically diverse country. The country has around 70 million populations, and is geographically divided into four main regions: central, north-eastern, northern, and southern regions. Each of these areas has their own local dialects. Bradley (2010) reports the sociolinguistic situation in Thailand, and notes that the 'standard' Thai is the national and official language used in education, TV and radio broadcasts, and newspapers etc. The language is spoken as a mother tongue by only around 26 million people who live in the central capital region (Bangkok). Thai is used as second language of about 27 million people in north-eastern Thailand who speak a local language called Isan (or Lao), about eight million in the north who speak Kham Myang or northern Thai, and about seven million in the south who speak Pak Tai. Similarly, Kosonen (2007) reports a similar linguistic situation, and estimates that there are 74 languages

spoken in Thailand (see Appendix R, page 218, for population of language groups in Thailand). The two studies cited above reported more than one decade ago, surely the present situation is even more linguistically diverse than that given the forces of globalisation and internationalisation as discussed in Chapter Two. I will move next to explain specifically the educational setting for my study.

4.5.2   Educational setting

This study was carried out at a Thai university located in the heart of Bangkok, the capital city of Thailand with a very easy access through various types of transportation like local buses and underground trains. The university was the oldest private non-profit higher education institution offering degrees in various disciplines including Business Administration, Accounting, Economics, Humanities, Science, Communication Arts, Engineering and Laws. The university was founded in 1940 by the Thai Chamber of Commerce to initially provide education for business to Thai students. In 2016, the time when my fieldwork took place, the university had 17,331 undergraduates and 1,945 graduate students. The students studied in big and spacious classrooms equipped with all necessary instructional media (like computers, the Internet, projector screens, whiteboard, modern chairs and tables etc.). The buildings where the classrooms were had been new and iconic. In terms of size, the university was comparatively small when compared with other Thai state-funded universities, but it had its strength in business orientation which stemmed from its close relationship and cooperation with the Thai Chamber of Commerce. So, it was a small but prestigious university for businessmen.

The time when I collected data, the school offered two types of programmes. The first programme was Thai programme that used the local Thai language as a means of communication. It is usually attended by Thai students across different disciplines. The second programme, being English as a medium of instruction (EMI), comprised both Thai and international students. This study specifically examined the latter EMI education offered by a sub-department called International College within this university setting. Driven by the globalisation and internationalisation (see a full discussion of the influence of these two concepts on my university in Chapter One), the school had recently established two offshore campuses: one in Yangon and another in Mandalay, both were in Myanmar. Also, during the time of my data collection and after a recognized accomplishment in opening the two off-shore programmes, the third cross border campus was to

be launched in Iran. The university engaged in various internationalisation activities (see Appendix Q, for international and global networks, and academic mobility programmes).

This study was carried out to investigate the EMI programme located in the main Bangkok campus. This programme was offered in four distinct disciplines (Accountancy, Business Administration, Business English and Economics) and at three degree levels (Bachelor's, Master's and PhD). As noted on the 14/09/2016, there were 47 teachers including both part-time and full-time members who were both Thai and non-Thai, 771 students, and 15 administrative staff. The student body, as registered in the first academic year 2016-17, the time when this study took place, was strongly multilingual (see Appendix F). While Thai students formed 48% of the population, the international intake made up more than half (52%) coming from 34 different countries worldwide. They were from Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Lao, Maldives, Mexico, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, The Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Taiwan, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, UK, USA, and Vietnam. The largest overseas group was from China (35%) leaving the other 17% of international students from other countries as mentioned above. In the following section, I will provide details of how I gained the permission to the research site.

4.5.3 Gaining access to research site

On the 9th of May, 2016, I emailed the Dean of the International College where this study took place, to gain permission for this project. Although I was a teaching instructor at another department, School of Humanities, at the same university before I came to the UK to pursue my PhD study, I did not know the dean beforehand, nor any of the members at this international department. So, in my first email to him, I explained who I was and what I was doing and my plan. I explicitly described my research project, its aims and objectives, the benefits and contributions that my study may impact the educational systems in general. And more importantly, I elaborated the crucial ethical issues concerning how to protect the identities of all participants involved. In his quick response and to my delight, he immediately replied in the following day and agreed to take part in my project. I then exchanged a few emails with him arranging when and where to meet face-to-face upon my return to Bangkok and before I started to commence data collection process. I felt that being a member of the institution where the fieldwork took place helped me gain this access easily, but this does not adequately justify my choice. More justification is provided below.

4.5.4   Justification for this EMI programme

From a practical point of view, I chose to study language policy of the above university because it was feasible for me to obtain the access to the important data for my research. I worked for this university though I was not part of this particular EMI programme. The university provided me with a financial source of funding for my study. So, being a member of the institution perhaps helped me obtain the access to the research site easily. This technique of choosing a site or people in one's own social network is called 'convenience sampling' (Duff, 2008) which is very common in qualitative research in Applied Linguistics.

According to Duff, the convenience sampling technique provides the researcher with three practical merits. The first advantage of studying people (or a site) with whom one is already familiar is that the access and informed consent are easier to obtain. Second, it may be feasible to observe or interact with familiar participants or sites for a more extended period of time. This enables the researcher to gain more useful and rich data about the case or cases. And finally, there is likely to be a greater understanding of the context based on prior knowledge which might help explain the complex social issues under investigation. Indeed, it was these practical reasons that made this project feasible and workable. However, there is some concern over the use of this convenience technique: in picking any individuals that happen to be available for study, the selected case may not be the representative of the population (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Taking such concern on board, therefore, it seems to me that my choice of study needs further justification.

As Yin (2014) points out, the main rationale for selecting a case or cases to be studied is that they needs to be common. Here the case should feature the common characteristics or conditions of the phenomenon, therefore, it then represents the population. Regarding my EMI programme, it showed four commonalities with any other EMI universities around the world.

First, English was used as the main medium of instruction throughout the programme in all disciplines and all degree levels. For example, it was used in all kinds of in-class assessments (writing assignments, classroom presentation, and mid-term exams etc.). Second, this programme was similar to other EMI programmes in the sense that the Thai and non-Thai students wishing to take part in it would have to show a proof of English proficiency in terms of IELTS or TOEFL tests. These tests are widely used by EMI universities around the globe. Third, as any other EMI universities do, this programme offered some remedial language courses for those students who failed to obtain the accepted scores of either IELTS or TOEFL. The last commonality was that the

student populations joining this programme were from various linguistic backgrounds as discussed above. This multilingual body of participants made the programme a linguistically and socially complex site. This is common and typical of international universities around the world that offer EMI education.

In short, this EMI programme was rationalised by its four commonalities that made this programme a common EMI programme similar to other EMI programmes around the world. The commonalities were coupled with the three practical reasons that basically made this study researchable and viable in the first place or otherwise. Next, I will describe the research participants involved.

4.6   Participants of study

There were three different groups of participants: teachers (see appendixes G and H respectively), students (see appendix I) and administrative staff (see appendix J). They were different individuals with diverse backgrounds and were selected by virtue of a purposeful (or purposive) sampling technique. This technique is used to access ·knowledgeable people· who have in-depth knowledge, expertise, and experiences about the particular issues under investigation (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011: 157). The main focus of my policy study was to examine teaching practices or how language policies were actually implemented and what the teachers, students and others thought about the enacted policies and their effects. Therefore, I sought to find those participants who were involved in EMI courses in one way of another. They might have been a teacher or a student currently teaching and/or undertaking such programme or they might have been an administrative staff who knew the EMI policies, rules and regulations.

In what follows, I will next explain how these participants were recruited and the inherent challenges. I now turn to the teacher participants.

4.6.1   Teachers

4.6.1.1   Sampling teachers

Upon my arrival to Thailand, I first visited the dean as planned at his office at the international school where the fieldwork took place. During the first meeting with him, he introduced me to some of his colleagues, and later four of these agreed to join my project. I felt that the dean had some influence in their decisions or it might have been that they were genuinely interested in my

study. However, I still needed some more teacher participants. So, I asked an admin staff for all the teaching schedules available for that semester. I carefully selected new seven teachers based on different disciplines, genders and cultural and social backgrounds. They covered all degreed levels (Bachelor, Master and PhD). Duff (2008) recommends that in qualitative research and in general, sampling should be done widely so as not to prematurely rule out particular variables or factors. I also made sure that their teaching schedules did not clash, but fitted well with my observation schedule. I was hoping to have around eleven different classrooms to follow because they would perfectly fit well with my observation timetable. Also, choosing eleven initially would mean that if there was attrition among participants, several cases would likely remain providing multiple examples of linguistic practices (or phenomenon) under question. In addition, having several cases allowed me to compare and contrast across cases. Nevertheless, obtaining these additional permissions proved to be a challenge, the topic to which I turn next.

4.6.1.2   Gaining access to classroom

Gaining permissions to the classroom took place during the first two weeks of the new academic term, the time when some classes and lessons were already taking place. With the information given from the admin staff, I had listed seven prospective teachers with all of whom I was not familiar. I then began to find and talk to them to ask for their permission to my classroom visits. The first teacher whom I approached was from the accountancy department. I waited outside her classroom while she was still teaching. Then, when she finished and came out of the class, I greeted her and introduced myself. I could see clearly that she became so surprised by my approach that only halfway through introducing my project, she rejected it outright. But I felt that this was understandable for various reasons. First, I was a stranger for her and she did not know me beforehand. Second, it might have been that she had no interest in my project, therefore, did not want to hear anything or anymore about it. Or I might have not explained my project properly. Also, another possibility was that she might have thought I was going to evaluate her teaching performance.

Soon after I experienced such a quick rejection, I realised that approaching individuals by myself would simply put me in a precarious position where I could be turned down easily or where I could as well risk losing all of my prospective participants. I then came up with a new recruiting strategy. I thought I should seek some help from the dean of the programme. So, I talked to him about the challenge and fear I was experiencing. I then asked him if he could help me recruit the remaining participants on my list. He immediately agreed to help and wrote a letter supporting my

project. This supporting letter was sent to the remaining six teaching members with consent form and participant information sheets. In their quick responses, four agreed to take part in my project while one declined and one did not reply. A few days later, I asked the admin staff to email the participant who did not reply to see whether she received the letter or not. Still there was no response. I did not pursue her further since I did not want her to feel uncomfortable. In fact, the participant information sheet that went with the dean's letter clearly explained that their involvement was entirely voluntary. I interpreted no-reply as not wanting to take part in the project. However, I felt that the help from the dean had some influence on the agreement from the four teachers. But it should be noted that this did not mean the teachers who had agreed were coerced into taking part in my study because they still had the chance to say no. But their immediate responses, as I saw it, showed they were interested in my project, and therefore, willing to take part in. I then was able to recruit eight teaching staff, and a few weeks later two teachers joined in making my observation cohort ten teachers representing different disciplines (see appendix G on page 193).

Nevertheless, I should make it clear that I did not have any particular preferences in terms of gender in selecting criteria. I initially tried to balance by hoping to have four females in my participant cohort. But it turned out that the three participants who declined were all females leaving only one female teacher in my study. However, I was not interested in studying the correlations between cause and effects among different genders, so the cohort (nine males and one female) that I had would be fine. I felt that being a male researcher myself might have played some role in their forthcoming decisions given such cohort. But regardless of what gender, my next job was to cooperatively establish a good relationship with them.

After all the participants had agreed to take part, I contacted them to arrange to meet individually. In the preliminary meeting, I explained face-to-face again what my project was all about, its aims, what would involve when they participated and how the data would be anonymised and other issues. I emphasised that their involvement was totally voluntary, therefore, withdrawal could take place at any time without any prejudice and/or they did not have to give me any reasons if they would like to leave the project. Also, I made sure that they knew that my observation was totally non-judgemental in that I had no interests in the quality of their content teaching performances or how they effectively carried out the classroom management. I told them that my focus was to observe how a language or languages were used in classroom interactions between teacher and students and among them. During this conversation, the

teachers asked me a lot of questions concerning my projects despite that they had the information sheet that was earlier attached with the dean letter. I sensed that they became at ease after I verbally explained what my project was all about. One of the questions that they tended to ask, despite this being written in the information sheet, was how many times I would visit their classes. I told them that I would start observing from week three up to the weeks of mid-term exam, so altogether around five weeks. While most teachers were happy and said I could also do the weeks after mid-term or as long as I wished, there was one teacher who allowed me only one class visit and he told me when to come. This was absolutely fine for me too as long as the participant was happy and felt comfortable. Finally, each teacher signed two consent forms which they kept one and gave me back another. I felt that I made a good impression during the first encounter with them and I was really excited and looking forward to observing their lessons (the story continues below when I explain how I carried out classroom observations). But, in the following section, I will next explain student participants and how they were selected.

4.6.2   Students

In terms of sampling students, I used a purposeful sampling (Cohen et al., 2011). There were four selecting criteria when sampling student participants. First, students were selected because they were taking part in the EMI classrooms being observed. Second, they were socially skilled, out-going, productive, cooperative and forthcoming to the subsequently arranged interviews. Third, they willingly agreed to take part in the study. However, not all students who were invited agreed to participate in my study. And even though some had agreed, they did not show up in the subsequently interviews nor made themselves available for meeting later. I did not pursue or ask them why because I did not want to put any pressure on them.

The last selecting criterion was that I employed the concept of 'rich point' (Blommaert and Jie, 2010). The rich point refers to the event or moment that amazed or surprised me, or to use Blommaert and Jie's phrases, the moment that I thought 'hey, that's strange' or 'what the hell is this?' in terms of how the students used a language or languages in communication with their classmates. Usually the rich point was identified during the classroom activities among students. For example, when one student (T3) was using three different languages (English, Chinese and Thai) in succession in front of the class while he was giving classroom instructions to his classmates. At that time, I was sitting and observing at the back of the classroom, I quickly made some notes of what had just happened. Soon after the lesson had ended, I approached him and

told him what I found and what I thought was interesting. I then invited him to join my study which he immediately agreed.

In total, there were 16 students involved in interviews (see appendix I). Eight were males and eight were females from five different countries including Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, China and Netherlands. They represented various disciplines, years of study and all degree levels.

4.6.3　　　Administrative staff

There were four admin staff recruited for interviews (see appendix J). Two initially became my friends and later they introduced another two. This sampling technique is called 'referral sampling' (Duff, 2008). Two were female and the other two males. While two staff were Thai, one was Chinese and another Vietnamese. They were invited to join the study because they had the experience and knowledge of EMI policies, such as, English language requirements in student admission process. Also, some of them were teaching assistants.

In addition, there were four teachers who only joined semi-structured interviews, but not classroom observation (see appendix H). They were referred to by their teaching colleagues who were at that time participating in both classroom observations and interviews. These teachers were all male from four different countries: two were British, one French, one South African, and one Thai.

In short, to conclude this section of participants, in total there were 34 participants involved including 14 were teachers, 16 students and four administrative staff. Next, I will explain research methods used in this study and how they were carried out.

4.7　　　Research methods and details of implementation

There were two main research methods that I employed to collect data to answer my research questions. They are observations and interviews. These methods will be discussed in this section and sub-sections. The discussion will include both the general research literature relating to each method and how each was implemented during the fieldwork. I now turn to the first method of observation.

4.7.1   Observation: non-participant observation

Observation is a basic data collection method in qualitative research. It is defined as 'a purposeful, systematic and selective way of watching and listening to an interaction or phenomenon as it takes place' (Kumar, 2011: 140). Observations are useful in that they help the researcher collect large amounts of rich data on participants' behaviours and actions within a particular context. With over time and repeated observations, the researcher can gain a deeper and more multilayered understanding of the phenomenon (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

There are four degrees of participation in observation. They are complete participation, participant observation, non-participant observation, and complete observation (Cohen et al, 2011). In classroom observation, I used the method of non-participant observation. This means that I was known as a researcher to the group. Also, I was only observing classroom activities, but not taking part as a student or teacher as in complete participation and/or participant observation methods. According to Johnson (2013), classroom observation is essential for examining language policy implementation. It helps the researcher study how teachers appropriate language policies in their classrooms. I used non-participant observation to collect data that helped me answer my second research question (how are English language policies enacted inside the classrooms?)

In addition, according to Mackey and Gass, there are two types of observations: highly structured and less structured observations. In highly structured observations, the researcher often uses a detailed checklist or rating scale, but in less structured observations the researcher may rely on field notes for detailed descriptions of the phenomenon under question. With this regard, my classroom observations were less structured and I will explain how I carried out these next.

4.7.2   Observing classrooms

Most classroom visits started in week three of the term. This was because from my experience during the first two weeks, the students were still deciding which subjects they were going to take, and classroom schedules were also subject to sudden change. Most lessons that I attended lasted nearly three hours with 15 minutes break half way through. The number of students in classrooms varied according to the nature of the subject (see appendix G). While an Economics course offered at a PhD level contained only four students, an Organisation and Management subject for first year undergraduate students had more than one hundred students. But most classes had around between 16 and 40 students.

During my first visit to the classrooms, I had the chance to introduce myself to the whole class. I was told by the teachers beforehand to be ready for this presentation. So, I showed some powerpoint slides explaining myself, my project, its overall aims, what I was doing and what I was planning to do. I told the students that I would be sitting at the back of the class becoming one of their classmates. However, I could sense that my presence particularly in earlier visits as a researcher in the setting caused some consternation especially among the teachers, but for students this was not a big issue at all. But, since I was fully aware of this researcher's effect, I tried hard to minimise it. Observations helped me achieve this. That is, in classroom, the observation gave me the chance to get to know my participants quickly. I would normally get to the class early in order to get familiar with both the teachers and students. I also talked to them during the break and after the lessons. I offered help when appropriate. For example, when a teacher, T2, organised a quiz in class, I helped him distribute the quiz papers, monitoring the test and taking back the papers from students. As the term progressed, the teachers, students and I became friends and I felt that the researcher's effect was greatly minimised. I could notice this when students began to borrow my pen or asked me to share the course book when they did not bring it to the classroom. The same was true of teachers. For instance, on one occasion, after a lesson had lasted only for an hour, the teacher (F) received a call from the hospital saying that his son had an accident. He then came up to me while I was sitting at the back, and asked me for help with checking the class attendance, so he could leave the room for the hospital immediately. I felt that his call for help reflected the trust and rapport that had been established during my observations.

During the first few weeks of observations, in some classes, I did not ask for permission to make an audio recording because I felt that I needed to get to know the people and the setting first before I planned what to record and where to place my recording devices. Another reason was that I wanted to begin by observing the larger picture or the overall description of the classroom without any particular focus (Duff, 2008). But field notes and photos that were taken at the scene helped me capture what went on inside the classrooms. I used an observation guide that I adopted from McCarty's (2015) Observation Guide (see appendix L, page 203). In fieldnote guide, I wrote down two key areas: facts or physical classroom settings and reflections or what I felt about what had happened. These were written on my iPad alongside with the photos taken in the classrooms. As the term progressed, some emergent themes and issues were identified and my notes became more and more focused. I then asked the teachers for their permission to audio record their lessons. When asking, I emphasised that the recordings would be used exclusively for

only research purposes and all data would be coded and anonymised at every stage (Blommaert and Jie, 2010). But in some cases, I started recording right from the first visit with the teacher's permission, particularly in those classes where the teachers were more friendly and easy-going. I used two recording devices (Panasonic: RR-XS350 and Sony: ICD-UX512F) that were placed in front of me. There were 22 lessons that were audio-recorded in total. However, not all of these recorded lessons featured high sound quality suitable for analysis. Three lessons from F's classroom were inaudible because the teacher (F) didn't want to use a microphone when teaching, therefore, his recorded lessons will not be coded when analysing the classroom data. So, all together there were 19 lessons suitable for coding due to their sound quality, and these recorded lessons will be analysed in the chapter subsequent analysis chapter. I also collected classroom documents like quizzes, course book, learning materials and some examples of students' notes during my observations.

While observing, if I saw something that I thought was interesting, I would quickly take notes of it. Take one occasion as an example, while I was observing one of J's lessons and while he was teaching in front of the class, he suddenly switched from English to Chinese to address a group of Chinese students who were not paying attention to his lecture and making some noise at the back of the classroom. I felt that this was a very interesting way of using two different languages. So, soon after the class had ended, while I was accompanying him back to his office, I talked to him about that event that I had just witnessed during his lesson and I asked him why he used Chinese at that particular moment instead of English. This kind of interview needs to take place soon after the event because of the loss of memory (Blommaert and Jie, 2010). Soon after we parted, I took notes quickly while I still remembered his answers and comments. So, my field notes were written not only inside classrooms while I was observing, but also were written at no designated places: it could be in an empty room, on a chair and table around the buildings, in a coffee shop, in a canteen and/or in my own office (see appendix O, for a sample of field-note).

Together, classroom data, field notes, photos, teaching materials and some sample of students' work constituted the initial set of data that were used to contextualise the subsequent interviews. The interviews formed the second step of data collection process. Therefore, I will discuss interview in the following sections, and I will begin with the theories of interviews found in general literature. Then, I will explain how I interviewed teachers, students and the administrative staff.

4.7.3   Interviews: a social practice

In applied linguistics research, there are broadly two different concepts of interview: interview as a research instrument and as a social practice (Talmy, 2010, 2011; Talmy & Richards, 2011). According to Talmy (2011), research instrument interview considers interview as a resource for collecting information, and treats its data as a report of truths, facts, attitudes, and/or beliefs. However, the interview as social practice conceptualises the interview as a site for investigation and co-construction of meanings, and treats its data as a representation or an account of truths, facts, attitudes, and beliefs that are co-constructed between interviewer and interviewee. Moreover, (Mann, 2011, 2016) notes that the conventional interview as a research instrument tends to focus on the 'whats' (the product or content), but the interview as social practice is analytically concerned with both 'whats' and 'hows' (process of interview). Thus, as Mann continues, interview as social practice needs further reflexive consideration which involves 'a more critical engagement with interview practice and processes where difficulties, confusion, and complexities are not simply swept under the carpet but become at least part of the account' (Mann, 2016: 152-153). Similarly, Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) use two metaphors to refer to two epistemological conceptions of interviewing: the interviewer as a miner and as a traveller. While the miner approach is similar to the conventional concept of research instrument interview, the traveller is closely related to the interview as social practice. The interviews in this study with all participants (teachers, students and admin staff) were conceptualized as a social practice, not a traditional research instrument. In turn, I considered myself as an interviewer-traveller who walked along with my participants asking questions and encouraging them to tell their own stories of their lived world.

From a social view, my role as a qualitative interviewer was no longer considered as a potential threat that could cause biases or contaminate the answer from the interviewees. Rather, I considered myself as a facilitator who socially constructed meaning and knowledge in tandem with my participants. So, I was there in the research site to interact and help them to express their feelings, attitudes and understanding of the issues relevant to my research questions. Jenkins (2014) successfully used the interview-as-a-social-practice concept to explore the experiences of international students regarding the use of EMI policies and their effects on the students' lives.

With regard to the types of interviews, I used both unstructured and semi-structured interviews in my study. With regard to unstructured interviews, they were like casual conversations and took

place during the course of observation. The data from this was recorded in field notes, and used to formulate questions for later semi-structured interviews. In addition, in semi-structured interviews, I had a list of questions or issues or fairly specific topics to be discussed which were included in my interview guide (see appendix M). The interview guide was drawn from classroom observations, the emerging issues that I had found, and my research focus. However, the interviewee had a great deal of freedom of how to reply in semi-structured interviews (Bryman, 2016). The questions were not necessarily asked exactly in the way as outlined on the interview guide. Also, I could ask new questions that specifically followed up interviewees' replies. This freedom and the flexibility in interview process, according to Bryman, is also found in unstructured interviews. I next turn to how I carried out semi-structured interviews with all my participants.

4.7.4   Interviewing teachers, students and administrative staff

I spent nearly three months in the fieldwork and I mingled with teachers, students and administrative staff inside and outside classrooms. This gave me the opportunities to have a casual conversation with them. The topics ranged from the general issues like the weather to personal details like where they came from and why they chose to come to Thailand for study and work and how they liked Bangkok compared to their hometowns. They also asked me about the life in the UK as a student. Some said they had been to the UK or London to take a crash English course during the summer. I talked to them in various places, like, in the canteen while having lunch, outside the building and/or in front of the university when we passed by etc. I carried with me an iPad all the time, so I could make field notes anywhere and anytime. But I only did it when the person whose details were being written had gone. I never jotted down in front of them because they might have felt uncomfortable and also I wanted to pay more attention to the on-going conversation rather than worrying about writing something down. So, overtime I built up an archival set of data for each participant. This data was then used to contextualise the semi-structured interviews which took place at the final stage.

For teachers, I arranged semi-structured interviews after all the classroom visits had been completed, but with the admin staff, I just asked them for an interview after I obtained the document of language policy (e.g. the programme curriculum and/or the student booklets). Likewise, among students, I told them when I wanted to interview and I let them tell me when they were free and available before we arranged to meet. Given that qualitative interviews were

challenging, I used a variety of interviewing techniques. I let them choose the place and time that they were comfortable with. There were no designated places for interviewing: it could be an empty classroom, in their offices or in my office. I used Thai language to talk to Thai participants for better understanding while I used English with international ones for mutual understanding (see appendix K, page 201 for which language was used with whom). At the beginning of interview, I tried to break the ice by asking some general questions about their personal background information. I then moved on to more focused and substantial questions. I was aware of specific issues that were culturally and socially sensitive during the course of conversation.

In addition, the classroom data, general policies, photos and field notes were used to situate the interviews. For example, among the teachers, the theme or teaching patterns were also discussed too. This was considered as a form of member checking which involved taking some preliminary analysis back to some of the participants and asking whether my interpretation 'ring true' (McCarty, 2015). The participants should be able to recognise their linguistic behaviours in my interpretation. This served as a form of triangulation of data too. It must be noted that not one of them who disputed my interpretations or told me to make any changes. This meant that my observations and interpretation painted the overall enacted language policies inside their classrooms.

Before I ended each interview, I asked my participants whether they would like to say anything apart from what had been discussed. In most cases, students did not, but some teachers and staff did. They posed some very interesting questions, like, 'So, what else did you find out in my classroom?' or 'If you were in power, what would you change regarding the EMI policies?' or 'Could you tell me five things that should be improved in this programme?' I then elaborated appropriately.

After each interview ended, I listened to the recording as soon as I could while I still remembered what went on in the conversation and I made a summary of interview (Blommaert and Jie, 2010) which allowed me to preliminarily analyse the emergent themes. However, while listening, I realised that I failed to ask some follow-up questions, particularly in the very first few interviews. I also learnt that during the course of conversation everything happened so rapidly, that sometimes I even failed to cover all the issues although I had made a list beforehand. Consequently, since I had already told my participants that there could be a second interview if need be, I arranged another one a few days later. The second interview was much shorter than the first: while the first could last between thirty minutes and one hour, the second was up to

fifteen minutes. Nevertheless, regardless of how long or short the interviews were, they all generated very important, rich and contextualised data giving the first-hand accounts that helped me answer my research questions. Perhaps, more importantly the conversations I had with my participants were all lively, joyful and full of fun and laughs even though sometimes we shared different views on some issues and did not agree with each other.

In the following sections, I will explain the issues of trustworthiness, ethical considerations, translation and the limitations of study.

4.8   Trustworthiness

According to Duff (2008), there are two conflicting sets of criteria for evaluating qualitative research. While one set from a positivist perspective uses various kinds of validity and reliability, another from a constructivist view uses the terms like trustworthiness and credibility. In this study, the latter constructivist terms are used. In line with Gall, Gall, and Borg (2005), Duff presents a set of criteria used to evaluate the credibility and trustworthiness of researcher's knowledge claims. This includes, for example, strong evidence, the use of triangulation, disconfirming case analysis, member checking, thick description, long-term observation, and researcher's self-reflection. These criteria were taken into account throughout the research process. For example, in terms of triangulation I used three sources of data including document policy study, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews, to examine the English language policies and how they were implemented and perceived by teachers and students (see a more discussion of triangulation of data above).

4.9   Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations were upheld throughout the study. From the start, this study formally received the approval from the ethical research board committee at the University of Southampton. It then received the permission to be carried out from the local authority, the full approval from the Dean of the International College where this study took place. The procedures of informed consent were carried out throughout the data collection process. In the fieldwork and before any data was collected, I talked face to face to the participants as well as giving them the Participant Information Sheet (see appendix D). I then explicitly explained what the study entailed, its aims, who I was and what would mean if they decided to take part in the study. I told them that

the project had no physical risks and I emphasized how privacy and confidentiality would be ensured. I assured that they knew that this study was totally voluntary, therefore, they may withdraw themselves and their data from it at any time without any prejudices. They then signed two consent forms; one which they kept and another I had (see appendix E). The pseudo names were used instead of the participants' real names. After the research data had been collected, I coded and stored it on a password protected computer in order to assure all the anonymity. I finally shared some findings with some of my participants before I left the research site and I kept in touch with them via Facebook friends.

4.10   Translation

Interviews with participants were both in Thai and English depending on whether the participants were Thai or non-Thai. Basically, Thai was used with Thai participants, and sometimes the participants and I translanguaged using both Thai and English. English was generally used with the non-Thai ones (see appendix K for which language was used with whom; see appendix B for a sample of full interview in English). If the language used was Thai (see appendix C for a sample of Thai transcription), I then translated the conversation from Thai into English. This section will discuss the issue of this translation of interview data. The translation included four steps.

First, I transcribed the interviews in Thai language. When I had the Thai transcripts, I then translated them into English. Here, I employed a translation method called 'literal translation' (Ordudari, 2007). According to Ordudari, the literal translation includes both grammatical and lexical translation. While the grammatical constructions of the original language are converted to their target language equivalents, the lexical words are translated individually. At this step, I produced an English version of Thai transcripts. McDonough and McDonough (1997: 178) suggest checking the comparability of the translated version by having it back translated into the original language for comparison. Therefore, my next step was to have my English transcripts back translated into Thai, the original language of interviews. To do this, I sampled a few transcripts and asked a Thai researcher who was a friend of mine working in the field of Applied Linguistics to back translate them. After, he translated the English transcripts back into Thai, I finally compared his Thai versions with my Thai transcripts that I had previously produced at the first stage. Indeed, I found there was not any significance in differences between the two: the main ideas, concepts and events were not changed though the word choice was slightly different due to the highly

interpretive nature of translation. This showed as I believed that my translation was to some extent reliable and consistent.

4.11   Methodological limitations of study

There were two main limitations of this study: small number of participants and a short period of time spent on fieldwork. I will discuss these in turn.

First, the scope of findings of my study was restricted due to a small number of participants involved. For example, I had only 10 teachers who took part in classroom observations. More teachers could have yielded more classroom data which could consequently result in more understanding and insightful stories into the issues under investigation. Also, some critiques might argue that the small number involved makes it impossible to generalise the findings. Like, according to Bryman (2016), when a qualitative research involves only a small number of participants taking part in both classroom observations and interviews, it is impossible to generalise its findings to other settings. In other words, a few cases under investigation cannot be the representative of the whole population. This is the most pronounced criticism from positivist perspectives that is always levelled against any qualitative study. However, qualitative study, such as my study, instead of trying to generalise the findings to the wider scope, was aimed at understanding the phenomenon in depth and providing a detailed analysis of it. In doing so, different sources of information were used when collecting and analysing data, so as to gain rich and detailed accounts of local contexts. Consequently, instead of using the concept of generalisability from a traditional view, Denzin and Lincoln (2013) and P. Duff (2006) suggest using a term, transferability, which is more appropriate from the constructivist point of view (see a discussion of social constructivism above). Transferability assigns the responsibility to readers to determine whether findings apply to another context. If qualitative researchers provide enough rich and detailed description and analysis of one context, it should be possible for the readers familiar with another local context to decide what findings might or might not transfer. This concept of transferability is similar to the idea of 'resonance' proposed by Richards (2003: 263) for making wider connections. Indeed, the purpose of my language policy study did just that.

The second limitation of this study was the time that was spent in the fieldwork. This was rather short. I spent less than three months on gathering data at the research site. This was because the time frame available for me to conduct and finish this study within my PhD study was rather limited. Also, the amount of time spent on observing classrooms was largely determined by the

local teacher participants: one teacher allowed me only one classroom visit though others did allow more. While the time and local constraints might have potentially impacted on the kind of data received, they have been compromised by careful selection of participants (see section 4.7 for a discussion of selecting criteria) and data triangulation (see section 4.5 for a more discussion of triangulation) that enhanced the trustworthiness of this study. Nevertheless, for further research, more time should be spent in the field and more classrooms should be observed for a longer period of time in order to secure both the richness of language policy implementation and the effects of it on both teachers and students.

4.12   Conclusion

In this chapter, first, I examined the concepts of objectivity and subjectivity. I then discussed the theoretical worldview or the social constructivist view that underpins this research. After that, I explained the research approach that I employed to study language policy before I elaborated the research contexts, the research participants, different data collection methods and how these were conducted including the details of implementations of observations and interviews and their challenges. Finally, I discussed the issues of trustworthiness, how the ethical considerations have been upheld, translation and the limitations of study. In short, this chapter has explained how my data were collected. In the next chapter, I turn to my data analysis.

Chapter 5   Analysis of Classroom Data

5.1   Introduction

Classroom data was collected to answer my first research question which is to what extent, EMI policy is enacted inside EMI classrooms, and to showcase what actually happened in practice, i.e. the real language policies. I was also interested in what linguistic norm seemed to influence how language or languages were used by teachers and students for EMI teaching and learning. In this chapter, the classroom practices will be analysed and the findings will be presented and discussed. So, this chapter will first begin by explaining analytical techniques used to analyse the classroom data. These techniques are a sampling technique and Conversation Analysis (CA). First, I will explore the sampling framework. The sampling was used to broadly determine the amount of English use and use of other languages by teachers in their content teaching in EMI lessons. Secondly, I will move on to discuss another analytical framework. The CA approach was used to closely examine how the teachers and students actually used English and other languages to negotiate meaning during the course of their EMI lessons.

After that, I will explain how my classroom data was analysed using the two analytical frameworks. This will include the presentation of main themes and sub-themes that emerged from my data. In short, the analysis of classroom data will contribute to an understanding of how the formally stated language policy was enacted by teacher and students inside EMI classroom, and what norms or what kind of English seemed to influence their teaching and learning. So, in what follows, the analytical techniques will be first discussed.

5.2   Analytical techniques for classroom data

There are two main parts in this section. In the first part, I will explore the general literature regarding my two analytical techniques. Here, I will discuss the sampling method first, before I discuss the CA approach. Later on in the second part, I will explain my analysis in practice. Here, I will elaborate what I did and how I did when I analysed my classroom data using the two analytical frameworks. I will first next discuss my sampling technique.

Chapter 5

5.2.1   A sampling technique

In their article, Turnbull and Arnett (2002) usefully reviewed literature regarding discourse analysis techniques that are used to examine teachers' uses of target and first languages in second and foreign language classroom. They identified a range of techniques including a word-count approach, a Matrix Language-Frame model, a sampling technique, a survey, and interviews. While survey and interview methods do not always provide the true accounts of how much teachers think they use the target and first languages when asked (Polio and Duff, 1994), other techniques like the word-count approach and the Matrix model do not serve the purpose of my study because these frameworks specifically seek to examine in detail how different languages or codes are mixed forming codeswitches in utterances produced by teachers and students inside classrooms. Therefore, I chose the sampling technique to determine to what extent or how much English was generally used by teachers in EMI classrooms.

There are four steps when using the sampling approach. First, a starting point of classroom teaching is to be determined. This could be the moment when the teacher starts addressing the whole class and talking about the content to be learned. Secondly, a time frame for each utterance to be sampled and coded is determined. Here different time frames were used in literature: Duff and Polio (1990) sampled every fifteen seconds while Macaro (2001) used a five-second sampling. In my analysis, I used this five-second sampling following Macaro (2001), and Lo and Macaro (2012). Thirdly, the utterances (or languages) are coded according to certain categories. Lastly, an ending point is determined. This is when the classroom teaching is finishing and is usually indicated by the teacher. A simple calculation can be used to determine the ratio of target language to English use.

While the sampling technique does not require a full transcription of classroom interaction, it needs to be validated (Polio and Duff, 1994). Although the exact amount of use of English and other languages can never be obtained, the technique provides an estimate use of these languages by teachers and students in their interactions. I should point out that the results that are yielded by this method should be triangulated with other data collecting tools like observations and interviews as employed in this present study. I will move next to discuss the second analytical framework which is Conversation Analysis (CA)

5.2.2   Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) emerged in pioneering research into the structural organization of every conversation carried out by Harvey Sacks in the sociology departments of the University of California at Los Angeles in the 1960s. Then, Sacks in collaboration with his principal researchers, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson propagated the conversation analysis approach and their studies have influenced other scholars in fields, such as, sociology, social psychology, linguistics, sociolinguistics, communication studies, human-computer interaction, and speech therapy.

But, what is CA? As Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 11) note, at the most basic level, conversation analysis is the study of talk, and to put it in a slightly more complex way, 'it is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction'. The term 'talk-in-interaction' is a specific term used among conversation analysts, and it basically refers to the general term 'conversation'. Hutchby and Wooffitt define CA according to what it does. In this sense, since CA research is the study of talk-in-interaction, it is primarily based on transcribed recordings of actual interactions. What is recorded is 'naturally occurring' conversation; in other words, the interactions which are recorded are situated as far as possible in the ordinary conversation of people's lives, as opposed to being prearranged, set up in laboratories, and/or experimentally designed. So, researchers make extensive use of transcripts of these naturally occurring events, both in generating analyses and in presenting their data.

Moreover, CA is then the study of recorded, naturally talk-in-interaction, but what is the aim of studying these interactions? Principally, CA seeks to discover how participants understand each other in conversation with a central focus on how sequences of talks are structurally organised. The underlying assumption of the focus of sequences is that during the course of a conversation or any talk-in-interaction, speakers display in their sequentially 'next' turns an understanding of what the 'prior' turn was about. This understanding may turn out to be what the prior speaker intended, or it may not; whichever is the case, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn in the sequence (ibid.;). Similarly, as Schegloff (2007) puts it, in any conversation participants' main concern is to achieve mutual understanding among them, so CA analysts investigate how speakers co-construct their turns in order for them to make sense of each other's contributions. With this regard, CA framework is useful for the study of intercultural communication because the main emphasis is on the negotiated nature of interaction, and also because CA maps out the understanding process displayed in the interactants turn-by-turn-analysis (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). The CA framework has been used to analyse ELF interactions in

many ELF stidies (e.g. Firth, 1996; Kaur, 2009, 2011; Smit, 2010b; Cogo, 2009, 2012; Cogo and Dewey, 2012).

However, the CA approach is not without its critics. The main criticism is that since CA relies primarily on transcribed data, it lacks an adequate sense of the contextualisation of the talk-in-interaction with a broader set of social and political influences, such as, wider social network, relationships between participants, their gender and past experiences (ten Have, 2007; Hammersley, 2003; Wei, 2002; Blommaert, 2001). However, in order to respond to such criticism, it is suggested that CA should be used with other qualitative research methods. In my analysis of ELF classroom data, I have combined the turn-by-turn CA technique with a qualitative approach which allows for more detailed accounts of the communicative, social, and political contexts. These contexts were provided by the participants and me as a researcher in the interviews and classroom observations during data collection process (see a full discussion of the qualitative approach in the previous methodology chapter).

There are two types of CA research: 'pure' and 'applied' CA (ten Have, 2007). The pure or classic CA research investigates the sequences of non-institutional or informal talk-in-interaction, such as, telephone conversations, call centres and dinner parties. However, the applied CA studies any institutional interactions with specific goal orientations, such as, doctor and patient, teacher and student and so on. Therefore, my use of CA approach is considered as an applied CA combining it with qualitative accounts to investigate how teacher and students co-constructed and negotiated meaning inside EMI classrooms. I move next to explain how I coded the classroom data using the sampling technique.

5.2.3   Coding classroom data

As explained in the previous methodology chapter (see section 4.8.2 of observing classroom), there were 19 lecture recordings that featured a sound quality, and therefore, were suitable for coding. So, these recordings were coded using the above five-second sampling technique to estimate the amount of English and other languages used by teachers in their content delivery.

In my analysis, the amount of English and other languages spoken by teachers and students under question was quantified by listening to the audio recordings and sampling a lesson every five seconds. A starting point where the teacher seemed to address the whole class was chosen and counted as 0:00. This could be an introduction stage at the beginning of the class when the

instructor was greeting the students, reviewing the previous lesson and/or introducing the incoming lesson. From then on, I set a digital watch and each utterance was coded by listening to the audio-recording every five seconds. I noted down the language of the current utterance. Five categories of language use were used:

(a) Teacher talk in English

(b) Teacher talk in other languages

(c) Students talk in English

(d) Student talk in other languages

(e) Miscellaneous tasks

I adapted these coding categories from Macaro (2001). Appendix N (see page 207) shows an example of coding sheet for a ten-minute period of lesson. Most categories are self-explanatory with the exception of the miscellaneous teaching and learning tasks. This category included tasks like pair/group work, watching a short video footage, quizzes and non-interactive silence. However, there were some parts of lesson that were not coded. These were times that were spent on checking classroom attendance, ten or 15-minute break during the lesson, and/or any discussion of non-content-related issues like making up classes.

This five-second sampling method allowed me to determine what percentage of the lesson consisted of teacher – student oral interaction. Also, it enabled calculations of using English and other languages to be made on the basis of percentage of these uses in the whole lesson. Two lessons from T1's classrooms were coded twice to check for intra-coder reliability of the method. I chose these lessons because the teacher tended to translanguage between English and Thai and there were more instances of use of Thai than other lessons. The second coding which took place a week after the first resulted in no change to the overall percentage. Perhaps, this was because the coding categories were quite straightforward, and also I became familiar with the data during the coding process.

Altogether my corpus of classroom data totalled 2,244 minutes or around 38 hours of 19 lessons combined from nine different EMI lecturers. The summary and results of coded classroom data is presented in the following table 5.1. Although the students' utterances were also originally coded, they were omitted from the table which shows only the analysis of teacher talk.

	Teachers	Lessons	Time (mins)	TT's talk in %	Use of English in %	Use of other languages in %
1	K	Lesson 1	99	92	100	0
		Lesson 2	90	96	100	0
		Lesson 3	84	97	100	0
2	M1	Lesson 1	129	83	100	0
		Lesson 2	118	80	100	0
3	C3	Lesson 1	117	62	100	0
4	M3	Lesson 1	139	69	100	0
		Lesson 2	146	48	100	0
5	T1	Lesson 1	138	86	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 2	136	85	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 3	132	84	99	1
6	M2	Lesson 1	81	30	100	0
7	N1	Lesson 1	144	54	100	0
8	T2	Lesson 1	131	80	100	0
		Lesson 2	128	87	100	0
9	J	Lesson 1	110	20	100	0
		Lesson 2	114	48	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 3	99	33	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 4	109	29	100	0
	Total	*19*	*2,244*	*66*	*99.9*	*0.1*

Table 5.1 A summary of coded classroom data

Regarding teacher's talking time, in general the lessons were similar in the sense that a large part of most of them can be characterized as a 'dramatized teacher monologue' (Smit, 2010b). This means teachers appeared to do most of the talking in class as shown in the third column from the right hand side in the table with a mean of 66 percent of teachers' talk in a lesson. For example,

the lessons from K, M1, T1, and T2 included longer stretches of lecturing as revealed in the relatively higher percentages of teachers' talking time during the lesson time than in other lessons. This finding is in line with some previous EMI studies in various geographical contexts. In Europe, for instance, Smit (2010b) and Costa and Coleman (2013) found that EMI teachers did most of the talking while students were passive, thus, contributing less inside EMI classrooms. Similarly, the teacher-led EMI classrooms were also found in many countries in Asia like China (Tian, 2014) and Japan (Humphries, 2014), and in South eastern Asia like Taiwan (Tien, 2014), Bhutan (Robinson, 2014), Vietnam (Canh, 2014) and Thailand (Tayjasanant, 2014).

Regarding the teacher-dominated teaching style found in my study, perhaps there are two explanations for this. First, scholars like Tran (2013) and Phuong-Mai et al. (2005), attribute the domination of teacher in Asian classrooms to the influence of a concept, Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC). The CHC denotes a teaching and learning style that the teacher is considered as the source of knowledge and authority while students are generally viewed as typically passive, unwilling to ask questions or speak up in class and often based on memorising rather than understanding the knowledge delivered by teacher. This teaching style is usually practiced and found in Asian countries like China, Vietnam, Singapore, Korean, and Japan. Equally true, I would like to extend this teaching style to Thailand as well since it appeared in my EMI classroom data, and in Tayjasanant's (2014) study of EMI classroom in Thai context.

Another explanation for teacher-controlled lectures is due to the nature of the subject itself. The classes that were primarily based on numbers, calculations and theories tended to show more teacher's talking time than that based on problem-solving tasks. For example, K was teaching a PhD course in a field of Economics featuring a lot of long equations and numbers, so in his lectures most of the explanations and economic theories were from him. This was revealed through a relatively high percentage of teacher's talk in all his lessons (92, 96 and 97 percents in lessons 1, 2 and 3 respectively). Likewise, T1 was lecturing some theoretical concepts in an area of international Logistics. Thus, these lessons required little discussion and interaction in the classroom. Some short examples of T1's classroom interaction will be presented in the following section to showcase how meaning-making process was socially accomplished inside EMI classroom, and also will showcase a typical teacher-dominated discourse.

However, some classes that were mainly based on problem-solving showed more student contributions. This included lessons from M3, M2, N1, and J as reflected in the low percentages of teachers' talk in each of these lessons. For example, in M3's lesson 2 and M2's lessons, students

were giving a small group presentation of marketing research project resulting in a low proportion of teacher's talking time of around 48 and 30 per cent respectively. Also, in J's lessons, students often carried out a group-work project before they had to present their work in front of the class. So, while still led by the teacher, these lessons showed more students' contributions and the interaction between them and their teacher.

When coding and analysing my classroom data, I came up with three overarching themes including 'English-Only policy', 'Translanguaging' and 'variation in form'. These main themes helped me answer my first research question (To what extent, is the institution's language policy (or English) enacted inside its EMI classrooms?). In what follows, the themes will be discussed in turn. Next, I will move on to describe the first theme, 'English-Only policy'.

5.3 English-Only policy

English-Only policy was found to be prevalent in this EMI setting as shown in the table 5.2 below.

	Teachers	Lessons	Time (mins)	TT's talk in %	Use of English in %	Use of other languages in %
1	K	Lesson 1	99	92	100	0
		Lesson 2	90	96	100	0
		Lesson 3	84	97	100	0
2	M1	Lesson 1	129	83	100	0
		Lesson 2	118	80	100	0
3	C3	Lesson 1	117	62	100	0
4	M3	Lesson 1	139	69	100	0
		Lesson 2	146	48	100	0
5	M2	Lesson 1	81	30	100	0
6	N1	Lesson 1	144	54	100	0
7	T2	Lesson 1	131	80	100	0
		Lesson 2	128	87	100	0
8	J	Lesson 1	110	20	100	0
		Lesson 4	109	29	100	0

	Total	14	1,625	66	100	0

Table 5.2 English-Only lessons

Classroom data showed that there were 14 lessons out of 19 in which only English was used as the medium of instruction by EMI teachers. As the table 5.2 shows above, eight teachers (K, M1, C3, M3, M2, N1, T2, and J) spoke only English when teaching, and did not speak any sentences of other languages in their classrooms. This shows in the second column from the right hand side that the amount of English used as a proportion of lesson time is 100 percent resulting in no use of any other languages as revealed in the last column. Among the teachers enacting English-Only policy, five were Thai and three non-Thai. There are several reasons for this English-Only policy: 1) role of English as a lingua franca; 2) EMI programme policy; 3) teachers' language proficiency; and 4) practical and pedagogical concerns.

The first reason is the main reason for the preferred choice of English: English operates as a global lingua franca in EMI setting. In semi-interviews with teachers after classroom observation I asked them for reasons why they used only English. For example, K mentioned that he used English 100 percent in all his three observed lessons because there were non-Thai students in there. From my classroom observation, the teacher taught a PhD subject in Economics and there were six students in this course: two students were Thai, and one from the following countries, China, Vietnam, Bangladesh, and Bhutan (for more details about each observed classrooms, see appendix G, page 193). Similarly, the same reason was also stated by other teachers. T1 who taught Logistics to a mixed group of Thai and non-Thai students stated that the use of English would be open to everyone inside classrooms regardless of which countries they came from. These responses underscore the fact that all students know English because they have learned it as a 'foreign' language to communicate with other speakers from different language backgrounds in this multilingual EMI setting, and English is often their first and/or only language other than their mother tongue. The use of English in this sense perfectly matches the definition of ELF that, as Seidlhofer (2011: 7) puts it, ELF refers to 'any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option'.

Furthermore, the exclusive uses of English or English-Only policies found in EMI classroom practices in table 5.2 reflect the 'virtual position' in Macaro's (2009) categorisation of English use in

EMI classroom where EMI teachers believe that the English-Only is desirable and appropriate. While my finding is similar to some previous EMI studies like Smit (2010b) and W. Baker and Hüttner (2017), but in the most part is different from many other previous EMI studies in similar contexts like Tian (2014) in China, Humphries (2014) Japan, Tien (2014) Taiwan, Robinson (2014) Bhutan, Canh (2014) Vietnam, and Tayjasanant (2014) Thailand. For example, in Taiwan, Tien (2014) studied her own EMI practices and reported that her use of L1 (Mandarin Chinese) in lessons one, two, and three increased from around six percent, 15 percent to 30 percent of her classroom talking time respectively. Also, in Thai context, Tayjasanant (2014) observed two EMI classrooms and found that in the first class Thai language was used around 80 percent of classroom instructions by the teacher, while in the second the Thai language was used about 30 percent. Perhaps one possible explanation of the difference in the amount of English use between my study and Tien's and Tayjasanant's studies is the linguistic backgrounds of participants involved: whether the teacher and students share the same L1. In Tien's study, the teacher (Tien) and almost all students (76 students) were Taiwanese speaking Mandarin, while there were only seven exchange students from mainland China who could possibly understand Mandarin. Since the Mandarin Chinese was shared among most of the participants, it was then used to communicate to all the students inside EMI classrooms still maintaining the mutual understanding among all the participants. Similarly, in Tayjasanant's study all the participants including teachers and students were all Thai, so the shared Thai language (instead of English) was being able to use as a medium of classroom instruction when necessary. However, the body of EMI participants in my study was truly diverse coming from more than 35 different countries around the world (for students see appendix F, and teachers see appendix G). therefore, the teachers had no choice but to use English only as a medium of instruction or as a lingua franca in order to achieve and maintain the mutual understanding among the linguistically diverse group of students in their EMI classrooms.

Secondly, another explanation of why the teachers under question used English only is because of the explicitly stated language policy that clearly requires English as a medium of instruction for this programme (see a discussion of this topic in Chapter One, topic 1.3 when I discussed the formally documented language policy of this university). When asked for reason why English-Only in their interviews, T2, M2, and N1 all said that they had to follow the programme policy, thus speaking only English in their observed lessons. They appeared be aware of the formal policy. So my data showed that classroom practices were in line with the stated language policy. This finding resembles one previous study by Baker and Hüttner (2017), but is different from many EMI studies in various contexts like Tien (2014), Tayjasanant (2014), Hasim and Barnard (2018), Costa and

Coleman (2013), Ali (2013), Carrol and Hoven (2017) and Aizawa and Rose (2018) which showed a gap between the formal policy and the classroom practices. The EMI teachers in these studies were aware of the EMI policy (the use of English only), but they had to use L1 for a range of reasons (e.g. pedagogical reasons, comprehension checking, managerial functions and time-saving).

Thirdly, one possible reason for why both the Thai and non-Thai instructors used English-only in their classrooms is that they all appeared to have a high level of English proficiency and had years of teaching experiences with EMI programme. Among the Thai teachers, K, N1 and M2 used to live and study overseas. They had their PhD from English speaking countries. While K had his PhD from one of the leading US universities, N1 did his PhD in the UK. Also, T2 had a Master degree in Linguistics from a US university. Regarding teaching experiences, they all had been teaching EMI programme for nearly ten years (See appendix G, page 193 for background information of each teacher). From my observation, they all appeared very confident in their subject knowledge and their English abilities although they admittedly held some negative attitudes towards their English which will be explored in the next chapter of interview. Among the three non-Thai teachers who used only English in their lessons, they all speak very little or basic Thai, but fluent in English. C3 was from South Africa, and considered himself as having a British accent. He had lived in Thailand for only a year prior his participation in this study. He said he picked up a few basic Thai words and expressions, but I did not hear any of these in his lesson. Similarly, M3 was from Canada on a research collaboration project between a Canadian university and the local Thai university under question. He was there only for one semester teaching a marketing research subject during the time of my fieldwork. M3 did not speak Thai at all, but only English in his two lessons visited. In addition, M1 is Bulgarian and had lived in Thailand for more than 10 years. Although he said he could speak some basic Thai, I did not hear any Thai words while I was observing his lessons. In short, these non-Thai teachers spoke English 100 percent with a very high level of English proficiency. The English language proficiency of EMI participants was found to be one of the key factors that influence EMI classroom language practices (Aizawa and Rose, 2018). Aizawa and Rose (2018) rightly point out that the reality of actual classroom language use was far more complicated than the policy indicated, and depended on several factors including stakeholders' language proficiencies, classroom activities, teaching materials, lectures content, and academic disciplines.

Lastly, from a pedagogical standpoint, T2, M1, M3, and F mentioned that the use of English-only in their EMI classrooms would help students improve their English language abilities alongside their content knowledge. These teachers tended to believe that some students, not all, were weak and

needed some practice in using English. So they believed that English-Only would help their students improve their English. This finding corresponds to some previous EMI studies, for example Haji-Othman et al. (2014), Lasagabaster (2015), and Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017). Haji-Othman et al. (2014) reported that some Bruneian EMI teachers preferred to use English only in their classrooms because they believed the maximum exposure, or absolute exposure, to the target language is the only way to improve the students' linguistic abilities, while L1 use would deprive the students of practice they needed, therefore hindering their English language development. Similarly, Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) also believe that the use of L1 is detrimental to learning and improving English while English-Only in EMI classroom will increase the exposure to the target language, and thus is instrumental in its acquisition. However, while the idea of 'English' or 'E' discussed in these two studies (Haji-Othman et al. (2014) and Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017)) seems to be based on the 'native English', Galloway et al. (2017) and Rose and Galloway (2019) with research in the field of Global Englishes call for the need to reconceptualise the 'E' in EMI, and propose a pedagogical framework, Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) for ELT in general and EMI education in particular to adequately equip the EMI students with the kind of English language skills appropriate for the global spread and use of English.

Nevertheless, while English-only was enacted inside the above 14 lessons, I also found a mismatch between EMI policy and practices. While the EMI policy stated that English should be used as a medium of instruction, I found that in a few lessons there was some use of other languages than English. I labelled such practice as translanguaging and it became my second main theme which is the use of English plus other languages, the topic now I turn next.

5.4 Translanguaging: English plus other languages

A mismatch between policy and practices was found in my data. While the EMI policy required the English as a medium of instruction, classroom visits showed five lessons out of 19 featured translanguaging meaning English was used and mixed with other languages. As the table 5.3 shows below, two teachers (T1 and J) used a small amount of either Thai or Chinese in their EMI delivery. This reveals in the last column as an average of less than one per cent of use of these languages (0.1 percent) in the whole lesson. In other words, while English is still used mainly (99.9 per cent), other languages are also used in these lessons by the two teachers to facilitate the students' comprehension of the content teaching. Therefore, in what follows, I will explore how the

teachers carried out the translanguaging practice. I will first examine T1's lessons before I move on to explore J's lessons.

	Teachers	Lessons	Time (mins)	TT's talk in %	Use of English in %	Use of other languages in %
1	T1	Lesson 1	138	86	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 2	136	85	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 3	132	84	99	1
2	J	Lesson 2	114	48	99.9	0.1
		Lesson 3	99	33	99.9	0.1
	Total	*5*	*619*	*66*	*99.9*	*0.1*

Table 5. 3 Translangunging: English plus other languages lessons

5.4.1 Translanguaging in T1's lessons

As the table 5.3 above shows, there were three lessons with T1 where I observed. Each of these lessons lasted approximately two and a half hours. The coding data revealed there was one instance (or pedagogical episode) of use of other languages found in lesson 1 and 2, but there were eight instances found in lesson 3. Altogether, there were 10 pedagogical episodes that were found in these three lessons. I will discuss these in turn in this section.

For lesson 1, T1 translanguaged only once which accounted for 0.1 percent of use of other languages as a proportion of lesson time. The translanguaging took place after the lesson had started just over an hour before the break. It took place for a very short period of time while I was sitting and observing at the back of the class. Basically, T1 appeared to use English only or exclusively throughout the two-and-a-half-hour lesson despite the small amount of other languages. This pedagogical episode will be explored and transcribed. I adopted the transcription conventions in my analysis partly from Cogo (2012) and partly from Jenkins (2014) (see appendix A page 171).

Chapter 5

T1 is a German male teacher. He taught a subject called, International Logistics and Supply Change. T1 appeared to have a high level of English proficiency. This is because as he mentioned in his interview, he used to study and work in the UK for some years before he moved to Thailand. He had lived in Thailand for more than 20 years and according to him he said he could speak some Thai. This confirmed my observation: I saw him speaking some Thai during his lessons. As well as teaching, he owns a logistic company and does his business in four languages (German, English, Spanish and Thai). He also speaks other languages including Italian, Dutch, French, and Chinese.

Regarding T1's lessons where I observed, the classroom setting was very multilingual. There were 40 undergraduate students, between 19 and 20 years of age. 23 students were Thai while 17 were non-Thai. Among the foreigners, ten were Chinese, two from Brazil and one from the following countries including Myanmar, Vietnam, Japan, Pakistan, and Netherlands. In the interview with T1, he felt that the Thai students were weaker in terms of English language proficiency than their non-Thai counterparts, and they often did not know vocabulary although they had chosen to study in an English programme.

The following first extract was from lesson 1 as shown in the table above. T1 was troubled that the Thai and non-Thai students seemed not to understand the meaning of an English term, cubic metre. I then will analyze the classroom interaction using the CA technique as described above, and consider how the teacher and students dealt with the unknown meaning of the English term. The teaching leading towards this extract was when T1 was explaining how goods are shipped on a cargo airplane and how they are measured in terms of a space and volume. He was talking about cubic metre but there seemed to be a lack of understanding of this term. He then asked the whole class, at the time, N3 who is a Thai female student was sitting at the front of the class close to the teacher.

Extract 1:

1   T1:   what's cubic metre? (4) what's cubic metre? (3) what's cubic metre? (3)
              what's cubic metre? (4), that's middle school (2), **<LNth> เรียนแล้วมอสาม <LNth>**
                                      <LNth> you studied in middle school <LNth>

2   SS: (no verbal response)

3   T1:   what's what's cubic metre?

4   N3:   I don't know in English but I know in Thai.

5   T1:   ah:: say in Thai

6   N3:   **<L1th> ลูกบาศก์เมตร <L1th>**
             <L1th> cubic metre<L1th>

7   T1:   YES, and how do you translate that, what does it mean? (2), what does it mean? (6),

it is one metre by one metre by one metre, it's a space right, it's a unit for volume.

The focus of the interaction above is on clarifying the meaning of the term (cubic metre). There are two reasons for this. The first reason is that in EMI teaching and learning where content knowledge is paramount, understanding the content is the most important goal to achieve in any EMI classroom. But this understanding is being threaten by a lack of it. The lack of understanding is indicated by long pauses in line 1 and no verbal reply from the students in line 2. Another reason is that in multilingual setting like in this EMI classroom, the teacher does not rely on a priori English knowledge because the students are from diverse language backgrounds with varying degree of linguistic proficiency: some may know the term very well while others with low language proficiency do not. As Jenkins (2015: 64) puts it, in multilingual communication 'what is shared may not be shared from the start (nor do interlocutors necessarily know from the start what they do in fact share)'. For this reason, the teacher turns to focus primarily on explaining the meaning of the problematic term. In doing so, he draws on a range of pragmatic strategies. My analysis revealed six different strategies that the teacher uses in the extract in achieving communicative success.

The first strategy the teacher uses is questioning strategy. In line 1, the teacher asks the same question four times. Also, the same question is repeated in lines 3 and 7. Questioning is found to be effective strategies for resolving an unintelligible word in EMI classroom setting because it draws students' attention to a particular word or concept under discussion, and also is used to check understanding of the term (Björkman, 2011). Secondly, the teacher also employs repeating strategies throughout the exchange. In line 1, the question is repeated four times and is repeated again in lines 3 and 7. The repeating strategy is used to emphasise a point being focused, and prevent misunderstanding in ELF classroom (Mauranen, 2006b). Thirdly, Thai translation is used in line 6 which is allowed by the teacher and subsequently uttered by N3. Translation from English to L1 is often found to be a good strategy to deal with some difficult English terms and concepts in many previous EMI studies (e.g. Kim (2014), Abdullah and Heng (2014), Tayjasanant (2014), Daryai-Hansen et al. (2017), Goodman (2017), and Mazak et al. (2017). Fourth, the use of Thai at the end of line 1 helps clarify the meaning because it provides a hint of the term helping particularly the Thai students to focus on it. Such use of Thai by the teacher whose first language is German also shows he wants to affiliate with the Thai students who form the majority of students in that lesson. The teacher's affiliation and collaboration also show at the beginning in line 5 when he produces a vocalisation of approval allowing for the direct Thai translation as shown in the following line 6.

Chapter 5

This finding is in line with previous ELF studies (e.g. Cogo, 2009, 2012) that show ELF speakers use the interlocutors' L1 to signal and show cooperation and affiliation to their community. The last strategy that the teacher appears to use is commenting on a term and concept (Björkman, 2011). In the last line 7, the teacher comments on the term (cubic metre) explaining what it actually means in order to establish an understanding of content among the students. As Björkman notes, explaining and commenting on a term is found to be an effective pragmatic strategy because it helps students understand the concept and it is used widely in EMI classroom by teachers.

The above EMI classroom interaction showing a mix of two languages (English and Thai) can be considered as 'English as a Multilingua Franca' or 'EMF' which, according to Jenkins (2015: 73), refers to 'Multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice, but is not necessarily chosen'. This means EMF refers to multilingual settings in which everyone present knows English, so English is potentially 'in the mix', regardless of whether or not and how much it is used. As the extract shows, English is used mainly or exclusively as a contact language because every student knows it. Also, since the EMI setting under question is a good example of multilingual settings where students are teacher are themselves multilingual, other languages of these participants are also present. In this case, Thai language is used 'in the mix' with English in multilingual interaction as shown in the extract and as described above. In essence, the focus of EMF or EMI communication is to achieve a mutual understanding among the speakers through the use of different languages and a range of pragmatic strategies. I will move next to describe the second extract which was found in T1's lesson 2.

In the lesson 2, I also found only one pedagogical episode during the two-hour-and-a-half observation accounting for a 0.1 percent of use as shown in the table 5.3. The episode took place nearly the end of the lesson. The teacher translanguaged from English to Thai to explain the meaning of a word, port authority. The following extract 2 shows a typical teaching style prevalent in this EMI setting which is teacher-dominated. While the teacher was giving explanations and asking questions, the students only provided short answers. The activity leading towards this extract was when the teacher was talking about sea port in Thailand, but he realized that students seemed to have some difficulties with understanding the problematic word.

Extract 2:

1   T1:   sea port in Thailand, we know Khlong Toei port right, where is Khlong Toei port?
2   SS: in Bangkok

3	T1:	in Bangkok, that's correct, it's also called Bangkok PAT, do you know what PAT means? (6) PAT is port authority terminal, what is port authority? (2) port authority, Thai people, do you know what that is
4	SS:	(no verbal response)
5	T1	**<LNth> การท่าเรือ <LNth>** right, so the Khlong Toei port belongs to port authority. *<LNth> port authority <LNth>*

As the extract above shows, the teacher's main concern is about explaining the the English term (port authority). This is because the subject knowledge is so important in EMI teaching and learning, that the teacher must make sure his students understand the technical term used widely in international logistic system. But the teacher feels the students do not know the meaning of the problematic word. The lack of understanding seems to be indicated by the pauses in line 3 and the silence in line 4. This perceived lack of knowledge prompts the teacher to provide the definition of the English term in Thai. Another reason why the teacher explains the term is that he does not assume a priori or shared knowledge among the students whether they know the word or not. Although it is possible that some students may know, the teacher does not rely on this assumption. Instead, the teacher works towards the mutual understanding among the students who are multilingual and diverse in terms of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In doing so, the teacher uses a few communicative strategies in a way languages are 'in the mix'.

First, the teacher uses a questioning strategy (what is port authority?) in line 3 to draw the student's attention to the word under discussion. He then rephrases the question at the end of the same line addressing specifically the Thai students. Rephrasing strategy is considered as a useful communicative tool to enhance communicative success among ELF users (Kaur, 2011). After that, in line 5, the teacher employs a direct translation strategy. The teacher here wants to make sure that the Thai students know the term being discussed, thus translates the term into Thai. The translation strategy is often found in EMI studies (e.g. Robinson (2014), Stroupe (2014), He et al. (2017), Groff (2017), and Carrol and Hoven (2017)), and it is used to help teachers explain the problematic and difficult English terms, and it helps students understand the terms better. Altogether, questioning, rephrasing and translation are all effective strategies for content teaching in EMI contexts.

In addition, the translanguaging between Thai and English by the teacher in line 5 is particularly interesting because it is multi-functional. First, at the simplest level, the translation provides an easy and quick understanding especially for the Thai students who do not know the word. This could save a lot of time and effort on teaching and learning (Tayjasanant, 2014; Tien, 2014).

Secondly, speaking Thai shows the teacher would like to affiliate himself with the Thai students who are the majority in the lesson (Cogo, 2012; Makalela, 2017). Thirdly, it shows the identity of the teacher (Groff, 2017). Here speaking Thai which is not his German L1, the teacher seems to project himself as a multilingual speaker who could speak many different languages. Also, he is exploiting one of his available linguistic resources at his disposal for communicative purposes (Seidlhofer, 2011). In short, the translanguaging can have many practical and social functions and is the key feature of multilingual communication. I will next move on to discuss the eight pedagogical episodes that were found in T1's lesson 3 accounting for an average of 1 percent of use of other languages as shown in the table 5.3.

In lesson 3 which was the last lesson oberved, T1 translanguaged between English and Thai, and Chinese eight times. So in the following paragraphs, I will explore each of these one by one. The first episode from this particular lesson was about a term, custom house, in a border province called Mukdahan. T1 was telling the students about his experiences of cross-border trade that he carried out as part of his company service. He showed them some photos taken from his trip to Laos. He was explaining where the custom house was and the custom processes. However, he was unsure about how a photo with a sign in Thai read, so he showed the photo in his powerpoint slides to the students and asked:

Extract 3:

1	T1:	here this is a custom house, can you read this, those words I cannot read, is it
		<LNth> ศุลกากรรึเปล่า? <LNth>
		<LNth> custom house? <LNth>
2	SS:	(no verbal response)
3	T1:	right? Mukdahan custom house, this is where all those custom processes take place, this is very important in cross-border trade

The above extract shows the teacher translanguages between English and Thai in line 1 to specifically ask the Thai students whether the Thai sign means a custom house. Although his question is met with no response in line 2, he imposes his own meaning in order to get on with his talk. When this happened I was observing at the back of the class and I saw and knew that the teacher was right in his reading. Therefore, he seemed to know what the sign means, but he still asks the Thai students for what it means. A few reasons can explain this. First, at the practical level the Thai utterance provides a direct translation from English to Thai which is easy for understanding of the sign among the Thai students, in case some of these do not know. This

finding is in line with many previous EMI studies, like Tien (2014), Tian (2014), Canh (2014), Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017), Makalela (2017) and Galloway et al. (2017). Another reason could be the teacher wants to show his affiliation towards the Thai students in his class (Martin, 2014; Cogo and Dewey, 2012). In doing so, he might want to gain some attention from them too. Moreover, he might simply like to practice some Thai exploiting one of his linguistic repertoires (Cogo, 2012). In short, in multilingual setting like in this class languages tend to get mixed and repertoires are constantly in flux in a fluid and creative way often with various social and interpersonal purposes (Jenkins, 2015b).

The second episode is about the name of a country, Laos. The teacher was still talking about his experiences of cross-border tucking from Thailand to Laos, and he was wondering whether the students knew what Lao PDR stands for:

Extract 4:

1   T1:   Lao PDR, what does PDR stand for?
2   SS: (people's democratic republic)
3   T1:   that is correct, people's democratic republic, **<LNth> สปป ลาว <LNth>,**
                                        <LNth> Lao PDR <LNth>
            <LNth> สปป <LNth> means what?
            <LNth> PDR <LNth>
4   SS: **<L1th> สาธารณรัฐประชาธิปไตย ประชาชนลาว <L1th>**
            <L1th> Lao people's democratic republic <L1th>
5   T1:   that's correct **<LNth> สาธารณรัฐประชาธิปไตย ประชาชนลาว <LNth>**=
                        <LNth> Lao people's democratic republic <LNth>
6   SS: =@@@

This extract shows the teacher wants the Thai students to know the Thai words for people's democratic republic when he translanguages from English to Thai in line 3. Since the Thai words are an acronym (**สปป ลาว**), he further wants to make sure that the Thai students know what the acronym stands for. So, he then asks another question at the end of line 3. This question is met with an answer in Thai in line 4, but then in line 5 when the teacher tries to repeat the Thai equivalent with some difficulties because the word is rather long and difficult to say in Thai, the students laugh as shown in line 6. One explanation for the teacher's translanguaging might be that he wants to just practice pronouncing this word in Thai in a playful manner in the way that makes the students laugh creating a friendly and relaxing teaching and learning environment in his classroom. This finding is in line with studies like Tien (2014), Tayjasanant (2014) and Goodman (2017) who found that both English and other L1s were used in a playful manner in EMI classroom

discussion between teacher and student in a way that creates a friendly and learning environment inside the classroom. Also, it is true the mix between English and Thai shows the affiliation and cooperation between the teacher and students (Tayjasanant, 2014; Martin, 2014). It as well shows their identities as well as provides an easy understanding of the terms in both languages. This corresponds with Hamied's (2014) finding who found that L1 (Indonesian) use was really effective in explaining difficult concepts. In essence, the teacher and students are supportive and collaborative in the negotiation of meaning through the use of their available linguistic repertoires.

The next episode is when T1 was talking about the dangerous goods that are strictly controlled in international logistic system. Matches are one of these goods, and the teacher was wondering whether the students knew this item.

Extract 5:

1	T1:	matches, what are matches?
2	SS:	(no verbal response)
3	T1:	I know that many people don't know this anymore
4	SS:	(no verbal response)
5	T1	ok, **\<LNth\> ไม้ขีด \<LNth\>**
		\<LNth\> matches \<LNth\>

The teacher translanguages from English to Thai in line 5 because there seems to be a lack of understanding of the term (matches) as indicated by no response in the previous lines 2 and 4. Since the students fail to take their turn in providing the answer twice, it cannot be assumed that the word is shared or known to them. Because the understanding of the problematic word is crucial in international logistic system, the teacher has to resort to a communicative strategy, a direct translation which provides a quick and easy understanding of the term in the students' L1. Translation is found to be effective in facilitating students' comprehension, particularly the students with low English proficiency (Kim, 2014; Abdullah and Heng, 2014; Haji-Othman et al., 2014; Daryai-Hansen et al., 2017; Aizawa and Rose, 2018). Although it is possible that some Thai students might know the term well, the teacher does not rely on this assumption knowing that students are diverse in terms of English language skills. Instead, he prefers to establish a clear understanding for the students making absolutely sure that all the Thai students know what he is talking about. In doing so, the teacher is showing his multilingual identity and using his available linguistic resources for communicative success (Cogo, 2009, 2012).

In the following extract, the teacher was troubled by a lack of understanding of another term, coal, among both Thai and Chinese students. The lack of understanding prompted the teacher to translanguage among English, Chinese, and Thai.

Extract 6:

1	T1:	we have another kind of flammable solid we use in our daily lives and which is still used and being used in Thailand and that is coal, you know coal?
2	SS:	(no verbal response)
3	T1:	yeah, everybody knows coal
4	SS:	(no verbal response)
5	T1:	I don't know how to say in Chinese, how to say coal in Chinese?
6	SS:	xxx
7	T1:	how do you say in Chinese?
8	SS:	**<L1ch> 煤 <L1ch>**
		<L1ch> coal <L1ch>
9	T1:	**<LNch> 煤 <LNch>** and in Thai, **<LNth> ถ่านหิน <LNth>**
		<LNch> coal <LNch> *<LNth> coal <LNth>*

The teacher works really hard in order to make the students understand the meaning of the word, coal, in their L1. He is surprised by a lack of understanding of the term as indicated in line 3. The teacher is constantly checking the responses from the students as shown in lines 2, 4, and 6. Since the students fail to respond like in lines 2 and 4, the teacher has to resort to some translanguaging techniques between Chinese and Thai. In line 9, the teacher translanguages among Chinese, English and Thai showing that not only does he want to affiliate with the Thai students, he also wants to do it with the Chinese too. This finding corresponds with the finding in Goodman's (2017) study who found that in EMI classroom teachers used students' L1 like Russian and Ukrainian to ensure understanding of key terms and concepts in English. Goodman notes that EMI teachers occasionally translanguaged words from English to students' L1 if they were unfamiliar with the word. Also, his Chinese utterance shows that the teacher wants to learn the Chinese word for coal. It is often found that a multilingual setting often creates a learning opportunity among participants with a different L1 where one person learns other person's L1 (Palfreyman and van der Walt, 2017). In multilingual setting, as Jenkins (2015b) languages are 'in the mix' and relate to each other in a fluid and creative way.

The next episode shows another translanguaging when the teacher found that the Thai students did not recognise the English word (mosquito coil) in Thai.

Extract 7:

Chapter 5

1	T1:	mosquito spray or mosquito coil, do you know mosquito coil?
2	SS:	(no verbal response)
3	T1:	**<LNth> ยากันยุง <LNth>**=
		<LNth> mosquito coil <LNth>
4	SS:	=@@@

The teacher translanguages from English to Thai in line 3 because the students fail to uptake in line 2 resulting in no response. The no response indicates the students do not share the meaning of the word (mosquito coil). Again, the teacher is being informative and collaborative in establishing the understanding of the word when he says it in Thai. Here, a translation of English to Thai is used for students' comprehension of the English term. This reason is usually found in EMI literature, like Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017), Tayjasanant (2014), Stroupe (2014) and Mazak et al. (2017). Also, he says it because he wants to practice using one of his linguistic resources for communicative reason (Cogo and Dewey, 2012; Cogo, 2009, 2012). The laughers in line 4 show the students' appreciation of the teacher's translanguaging, making the classroom become lively and friendly at the same time the Thai students who do not know the word understand it. Again, the content teaching and knowing is paramount in EMI classroom and is achieved through the use of translanguaging practices.

The following extract shows T1 feels that the meaning of radioactive materials was not shared by many of his students particularly Thai and Chinese. What interesting about this extract is how the teacher translates the meaning of radioactive to Thai language and how the students respond to his Thai translanguaging. It is also interesting how the teacher encourages his Chinese students to look for and say the word in Chinese. The activity leading to this extract was that T1 was talking about how to transport dangerous goods, such as radioactive materials.

Extract 8:

1	T1:	some medical equipment for hospital needs radio active material, that's true, commercial use of radioactive material, there is one example, what's the meaning of radio active, what is radio active? (2) what is radio active? do you know that? (2) nothing to do with radio what is radio active? (3) what is radio active? (5) you know that? (3) look that up in dictionary and tell me the Chinese word radio active.
2	SS:	xxx
3	T1:	in Thai**<LNth> กัมมันตภาพรังสี <LNth>**
		<LNth> radioactive material <LNth>
4	SS:	Oh:::
5	T1:	in Chinese
6	S:	**<L1ch> 放射科物质 <L1ch>**
		<L1ch> radio active material <L1ch>

7	T1:	say that again=
8	SS:	=@@@
9	T1:	how do you spell that?=
10	S:	=**\<L1ch\> 放射科物质 \<L1ch\>**
		\<L1ch\> radio active material \<L1ch\>
11	T1:	uh:h I don't =
12	SS:	=@@@

The use of languages or the repertoires in flux reflects the classroom contexts. In this lesson, there were Thai and Chinese students. While the former formed the majority of the student population in the class, the latter were the majority of the non-Thai ones. Also, while some of these students were proficient in English, many others particularly Thai students were weak in the language skills. Therefore, taking everything into account, the teacher chooses to work towards the comprehension of the problematic word (radioactive material) rather than making an assumption that the word is shared by all the students.

In line 3, T1 speaks Thai language providing a direct translation of the word (radioactive) in Thai. He does this because, first, he feels that the students do not know the meaning of the word and cannot provide the answer to his question. In line 1, the teacher asks the same question many times. The pauses indicate that the students do not recognise the word. Second, he knows the Thai word very well and speaks it very clearly. A vocalisation in line 4 shows the students' surprises due to the teacher's clear Thai utterance in the previous line 3. In addition, the teacher is really encouraging the Chinese students to provide a Chinese translation as shown in lines 5, 7, and 9. The laughers in lines 8 and 12 show that the Chinese translation is too difficult for the teacher to repeat. Altogether, the surprises and laughters show that both students and teacher seem to have a lot of fun with these languages. The teacher shows affiliation and cooperation with the students when he translanguages between Chinese and Thai. In interview, T1 said that when the Chinese students told him the words in Chinese, although sometimes he did not understand them, he assumed that the students understood what was being talked about or the meaning of English terms under question. In short, T1 appears to make the best of students' various linguistic repertoires (Thai and Chinese) and to employ diverse accommodation strategies, like questioning and translation strategies, in his classroom teaching and learning. Altogether the pragmatic strategies and the translanguaging create and facilitate learning experience among the students who came from linguistically diverse backgrounds. This finding is in line with studies like Makalela

Chapter 5

(2017) and Mazak et al. (2017) who believe that translanguaging is effective and beneficial for students learning experiences.

The following extract is another episode that shows three languages (English, Thai and Chinese). The teacher was giving the meaning of acid in both Chinese and Thai.

Extract 9:

1   T1:   acid, you know what an acid is?
2   SS: (no verbal response)
3   T1:   in a battery for example, yeah battery has very strong acid, you put it on table it will burn through the table, burn through the floor, ya make a hole, I forgot how to say it in Thai I used to do it, how to say acid in Thai?
4   SS: **<L1th> กรด <L1th>**=
            <L1th> acid <L1th>
5   T1:   = exactly **<LNth> กรด <LNth>,** and in Chinese?
                    <LNth> acid <LNth>
6   SS: **<L1ch> 酸 <L1ch>**
            <L1ch> acid <L1ch>

The students do not always answer the teacher's question, and when they remain silent, the teacher tends to understand the silence as a lack of linguistic knowledge about the term (acid). Therefore, the teacher needs to provide the meaning in the students' L1s because he cannot assume all the students know the word. Here the teacher exploits the students' linguistic repertoire. He first asks the Thai students to say the problematic word in Thai at the end of line 3. After that, he asks the Chinese students to say it in their own language in line 5. It appeared to me that the multiple languages (English, Thai and Chinese) naturally came into the classroom instruction as and when needed in order to ensure that everyone understood the term being discussed. This finding corresponds with some translanguaging studies like Groff (2017), Makalela (2017) and Daryai-Hansen et al. (2017). In short, the teacher's way of achieving mutual intelligibility in his EMI classroom is fluid and dynamic in an ad hoc situation. The students who do not know the word will understand it despite their low level of language proficiency.

The following extract is the last pedagogical episode from T1's lesson 3. Again, he wanted to make sure that the Thai students knew the English word, compass, which was also considered as one of the dangerous goods in logistic trade.

Extract 10:

1	T1:	compass, you know what a compass is?
2	SS:	(no verbal response)
3	T1:	**<LNth> เข็มทิศ<LNth>** the compass that shows you where is north, you know right? *<LNth> compass <LNth>*

The teacher translanguages in line 3 because there is no response in line 2 which shows a lack of understanding of the term (compass) in Thai. The teacher believes that the students particularly Thai have not enough language proficiency to understand the English term. The translanguaging also shows the foregrounding of mutual understanding of the concept rather than relying on a shared linguistic resources among students in EMI classroom. Moreover, the direct translation provides an easy and quick understanding of the word which saves time and effort in teaching and learning. EMI teachers often used L1 to explain the terms in English in order to save time (Tien, 2014; Tian, 2014; Groff, 2017). The teacher also shows his affiliation towards the Thai in the local context. This finding is in line with Martin (2014) in a similar context who found that in the Philippines EMI instructors also used the students' L1 (Tagalog) to show their solidarity and to ensure rapport with the students.

To conclude this section, there were 10 pedagogical episodes found in the three lessons by T1. These episodes show a fluid and creative way of interaction inside the EMI classroom. In what follows, I will move next to explore the pedagogical episodes that were found in J's lessons.

5.4.2 Translanguaging in J's lessons

As the table 5.3 shows above, J used English plus other languages in two lessons (lessons 2 and 3) accounting for 0.1 percent of use of either Thai or Chinese as a proportion of lesson time in each of these lessons. The teacher used one episode of Thai in lesson 2, and used one Chinese episode in another lesson. I will explore these two episodes in turn.

J is a Thai male teacher and taught a subject called Organization and Management for first year undergraduate students. He speaks nine languages including Thai, English, Japanese, Lao, Chinese, Spanish, French, Burmese, and Vietnamese. He had a PhD from an overseas university and had been teaching EMI for 15 years. J appeared to have a high level of English language proficiency.

Regarding his classrooms, the subject was for all first year students. This was a large class in a big lecture theatre and there were 127 students from different 12 nationalities. 55 students were Thai while 72 were non-Thai. Among the non-Thai group, 51 were Chinese, eight from Vietnam, five

from Myanmar, and one from the following countries including South Korea, Cambodia, Nigeria, USA, Turkey, Bangladesh, Bhutan, and Laos.

The first episode was found in lesson 2 which lasted around two and a half hours. It happened soon after the lesson had started for only 10 minutes. The classroom activity leading up to the following extract was that J was asking students to talk about a book that had already been given to them a week ago. The book was about successful business people. The teacher wanted to know how the students liked the book. There was a student volunteer to talk about it in front of the class. J was then asking about the meaning of two concepts from the book which were 'freedom' and 'freewill', but he felt that these concepts were challenging and very similar, and some students would not understand the difference between them.

Extract 11:

1	J:	what do you mean freedom? freedom and freewill what's the difference?
		freedom and freewill (5) **<L1th> เสรีภาพ กับ การทำตามอำเภอใจ <L1th>**
		<L1th> freedom and freewill <L1th>
2	S:	xxx freewill is your mind, you can do anything what you want
3	J:	ok, what about freedom?
4	S:	(5) it's a kind of right on what you do something, but still refer to the the principle.
5	J:	it's the right to do something, but be mindful to other people right=
6	S:	=yes

At the end of line 1, J provides a direct translation for the Thai students to understand the meaning and difference between the two English words. Also, the translation is after a long pause that seems to suggest a lack of understanding of the words. The students appear to have a low level of English proficiency. In addition, the use of teacher's L1 might show his identity. Empirical studies (e.g. Cogo, 2012 and Klimpfinger, 2009) show that the use interlocutor's L1 show their cultural identity. Or it might be that a quick translation can result in a quick understanding. Translation or translanguaging is found to be helping and facilitating the students' comprehension of difficult English terms, and thus enhancing learning experiences of content subject (Martin, 2014; Abdullah and Heng, 2014; Canh, 2014; Mazak et al., 2017; Aizawa and Rose, 2018). Moreover, J is being collaborative and supportive as shown in line 5. Here he rephrases the student's utterance in order to make it clearer for mutual understanding. This is in line with a previous study that shows ELF users often reformulate the previous sentences to achieve meaningful communication (e.g Mauranen, 2006b). That J's reformulated utterance receives a latching yes response from the student in line 6 shows that the meaning of freedom has been

socially achieved. In short, the extract shows a typical multilingual communication that primarily focuses on the interlocutors' comprehension of the content being discussed through a range of communicative strategies.

I will next describe the second episode that was found in J's lesson 3. While English was used throughout the two-hour lesson, there were only two Chinese sentences uttered by the teacher in this particular lesson. This happened rather rapidly during his talk. J used Chinese which is one of his linguistic repertoires to make himself understood by a small group of Chinese students sitting at the back of the class. These students appeared to be talking while the teacher was teaching, and were not paying attention to the lecture. So, the teacher was really troubled by these students, he then stopped teaching. He after that turned his attention to the Chinese group and asked.

Extract 12:

1	J:	people behind want to speak
2	SS:	(silence and no verbal response)
3	J:	you want to SPEAK?
4	SS:	(no verbal response)
5	J:	**<LNch> 想说话吗? <LNch>**
		<LNch> wanna talk? <LNch>
6	SS:	(no verbal response)
7	J:	**<LNch> 你不是很想说话吗? <LNch>**
		<LNch> don't you wanna talk very much? <LNch>
8	SS:	(no verbal response)
9	J:	do you want to say something behind? (2), NO OK SO listen?

I interviewed J right after the lesson and I asked why he used Chinese to talk to those Chinese students at the back. He said he felt that the use Chinese would make them understand his message more clearly than English because it was their L1. His main purpose was only to make them understand what he was trying to say. These Chinese utterances resulted in two silences in lines 6 and 8. These silences seem to show that the Chinese receive the message and perhaps realise that they should not be talking during the lecture. The silences also show that the whole class is now paying full attention to the teacher. J seems to exploit his various linguistic resources to achieve communicative success. Meanwhile, he still focuses on the use of English as the medium of instruction. This reveals through the use of English in questioning at the beginning of the extract, in line 1 and 3, before he translanguages to Chinese. Also, in line 9, J is questioning

again. Questioning strategies are the most common strategies found in my classroom data. They are used to gain attention from students to a particular topic or task and J is using them quite well. In the EMI literature, it is often found in studies like Gierlinger (2015), Macaro (2018), and Lasagabaster (2013) that teachers often translanguaged to the students' L1 to deal with their disruptive behaviours. Also, the use of L1 to keep misbehaving students under control can be categorised as one of managerial purposes which include managing classroom activities, providing instructions and maintaining the peace and pace of classroom teaching and learning (Stroupe, 2014).

After this incident happened, I was really interested to find out the effect of J's choice of language which was the use of Chinese for this purpose. In other words, I would like to find out the effect of his language policy. I then interviewed four students who witnessed the incident. Two of these were Thai and another two Chinese. I found that the use of Chinese by the teacher received both positive and negative responses.

From a positive point of view, one Thai student (T3) felt that the use of Chinese was for clear understanding and communication. He said, "the teacher wants to make the Chinese understand his message". T3 appeared to share the same view as the teacher. Another Thai student (B3) felt that the teacher did not want to embarrass the Chinese group. He said, "I think the teacher wants to save face of those Chinese because if he uses English, everyone will understand it, but since he speaks Chinese, only Chinese students will understand it". In essence, these two students showed a positive feeling towards the teacher's use of Chinese. This is perhaps they are Thai and share the same value with their Thai teacher (J).

However, when I asked the two Chinese students (A2 and V1) who were in the lesson but were not part of the noisy group, I found a different feeling. They felt upset and embarrassed by the use of such Chinese because they felt the use of Chinese was to communicate to all the Chinese in that class including the good students. A2 said, "[the teacher] did not speak English so he speak Chinese I think his word was to all the Chinese so that is why I feel upset and sad". Similarly, V1 said, "I think actually I don't feel good because I was a little embarrassed because this is Thailand not China and I think one Chinese means most of Chinese people". Later in the interview, V1 said, "actually I think [the teacher] doesn't respect the Chinese students". In short, sometimes the effect of one's language policy or one's choice of language is almost unpredictable which can either be positive or negative or both at the same time.

To summarise this section, I have explored the co-construction of meaning found in lessons from T1 and J. I only found these two teachers out of nine teacher participants who exercised the translanguaging in their negotiation of meaning. This reflects the limitations of my study as discussed in section 4.12 in the methodology chapter. In next part of the chapter, I am going to explore the third main theme which is linguistic features produced inside EMI classrooms showing some linguistic variation as a result of language contact in contact zones or in EMI settings.

5.5   Variation in forms

This section will discuss some non-standard linguistic forms that were found to produce by teachers and students inside EMI classroom. When English has become a global lingua franca and is used by multilingual speakers in various parts of the world (e.g. in EMI setting under question), it is used differently from its use in any Anglophone countries by its native speakers. Thus, the main aim of this section is to find out how my EMI participants used English that is different from the standard ENL, and what linguistic forms were used inside EMI classrooms. In other words, what choice of linguistic features (either standard or non-standard forms) were chosen. I would like to point out that the main aim of this present study was not to study exclusively the linguistic forms or lexicogrammatical features to start with, but these forms are presented in this section just to show how English (what kind of English) was used in greater detail in its own right in EMI classroom. The following findings will show an overall linguistic pattern of how communication took place among EMI participants in this EMI setting. When I analysed the linguistic features found in my classroom data, I listened to the recordings many times trying to look for the different ways in which how English was used as compared with the ENL. Although both standard and non-standard forms were found in my data, only the latter will be presented below. With this respect, I came up with six sub-themes as shown in the following:

- Omitting the plural endings (-*S*) in countable nouns
- Dropping the third person present tense (-*S*)
- Omitting dependent prepositions
- Non-standard use of definite and indefinite articles
- Replacing the relative pronouns (e.g. *which* and *who*) with the pronoun *that*
- Overdoing explicitness and clarity

These themes are in line with other previous lexicogrammatical studies on ELF interactions, such as, Seidlhofer (2004, 2011), Björkman (2009), and Cogo and Dewey (2012). The above themes will be discussed in turn in the following sub-sections.

5.5.1 Omitting the plural ending (-*S*) in countable nouns

The omission of the plural ending –*S* was generally found to be a common practice among teachers and students in this EMI setting. The following examples are only some and there were more than these in my data. These examples were produced by many participants in their spoken utterances inside EMI classrooms.

(M2: Thai) …I prefer **six student** to present individual report (1) you already select what you want to do right? So **six person** …you have to present **ten minute**…you need to find the history of unico from Japan to Thailand to **many country**…

(N1: Thai) …this is the actual data of the past **six period**…

(J: Thai) …I give you **five minute**…

(M1: Bulgarian) …buy **thing** online…

(S6: Thai) …we have **two choice**…

(S7: Thai) …we cannot ask **two concept** in one question…

When I paid attention to linguistic features of utterances produced by both teachers and students inside classroom, I found that they tended to ignore the plural endings in countable nouns as presented above. This omission was quite common in my classroom data, and this finding resembles many previous ELF studies, for instance, Seidlhofer (2004), Björkman (2009), Mauranen (2012), Cogo and Dewey (2012). The omission of the plural ending morpheme stems from the influence of L1 of ELF speakers. For example, Thai language does not mark its nouns with an ending morpheme to show the plural form of the nouns. But Thai uses numerals in front of countable nouns to show their quantities. Many other languages work in this way too and they do not require the ending morpheme which is very different from StE language. So, it is natural to see the plural morpheme being left out in utterances spoken by ELF speakers. Björkman (2009) studying EMI programme in a leading Swedish technological university notes that it is quite common not to use plural endings after numerals in technological lectures and groups discussions among EMI students. Björkman also points out that some ELF speakers like Chinese speakers of English may find pronouncing the ending morpheme difficult because in their L1 this ending

morpheme does not exist. Similarly, Mauranen (2012) writes that the plural ending is only a typological anomaly in English, and there is no communicative efficiency attached to its use, so the omission of it will not be communicatively disturbing. Mauranen describes the influence of L1 on the use of English among NNESs as 'similects' while Jenkins (2018b) refers to it as 'language permeation' giving the idea of languages permeating and influencing each other in multilingual settings. Moving on to the second linguistic feature that was very common in ELF interactions, this is the zero marking (rather than -S) of present simple verbs in third person singular.

5.5.2   Dropping the third person present tense -S

In my classroom data, I found that EMI participants tended to speak without pronouncing the ending –S morpheme in present simple verbs in third person singular. These are some examples of zero marking morpheme in spoken utterances.

(M1: Bulgarian)   …so, **this happen** right now…

(M2: Thai)   …I think it can be **anyone who come** today…

(S1: Thai)   …because **it locate** near the main gate of the shopping mall…

(S2: Thai)   …the target market is simply **everyone who want** to shop at this brand…

(S3: Thai)   …**tiffany offer** a broad range of products…

(S4: Thai)   …**mister donut** err **belong** to the crg group…

(N1: Thai)   it seems like **everyone forget** everything.

(S7: Thai)   …**this make** you feel uncomfortable…

(J: Thai)   when **his mother come**, **he don't** come to class.

This finding is in line with, for instance, Seidlhofer (2011) and Cogo and Dewey (2006, 2012). The use of zero morpheme ending among ELF speakers as shown above is also influenced by their L1s in their English utterances in a language contact situation. Standard ENL has been described as being 'typologically unusual' among the world's languages Trudgill (2002: 94). Among present-tense verb forms, only the third person singular shows morphological marking. This verb form is least likely to receive special marking in many dialects of English, so standard ENL is unusual in this respect. While the standard ENL marks the third present singular verb, Trudgill lists a wide range of native and nativized Englishes that make use of the third person zero including East Anglian dialects in the UK, African American Vernacular English (AAVE) in the US, English-based creoles and post-creoles of the Caribbean and West Africa, the South Pacific pidgin and creole varieties, Tok

Pisin, Bislama, Solomon Islands pidgin as well as nativized Englishes, for example, Singapore English and Malaysian English. The use of the third person zero marking is a result of increased language contact between English and other languages. Since such use is also found in so many varieties of Englishes, it must be expected in ELF interactions too due to the extensive language contact in multilingual situations. I will argue that the use of zero morpheme ending in EMI classroom settings is entirely natural and thus should not be considered as an ‹error› as such.

Moreover, not only is the third person (-S) typological odd in standard ENL, it is also redundant in that the marking morpheme does not add to any communicative effect (Seidlhofer, 2011). Therefore, ELF speakers tend to break free from the constraints of the established norms. They tend to ignore the ending morpheme because its absence does not appear to cause any breakdown in communication. However, this does not necessarily mean in ELF communication the ending morpheme (-S) does not get used. Cogo and Dewey (2012) note that –S and zero forms were both used in normal ELF interactions in the sense that these two variants were actually competing each other in ELF communication. Their data showed that the distribution of –S and zero variants in third person singular was 48% and 52% respectively. As Cogo and Dwwey (2012) write, since the zero form showed a higher distribution than its counterpart (-S), it won in this competition.

Furthermore, Cogo and Dewey note that the presence of ENL speakers in an ELF interaction can have a major impact on the relative frequencies of the two third person variants; -S forms were more frequently found in interactions including ENL speakers than that without English speakers while the zero ending tended to occur more in conversation among only NNESs. This shows the influence of contact zone within which the ELF interactions take place, and consequently has some theoretical implications on how a community is viewed (see a full discussion of theoretical implication in the next chapter). Given the minority of English speakers and the increasing number of ELF users around the world, it is interesting to see, as Seidlhofer (2011) notes, what will have happened to the two third person variants in 50 years› time, particularly when the –S ending in standard ENL becoming a grammatical idiosyncrasy due to its speakers becoming the minority.

5.5.3 Omitting dependent prepositions

I also found that in my data the participants tended to omit the dependent prepositions when speaking while these prepositions are generally uttered in standard English language. The following are some examples.

- depend (on) - it **depend** the situation (S5: Thai)

- focus (on)   - I **focus** only football   (J: Thai)

- listen (to)   - **listen** this one three minute and you will understand (N1: Thai)

- listen (to)   - the company **listen** their customers   (S16: Thai)

- proud (of)   - we are really **proud** you guys...we are **proud of** you guys

                                                        (S13: Thai)

- look (at)   - ok **look** this example   (S17: Thai)

This finding is similar to previous ELF studies, such as, Seidlhofer (2004) and Cogo and Dewey (2012). There seems to be two explanations for the omission of dependent prepositions in ELF communication as shown above. First, it shows the influence of L1. As Cogo and Dewey (2012) note, typologically speaking English is again quite marked with its use of dependent preposition that must follow a verb, such as, *listen to* and *look at*. However, these use of prepositional patterns in standard NEL can be different from other languages. For example, in Latin derived languages, as Cogo and Dewey continue, verbs can occur with no preposition before their object or complement. The researchers explain that the phrase, *listen to music*, as used in standard ENL will be used as, *listen music*, in other European languages. Like, the use of *listen music* with the Italian equivalent will be *ascoltare la musica*, or the Spanish *escuchar música*, both of which use no preposition between the verb and object. Similarly, the French *écouter* and Portuguese, *escutar* are followed directly by the object with no intermediary proposition. Similarly, the omission of dependent preposition is also true of Thai language. In Thai the verbs are usually followed by their objects or complements directly without any required prepositions. In essence, the use of zero dependent preposition in EMI classrooms is influenced by speakers' L1.

The second explanation of why the dependent propositions tend to be omitted in ELF communication is that the prepositions have little or no semantic value. Because there is no communicative effect attached to it, it is possible that ELF speakers ignore the preposition in their interaction which is still meaningful without the required propositions. As Cogo and Dewey (2012: 53) point out, 'there is no evidence anywhere in our corpora that the omission of these prepositions causes a breakdown in communication'. However, this does not necessarily mean that ELF speakers do not use the dependent prepositions at all. I should point out that the above

incidents of no use of dependent propositions were found alongside with the use of dependent ones. For example, S13 when talking in front of the class produced the phrase *proud of* twice: his first utterance was without the dependent proposition *of*, but the preposition was uttered in the second. This co-existence of the use and no use of dependent prepositions in ELF interactions indicates an ongoing process of language change when English is used in multilingual settings and in language contact situations. The process of change is taking place not only with the prepositions, but with the articles too, the topic will be discussed next.

5.5.4   Non-standard use of definite and indefinite articles

This section will discuss how my participants used articles; definite (*the*), indefinite (*a* and *an*) and no use of these. They did not always follow the prescribed rules of standard ENL. Zero article was often used in place of both definite and indefinite articles as shown in the following examples.

(M2: Thai)   - so you already select Ø topic for your individual report right?

(N1: Thai)   - they have to buy Ø very expensive forecasting programme

(N1: Thai)   - I give you Ø very short time

(M2: Thai)   - the business can make Ø most profit

(S11: Thai)   - no one wants to be Ø second one, everyone wants to be the Ø first

(J: Thai)   - if your coach score Ø lowest, I will give you minus five mark.

This finding is in line with previous ELF studies such as Björkman (2009) and Cogo and Dewey (2012). There seems to be two reasons that can explain the use of zero articles in places where definite and indefinite articles are generally required in ENL. The first one is that EMI participants are speakers of a language that does not have an article system as ENL do. This is particularly true of Thai language. The utterances shown above were from EMI speakers whose L1 is Thai. So, it is the influence of Thai that explains the absence of the articles. The second explanation is that the article system in ENL norms is redundant and its absence does not cause any breakdown in communication. So, for this reason, it is possible that my participants may ignore the use of required articles.

5.5.5 **Replacing the relative pronouns (e.g. *which* and *who*) with the pronoun *that***

My data showed that the participants sometimes overused the relative pronoun *that* in place of *who*, *which*, and *when* as required by ENL norms, e.i. who + person, which + non-person, and when + time:

(S1)   because it locate near the main gate of the shopping mall, there are a lot of number of people *that* pass through this shop

(S9)   I have the coach *that* is a friend

(S1)   ...the night market *that* is a popular market

(M2)   you need to clarify what time *that* is the business can make most profit

This finding is similar to findings from VOICE corpus (Seidlhofer, 2011). There are many more examples that were found in my classroom discourse. One explanation for why my participants used the pronoun in this way is that the speakers exploit the redundancy inherent in the English language. According to the ENL norms, relative pronouns *who* should be used with a person while *which* with non-person and *when* with time. These rules are seen as being redundant, so ELF speakers tend to break these rules and use the relative pronoun *that* instead of those redundant pronouns. Doing so does not cause any breakdown in communication because the *that* pronoun clearly and immediately refers to the person or things being followed. Seidlhofer (2011: 106) calls this innovative use of relative pronoun as 'Economy of processing effort' which is achieved by using one relative pronoun for all purposes.

5.5.6 **Overdoing explicitness and clarity**

My classroom data showed that EMI participants overdid explicitness and clarify in many ways as shown in the following examples. Firstly, they tended to use a proposition *about* following the main verb to enhance the explicitness and clarity of the message. There were many more in my classroom data, but the following are some examples:

(S3)   - today I am going to ***present about*** tiffany and co

(M2)   - you need to ***clarify*** that place ***about*** the location, environment nearby

(S4)   - the weakness of mister donut ***is about*** the space of the shop

Chapter 5

(N1)　- we move next on to **understand about** the concept of forecasting ok

(N1)　- what will happen, if we **make about** a forecast?

(N1)　- so, **forget about** this one

(S8)　- he **suggest about** err use paper

(S14)　- you **learn about** good thing

(J)　- make sure you **know about** the words and vocabularies

Secondly, the EMI teacher and students tended to use a pronoun right after the subject to give the importance to the subject:

(D2)　- Ling, **she** is sick

(D2)　- Leon and Beer, **they** do not come to class

(J)　- all the leaders in the world, **they** must read this book

(S4)　- krispy Kreme, **they** have a lot of table and space for customer to sit and have a talk

(S4)　- mister donut, **they** have only two or three table for the customer to sit

(S3)　- if the customers, **they** like this designer, they also will buy the product

(S3)　- most of the customers are satisfied because err tiffany and co, **they** err give lifetime guarantee

Thirdly, EMI speakers tended to overuse two nouns to increase the explicitness:

(S1)　- it is simple and focus on **brown** and **black colour**

(S3)　- I like the **blue colour**

(M2)　- I see they use **white colour**

Lastly, my EMI participants tended to over-emphasise when it comes to comparative and superlative forms:

(S10)　- this question is **more easier** than that question

(M2)　- starbuck is **more cheaper** price

(N1) - this one is the ***most easiest*** one

(J) - it must be ***more happier*** to lose a big game than to win a small game

My finding resembles findings from some previous ELF studies like Seidlhofer (2004, 2011) and Cogo and Dewey (2012). One reason for the non-standard linguistic features shown above is that ELF speakers tend to place more emphasis and importance on content or main idea of the message rather than following the linguistic norms prescribed by ENL standard.

To sum up, this section has explored linguistic variabilities found in EMI setting under question. Six sub-themes in terms of lexicogrammatical features have been discussed in its own right. The themes have shown that EMI participants used English differently from the standard ENL. Cogo and Dewey (2012: 45) call these features as 'adaptive pattern of lexical and grammatical forms'. As the researchers point out, the forms show a pattern of innovation in ELF communication because they are indicative of emerging ways in ELF use of language. They meet the following four key criteria. First, the forms are systematic in nature, and have been carefully investigated using both qualitative and quantitative analyses of data. Secondly, they occur frequently and extensively in numerous occasions and are produced by numerous speakers from a wide array of L1 backgrounds. Thirdly, they are communicatively effective, in other words, non of these forms (presented above) lead to a breakdown in communication. Finally, these features are therefore considered variants (not errors) when compared with standard ENL equivalents.

5.6   Conclusion

This chapter has discussed first of all the two analytical frameworks used to analyse the classroom data. These were a five-second-sampling technique and CA approach. The sampling technique yielded the three overarching themes including the 'English-Only policy', 'English plus other languages', and 'variation in forms'. These themes were then discussed. The themes perfectly matched the definition of English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF) (Jenkins, 2015b). The key findings were that English was mainly used as a contact language in this EMI setting. Also, not only English, but other languages were also used in interaction inside classroom. The main reason why English was preferred as a medium of choice is that in multilingual setting English is known to everyone present, therefore it is used as a lingua franca among speakers in this case teachers and students who were from different language backgrounds. In addition, since these participants are multilingual, their other languages like their L1s were also present. So, the finding revealed the

use of other languages in classroom teaching and learning in a fluid and creative way. It also revealed the influence of these languages on the use of English by both teachers and students showing variation of linguistic forms as discussed in the second part of the chapter. In short, the use of English in EMI setting or in multilingual contexts is different from that of in any Anglophone countries which are standard native varieties. In the next chapter, I will explore further how the teachers and students perceived their use of English and other languages. I will next move on to analyse my interview data.

Chapter 6   Analysis of Interview

6.1   Introduction

Interview data was collected to answer all of my three research questions: (1) to what extent are the institution's language policies enacted inside its EMI classrooms? (2) what kind of language ideologies inform teachers and students' orientations towards EMI policies and practices? and (3) how are the teachers and students affected by such EMI policies and practices? In this chapter, the interview data will be analysed and the findings will be presented and discussed. So, this chapter will first begin by explaining my two analytical techniques used to analyse my interview data. These techniques are a qualitative content analysis (Schreier, 2012) and Speech Functions Analysis framework (Eggins & Slade, 2006). While I used the content analysis to analyse the content or codes found in the data, I used the Speech Function framework to capture the interactional process of interview. After that, I will discuss the data analysis in practice which explains how the analysis was carried out and how the codes were obtained. Here, at the end of my analysis process I came up with a coding frame, and the final set of codes included four overarching themes: 'English in practice: English-Only', 'English in practice: English plus', 'Teachers' orientations towards their own and their students' English' and 'Students' orientations towards their own English'. Finally, these main themes will then be explored in turn.

So, the first topic to discuss is the general literature concerning the concepts of interviews used in my analysis that is the importance of analysing both the product and process in interview data.

6.2   Considering the product and process in interviews

In analysing my interview data, I followed Talmy and Richards (2011), Talmy (2011) and Mann (2011, 2016) who problematise the conventional concept of interview as research instrument, and at the same time retheorise interview as social practice or active interview. As Talmy and Richards (2011: 2) observe, an active interview is a theory of interview that foregrounds not only the content drawn from interviews that is the 'whats', but also the linguistic and interactional resources used to (co)construct it or the 'hows'. In this reconceptualisation, Talmy (2011: 28) problematises the conventional approaches to interview, and argues that in conventional approaches, the data analysis often displays content or theme in a 'decontextualised' way in which 'respondents' utterances are treated as independent of, and unaffected by, their

interactional context, and are then systematically grouped, coded, and summarised'. By contrast, in interview as social practice, as Talmy notes, 'data analysis focuses not just on content, but on how meaning is negotiated, knowledge co-constructed, and the interview is locally accomplished' (ibid.; 27). The analysis of content that shows not only the concept or theme, but also the interactional structure of the concept and the flow of argument, will help reduce the biases from the researcher and make the findings transparent (Wodak, 2006). Therefore, in my analysis of interview data I looked at both in order to analyse how an interview was achieved. Thus, I used two different analytical methods including qualitative content analysis and speech functions analysis to analyse both the content and process respectively. These methods will be discussed in turn in the following sections, and they will be discussed according to the general literature before I explain how I analysed the data. In the next section, I discuss the analytical framework for analyzing content.

6.2.1   Analysis of content: qualitative content analysis

In analyzing content in interview data, Mann (2016) lists a wide range of analytic approaches that can be used. These include thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), steps and modes of interview analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), categorisation and coding (Richards, 2003), and cross-case analysis (Creswell, 2007; P. A. Duff, 2008; Merriam, 1988). According to Mann (2016), there is a great deal of overlapping among these approaches, and many researchers working on qualitative interview analysis adopt a combination of several data analysis techniques. While I mainly followed Schreier's (2012) analytic technique of qualitative content analysis, I additionally employed some coding strategies from grounded theory proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998) and Corbin and Strauss (2015), as I go on to explain.

Qualitative content analysis, according to Schreier, is typically concerned with describing the content of data or analyzing what the interviewees say about the phenomenon under investigation. It is systematic, flexible and it reduces data. The qualitative content analysis broadly entails two steps. First, it involves translating all those meanings of interest found in data into codes or a coding frame. Then, the second step is to classify successive parts of data according to these codes. The codes are not concept-driven, but data driven. They emerge from data. To arrive at the final set of codes, the researcher will go through data many times and continue to revise codes repeatedly.

Schreier suggests some coding strategies for developing a coding frame. These include different types of coding techniques (open, axial and selective coding) developed by Strauss and Corbin (1998). According to Strauss and Corbin, coding process involves a series of activities. First, open coding involves breaking down data into discrete incidents, ideas, events, and acts. These items are then given a name that represents or stands for their meaning. The name may be placed on the objects by the analyst because of the characteristic they evoke, or the name may be taken from the words of participants themselves. The latter often are referred to as 'in vivo codes' (Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 105). As data analysis continues, events, happenings and actions that are found to be conceptually similar are given the same name. The names that are used are arbitrary: other researchers might use other labels depending on their research focus, training and interpretation, but the conceptual name or label should be suggested by the context in which an event is happening.

After events are coded, codes are then grouped into themes. Codes that are thematically similar are grouped under the same label. Grouping codes is important because it enables the analyst to reduce the number of codes with which he or she is working. Basically, open coding generates initial codes that are then grouped together into themes. Then, the second step of coding is axial coding. The axial coding is concerned with continuing the process of developing these codes and themes (Corbin and Strauss, 2015). Last, but not least, the final step of coding strategies is selective coding. This involves further refining and integrating the codes and sub-codes. At end of coding process, a coding frame will emerge from data. As Schreier (2012) notes, the coding frame should include several main codes and their sub-codes.

Having explained the frameworks for analyzing content in data, I will next turn to another analytic framework (the speech function analysis) that I used to analyze the process of interviews before I explain how I coded my interview data using the qualitative content analysis described above.

6.2.2   Analysis of process: Speech Functions Analysis

Regarding the analysis of process in interview data, Talmy (2011) suggests using any analytic approach to discourse level that acknowledges the sociality of the interview. Therefore, I adopted the Speech Functions Analysis framework developed by Eggins and Slade (2006) to analyse the process of interview. The reason for selecting this framework is because, as Eggins and Slade argue, not only it offers a comprehensive set of techniques for analysing patterns in casual conversation at different linguistic levels, the framework is also useful in providing explicit and

detailed linguistic description that can capture the linguistic and interactional resources used by interactants in any conversation. However, I didn't use the whole framework due to the focus of my study and because the framework itself is too large. Therefore, in what follows I will present a brief summary of it in respect of the parts relevant to my own analysis.

Eggins and Slade describe that in any casual conversation there are four major speech functions or moves including opening, continuing, responding and rejoinder moves. First, opening moves, as the name suggests, serve to prepare the ground for interaction. The moves can be normal greetings such as 'hi' or 'hello'. They then open up and indicate a subject for discussion. So, they can also be open or closed questions and/or general statements of fact and opinion that will freely generate agreement or disagreement in the conversation.

Second, continuing or sustaining moves enable the person who has been opening up the conversation to provide more information and details at the beginning of the interaction. The moves involve clarifying, giving some examples and providing similar or contrasting information, so that another speaker can understand what is being discussed. Conjunctions such as 'for example', 'like', 'I mean', 'but', 'so', and/or 'because' are used by the speaker who continues to provide more information about the issue under discussion during the course of conversation.

The opening and continuing moves are also sustained by the responses from the other speakers in conversation. These responses are the third type of moves called responding moves or reacting speech functions. The responding moves serve to respond and engage with the questions or statements initiated by the previous moves or by the first speaker. The responding is divided into four sub-moves: developing, engaging, registering, and replying. These moves help speakers express and explain their ideas.

The last type of speech functions is rejoinder. The rejoinder moves have two main functions: tracking and challenging. Tracking involves four sub-moves such as checking, confirming, clarifying and probing moves. These are used to check the content of the prior moves. Moreover, the second type of rejoinder is challenging moves. The challenging directly confronts the positioning implied in the previous move, and/or actively rejects negotiation by questioning the veracity of what has been said. Therefore, they express a different and conflicting idea of the speaker. They also keep the discussion going because of disagreement and confrontation.

Although Eggins and Slade argue that their framework is only appropriate for informal settings such as dinner parties, Leung (2012) and Jenkins (2014) set some good precedents for applying it to

analyze respectively classroom interaction and interviews. For example, Jenkins showed how her conversations with international students were achieved, and how she was an equal partner in a conversation. The speech functions framework, likewise, provided a useful technique of describing how my participants and I jointly constructed the interview talk through the use of various moves as explained above. In turn, biases from the researcher were dramatically reduced and the findings became transparent. Also, I recognised and became aware of the reflective and critical engagement with practice and process which was a crucial element in my qualitative research. Next, I will describe how I analysed the interview data including both the content and process of interview using the two analyzing techniques described above.

6.3   Analyzing my interview data

I began analyzing data after I finished the translation process (see section 4.11, for a discussion of translation). Basically, interviews were carried out in both Thai and English: Thai was used with Thai participants and English with non-Thai. In the former case, I transcribed the interview in Thai first before I translated it into English while in the latter I just transcribed it in English straightaway. When I had all the transcripts in English, I then began the coding process.

In the first step of open coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1998), I assigned a conceptual name to each event, idea or action found in the transcripts. I added the name in bracket in bold adjacent to the identified code or concept (see Appendix P, page 215, for some samples of codes during the initial coding process). Creswell (2013) warns against the use of any computer programmes at this stage of analysis. According to Creswell, while a computer programme provides an organised storage file system so that the analyst can quickly and easily locate material and store it in one place, it does not do the coding analysis, but it is the researcher who does the analysis. I also felt that my data were so contextualised that using a computer software for analysing would have led to some kind of subtle loss of part of my data. So, I did hand coding throughout the coding process, but I used Nvivo after my analysis to keep all the codes and transcripts.

In open coding, there were two sources of the name I gave to a code: I either created it myself or used those given from my participants, i.e. in vivo codes. In addition, there were two ways of how I coded. I did line-by-line coding which involved close examination of data, phrase by phrase and sometimes word by word. Although line-by-line analysis was time-consuming, it enabled me to generate codes quickly. Another method of coding that I used was a whole sentence or paragraph. When I did this, I was asking myself 'what is the major idea or concept in this sentence or

paragraph?' I coded and recoded and I developed codes quite elaborately. This is because I felt that the more I refined and modified them, the more they became focused and meaningful. When the codes were given a new and more elaborate name, it helped me remember the contextual conditions in which the codes were originally found. It also helped me as my analysis continued. I came up with the initial 81 codes in total.

After I obtained these codes, I grouped them into different themes. Similar codes were put into the same pile. They then were re-examined, rearranged and removed several times. I employed a manual approach in categorizing and grouping. I printed out all the codes and used highlighters, coloured pens, scissors, staplers and glue as a way of separating, sorting, and recombining them. Thus, during the categorisation process, the table, the bed and the floor in my room were decorated with small bits of papers. I felt that this strategy, albeit old-fashioned, enabled me to see the relationships between the codes and themes. This grouping helped me reduce the large amounts of data to smaller, more manageable pieces of data. In grouping process, some codes became a major code or theme while others became a sub-code or sub-theme. The grouping process resulted in four final main codes which are presented in a coding frame below. Each main code will contain some sub-codes.

1. English in practice: English-Only
2. Translanguaging: English plus
   - English plus Thai
     - o Dealing with the unknown English words
     - o Explaining difficult terms and concepts
     - o Use for non-work related talk
     - o Showing affiliation, solidarity and connection
     - o Use for teaching non-Thai students some Thai words
     - o Exclusion of non-Thai students
   - English plus Chinese
   - English plus Thai, Chinese and others
3. Teachers' orientations towards their own and their students' English
4. Students' orientations towards their own English

These codes emerged from my data during the coding process. I had three research questions that guided my analysis. These are:

1) To what extent are the institution's policies enacted inside its EMI classrooms?

2) What kind of language ideologies inform teachers and students' orientations to EMI policies and practices?

3) How are the teachers and students affected by such EMI policies and practices?

The interview findings basically answered all the research questions above. The coding frame will be discussed in the following sections. In doing so as mentioned above, I will use Eggins and Slade's framework to analyse how the codes were presented and negotiated by the interviewees and me as a researcher during the course of interview. I next turn to the data and will first explore the first main code 'English in practice: English-Only policy'.

6.4   English in practice: English-Only

The following two extracts show EMI teachers strongly believed that English should be used only inside classrooms. I labelled this belief as an 'English-Only policy' because it is so strict in classroom rules that only English, not any other languages, is allowed. The extracts show how the code was negotiated during the course of interview. I adopted transcription conventions from both Cogo (2012) and Jenkins (2014) (see Appendix A).

When I conducted semi-structured interviews, one of my questions was that I wanted to know the classroom rules concerning with the choice of language that my teacher participants implemented in their EMI classrooms. Here I asked N1 what language he would use when teaching and why.

Extract 1[2]:

1	N1:	**I have to use English because this is English programme**
2	P:	how about other languages?=
3	N1	=**I'm NOT ok with other languages**, I try to force the use of English in my lessons because this is inter programme so they need to communicate in English
4	P:	yeah
5	N1:	if they ask me using other languages I don't respond
6	P:	er
7	N1:	**I try to force to encourage and enforce the use of English**
8	P:	yeah
9	N1:	Chinese should not be used in my class
10	P:	er: has there ever been any Thai students in your class who

---

[2] The interview was conducted originally in Thai, but translated into English (see Appendix C, for the original Thai conversation). Also see the translation process in the methodology chapter 4, section 4.11. The words that are highlighted in the extract are the key points.

                broke the rule and asked you in Thai =
11   N1:   = yeah there are [during the break though
12   P: [oh really?
13   N1:   but I don't answer in Thai I will try to speak English with them

In line 3, the latching responding move by N1 shows his engagement with the topic under discussion that he really approves and supports the use of English-Only. Also, the emphasis in his response shows his strong feeling about his classroom policy that he does not allow the use of other languages except English during his lessons on the grounds that the programme is an English programme. N1's support of the English-Only policy shows throughout the extract. He uses an engaging move in line 7 to restate his language rule. Also, another latching response in line 11 shows his involvement in the topic of discussion and his passion about his policy.

N1 seemed to be aware of the stated language policy of the EMI programme that was written in the policy guideline (see the discussion of this formal policy in the introduction chapter, page 4) that clearly stipulated English as a medium of classroom instruction. This finding is in line with Groff (2017), Carrol and Hoven (2017) and Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) who found that EMI teachers were aware of the policy. However, my finding is different from studies like Hasim and Barnard (2018) and Ali (2013) who found that some EMI were not sure about the language policy regarding the amount of English to be used, let alone when to use it. For example, Hasim and Barnard (2018) reported that the policy concerning the language of instruction at one Malaysian university was not clear, therefore the EMI teacher participants were not sure when and how much English was to be used: they did not know whether exams should be done entirely in Malay or English or both, and/or whether English or Malay would depend on the discipline subjects being taught. In addition, the result from my interview matched my finding from classroom observation when triangulating: in the table 5.1 (in the previous chapter), there was one lesson observed from N1, and this lesson shows a 100 percent use of English as a lesson time.

There were other reasons that may explain N1's use of English-Only. First, the medium of instruction had to be English because in N1's lesson there were some non-Thai students from China, Laos and Cambodia (N1/CRO1[3]). So, English operated as a principal lingua franca in teaching and learning. Moreover, N1 seemed to have confidence in his language ability and content knowledge because from interview, he had his Master's and PhD from two UK universities. He also

---

[3] See Appendix O, for a sample of field-note.

had six years of teaching experiences in EMI programme. So, his overseas academic qualifications and EMI experiences seemed to contribute to his use of English-Only policy. A similar result was found by Tien (2014) who reported that EMI students who had been abroad or had studied an English-medium instruction programme in high school before entering the university level tended to speak more English or used more English than those who did not have the EMI experiences. My finding links to the EMI teacher requirements in the recruitment process.

Moving on to the second extract, similar to N1 above was another teacher, F. F also implemented an English-Only policy in his lessons. From my classroom visits, he explicitly stated that 'English Only Please' when he heard some Thai or Chinese from his students during his teaching (field-notes; F/CRO3 and F/CRO4). Also, in one of his observed lessons, he said 'whoever used other languages, except English, in this class will have to pay a fine of 10 baht' (the baht is the currency for Thailand). Later in a semi-structured interview, when I asked why he introduced the English-Only policy as a classroom rule, he then explained:

Extract 2[4]:

1	F:	my point is that this is English class and therefore they should
		be using English, not Chinese or Thai. I believe if they would
		like to use these languages, they can use them elsewhere like
		outside classroom but in this class is a place where they should
		learn English and practice using English
2	P:	yeah
3	F:	practice is very important I can see that many of them do not
		practice English or they have not been asked to practice many
		of them like they are shy they don't want to speak up so I
		mean I'm really encouraging this =
4	P:	=yeah
5	F:	and my class I'm in charge of this class one hour and a half it's
		English-Only THAT'S IT?

At the end of line 5, F talks with some emphasis which shows his strong passion that only English should be used during his lessons. In fact, he strongly supports this English policy throughout the exchange with very input from me. For example, in lines 1 and 3, he talks at great length justifying his classroom language choice. F gave one reason for English use which was the lack of English practice among his students, and he believed the use of English as a medium of instruction would

---

[4] The conversation was originally in English

help them improve their English language skills. This reason was also mentioned by other EMI teachers like T2 and M3. Some previous EMI studies like Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) and Haji-Othman et al. (2014) showed that the use of English by EMI teachers would help and improve the students' English language skills. In addition, improving English proficiency among local students is one of the main aims of EMI programme (Wilkinson, 2013; Barnard and Hasim, 2018; Dearden, 2014; and Galloway et al., 2017). Moreover, it might as well be that F was aware of the language policy of the EMI programme that was explicitly written at this university.

More importantly and/or perhaps the real reason for F's use of English was that English became a lingua franca among speakers who shared different first language. From my classroom observation, F himself was French while the students were from different countries like Thailand, Vietnam, China, Cambodia and Indonesia. Therefore, understandably English had to be used for mutual understanding among the linguistically diverse group of people. My interview data was also in line with my observation. But when I asked about the penalty of 10 baht that he mentioned in front of the students whether this was another policy, he said "that's only a joke" (field-note; F/CRO3). Nevertheless, despite this, the 'joke' symbolically and clearly supported his classroom language policy regarding the choice of language he thought was good or appropriate, and therefore, was allowed and/or not allowed.

During my fieldwork after I learnt that English-Only was prevalent in this EMI setting, I decided to explore the reasons behind this policy by asking other EMI teachers who used English only. Some of the following reasons have already been mentioned above. I asked K and he said that he used only English because "the programme itself is an international programme and there are international students in the classroom". Similarly, T2 mentioned that "the students in EMI classrooms are expecting to hear and use English and this is why I only use English in my lessons". This finding is in line with some previous EMI studies, for instance Tian (2014) and Mazak et al. (2017) that found teachers spoke English only because they thought that there is an expectation of using English at the university level in higher education. Moreover, M2 also appeared to think that English-Only was appropriate. She said, "due to the policy, the mixing between Thai and English in classroom isn't appropriate and English should be in place only". As Spolsky (2012) notes, language practices are influenced by language management or language rules and also language beliefs and ideologies about what language to use. Knowing this, I then explored in detail the positive and negative effects of English-Only policy that may have had on both teachers and students in the local setting.

One advantage that was mentioned in the interview was that teaching content knowledge through English was easy because all the technical terms are already in English. With this regard, K said that, "teaching in English is easier than in Thai because there are a lot of technical terms which are originally in English". In studies like Kling (2015) and Hasim and Barnard (2018) EMI teachers often mentioned that they were more comfortable with using English than L1 in teaching because they did not have to translate the terms and concepts, but used them as they were originally used in English texts.

Moreover, English-Only policy was positively perceived in terms of mutual understanding among both local and international students. A German teacher (T1) said in EMI classroom, "English is open to everybody in my EMI lessons regardless of where they come from". Similarly, one Chinese staff (H) believed that English-Only would make everyone understand because most of students could understand English. Also English-Only was perceived to increase more participation from international students. One Vietnamese student (D1) said, "if the programme or seminar is using 100 percent English I will go otherwise I will not because I don't understand anything".

As already discussed in the previous chapter, the English-Only policy found in this EMI setting is different from the English-Only movement in any Anglophone countries, such as, in immersion programmes in second or primary schools for children with multi-ethnic origins in the US. That is, the English-Only policy in these immersion classrooms is largely underpinned by the notion of monolingualism and assimilationist view on language. By contrast, the English-Only policy that was found in my EMI setting is underpinned by the communicative effect because English operates as a lingua franca and is the only shared language among teachers and students who are from different countries.

However, not all EMI participants agreed and enjoyed the exclusive use of English. There were some students who encountered some negative experience of English-Only in their classroom discussion. They mentioned that the use of English often created fear, anxiety, and they found it difficult to speak English only as the following two exchanges will show. The exchange below was with a Thai student and the conversation leading towards this extract was about her experience of using English in EMI setting. She mentioned twice that she often felt fearful in having to use English. I then asked how and why that feeling possibly happened.

Extract 3[5]:

1	B2:	because **I have to make more effort when I communicate in English** like when listening I have to pay extra attention to what the teacher say in order to understand them this is because I am not a native English speaker so I have to pay more attention to the lecture to understand what they say.
2	P:	you have just compared yourself with a native English what do you mean by that?
3	B2:	I mean I have to think more and I I have to translate what they say I mean if you are a native you just communicate spontaneously but I communicate quite slower than the native maybe around six or seven seconds =
4	P:	=yeah [yeah
5	B2:	[**because I have to think before I can understand and speak or I use basic vocabularies not big words so I have to explain more and it take more time before people understand me**.

In line 1, she uses a responding move to express her difficulties and her uptake is very long which shows her strong feeling about the topic under discussion. Her involvement in the topic also shows in line 3 where she takes another turn at length finishing in line 5 with only a small latching turn from me shown in line 4. The overlapping turn in line 5 shows her engagement in the conversation. B2 felts that she had to make greater effort in understanding and speaking English than any native English speakers.

Similarly, other Thai students also expressed the same difficulties with using English-Only. B3 stated that speaking English was exhausting. He said, "it's like English is not my native language or when I communicate in English I will have to make the effort, it's not natural and it's exhausting". Another female student (P1) said, "using English is difficult I have to think of the English words to speak and it is hard". These language difficulties with English language in EMI classroom were also found among EMI students in Brunei where Haji-Othman et al. (2014) described the frustration of students when they were not able to convey their understanding of the content in English as 'an act of desperation' of the part of students. Regarding the extra time and effort among international students, Jenkins (2014) reports that any international students will need more time spent on producing the same amount of work than any home or English students will normally do. This may be three or four-time effort greater than home students.

However, the Thai students in general in this EMI setting were deemed to have a low level of English proficiency by their EMI teachers. The teachers tended to compare the Thai students with

---

[5] The conversation was originally in Thai.

their non-Thai counterparts. T1 mentioned that "I also feel that Chinese students, Myanmar and Vietnamese students they have a better grasp in general of the English language, the Thai students are little bit weaker, not all of them but some". Similarly, K said, "international students have more English skills than Thai students like Vietnamese and Chinese students speak better English than Thai students". Also, one Malaysian teacher (M3) compared Thai with European students and said, "some European have the ability, language ability higher than than the Thais". In EMI literature researchers often report that EMI students did not have enough English language skills in order to study the programme effectively (Goodman, 2017; Groff, 2017; Galloway et al., 2017; Dearden, 2014). Therefore, the students need language help and continued language support from the programme or university in terms of continued and extra EAP/ESP course throughout their course of study.

In addition, not only the Thai students found the use of English-Only difficult, but the non-Thai ones also shared the same experiences as the following exchange will show. The following code was with a Chinese student (A2). The discussion leading towards this exchange was about the general experience since A2 had joined this EMI programme. I then asked more specifically about his experience and concern in terms of language use.

Extract 4[6]:

1	A2:	**if you are not good at English you will feel stressful, sometimes I feel a lot stressful**=
2	P:	=because=
3	A2:	=because I am not good at English, so you know from start we have to use English but some of us are not good at English we are very very bad and only know some simple words and know nothing about the grammar but there are a lot of vocabularies for us so that what **MAKES us stressful**.
4	P:	it happens when you don't understand the lecture=
5	A2:	=yeah all of them, not only the lecture, the homework and powerpoint slides
6	P:	how do you do when you don't understand.
7	A2:	I look up the dictionary and all you need to do is **to study HARD**

In line 1, A2 uses a responding move to answer my question and to express his feeling about the difficulties with using English. His latching uptake in line 3 shows his strong feeling about the negative impact of English. Here he talks at length. A2's engagement also shows in line 5 when he latches and agrees with me before provides further details. In short, it seemed to me that both Thai and non-Thai students were negatively affected by the use of English-Only due to their low

---

[6] The conversation was originally in English.

level of English proficiency. EMI students in studies like Tien (2014), Tian (2014) and Humphries

(2014) also reported 'stress', 'fear' and great difficulties with the English-only in EMI programme

due to their perceived low level of English language skills.

Given the above difficulties and challenges of EMI programme the students faced, I then decided

to explore how the teachers felt about it and how they dealt with it in their teaching practices. A

Thai teacher (K) said, "some Thai students may find English-Only difficult to understand but this is

unavoidable they will have to come have talk to me after class". Also, one teacher (T4) stated that

while English-Only might be difficult, it could create some kind of learning motivation among weak

students. He said.

Extract 5[7]:

1   T4:   I think the impact for some students, if they are not good at English or they are still
weak at that right, so even they are not able to catch up some sentences or words
that I speak in the class, they know themselves they know what is missing **so there
will be some kind of motivation to learn more**, it is a kind of environment that
motivate them and FORCE them to study English more at an international university".

The emphasis shows the teacher's strong feeling about the impact of English-Only policy that

could motivate some students. This might have been true for A2 as he mentioned in the extract 4

above in line 7. Nevertheless, one German teacher (T1) talked about the EMI setting often creates

a conflict in a sense that it is an English-speaking zone where English is used as a policy, but some

students are limited in English skills. He said.

Extract 6[8]:

1   T1:   the students chose to study in English and also the international college has a policy
this is an English-speaking zone so everybody should speak English together er er and
**I JUST feel sometimes they just don't know the vocabularies because it's a new
subject how can they know the vocabulary and that is a bit of a conflict there**".

To sum up this section, the key findings discussed have been that English-Only was found to be

enacted inside EMI classroom for various reasons. The obvious reason is that English becomes a

---

[7] The conversation was originally in English.
[8] The conversation was originally in English.

lingua franca among teachers and students who were from different language backgrounds. Also, English was used as a medium of instruction due to the formal written policy of the programme. Nevertheless, while the English-Only policy facilitated a mutual understanding in multilingual settings, it also negatively affected some students who were weak in language skills and was not practical sometimes. As a French teacher (E) said in his semi-interview.

Extract 7[9]:

1   E: well I would like to be able to give all the instructions and communicate in English 100 percent, but **very often it's not practical because of the time constrains and because of the limitations from the side of the students**

This was when I started to explore in great detail the multilingual practices inside EMI classrooms. I was interested to know what kinds of languages played a role alongside the role of English language in EMI teaching and learning. I will next explore the second main theme, 'translanguaging: English plus'.

6.5   Translanguaging: English plus

This main code included three sub-codes which are 'English plus Thai', 'English plus Chinese', and 'English plus Thai, Chinese and others'. These themes helped me understand how EMI policy was implemented inside its EMI classroom by teachers and students, and also I learnt about the effects of these language policies on teachers and students. All the three sub-themes will be discussed in turn in this section. I first turn to the first one that is 'English plus Thai'.

6.5.1   English plus Thai

This section deals with how both teachers and students made their own language policy in general, and in particular, how they used English and Thai languages in various situations and for a wide range of purposes with diverse consequences including positive and negative outcomes. During my fieldwork, I found different roles of Thai language that seemed to play alongside English. These included Thai was used when the Thai participants don't know the English words, when they wanted to explain difficult terms and concepts in English, and wanted to talk to other Thai persons in a group consisting of non-Thai participants. Thai was also used by non-Thai people

---

[9] The conversation was originally in English.

to show affiliation and connection with their local Thai friends. The language was also used when teaching Thai to non-Thai students by Thai persons and for ease of communication among them. Despite these positive perceived outcomes of the use of Thai, it also negatively resulted in the exclusion of the non-Thai students. These roles of Thai will be discussed in turn in the following sub-sections. I will next discuss the moment when my EMI participants made their own language policy by deciding to use Thai in their English utterances when they encountered some unknown English words.

Dealing with the unknown English words

The following extract came from a Thai student participant (D2). He said in a group meeting with Thai and non-Thai friends he often had to use some words in Thai when he could not think of the English words while he was speaking. Then, his Thai friends would normally help translate the Thai words into English for the non-Thai participants to understand what was said in Thai.

Extract 8[10]:

1	P:	let's move on to the next topic do you ever have to use Thai when you talk English with your non-Thai friends but I know you normally use English with them
2	D2:	yeah I do sometimes use some Thai words but normally if there are members who are international in my group I will use English because I want all the group members to understand which include both Thai and international students.
3	P:	yeah=
4	D2:	=**but sometimes there are occasions when I can't think of the English words to use so I use Thai language instead** and then my Thai friends will help me translate that into English so the international friend could understand for example it just happened in a meeting a minute ago when I couldn't think of the word minimum in English so I used the Thai word my Thai friend then helped me with the translation into English so my Cambodian friend can understand
5	P:	yeah

In line 2, D2 uses a very long continuing move to explain in great detail how he translanguages between English and Thai when he could not think about the English words. The move continues and ends in line 4 with an example of a Thai word that he has just used in a conversation with his Thai and non-Thai friends. The long stretches of turn (in lines 2 and 4) show D2's involvement in the topic. From the interview, D2 stated that he could speak two languages (Thai and English) and felt that his English was not good because sometimes he had to mix between Thai and English

---

[10] The conversation was originally in Thai.

because he was not an English native person (his attitudes towards his own English will be explored below).

In addition, there were also other Thai students who mentioned they mixed between Thai and English when they could not think about the English words. B2 said that "sometimes when I have to answer a question from a teacher inside classroom, and if the teacher is Thai and if I can't think about the English words, I will use Thai phrases instead". Similarly, V2 said, "sometimes I switch to Thai when I'm not sure about which English words to use and/or how to say that in English, later everyone will try to translate that for the international friends". This finding confirms some previous EMI studies like Gierlinger (2015) and Haji-Othman et al. (2014) who showed EMI students mixed their L1 and English in their utterances because they did not know the English word at the time of speaking. Haji-Othman et al. (2014) note that an important factor is that the students and their teacher shared a common language to which they readily resorted when the need arose. This shared language between these participants appeared to be more readily employed by the students as 'a safety net' when they felt that the communication in English was not possible. Also and perhaps more rightly, in multilingual communication, as Jenkins (2015b) notes, other languages (L1, L2 or L3 etc.) also influence how English is used, and these repertoires are often in the flux in the communication. I will next move on to the second role of Thai language: it is used to deal with some problematic terms and concepts in English in EMI setting.

Explaining difficult terms and concepts

In my data, sometimes an L1 explanation or translation of difficult terms and concepts facilitated classroom teaching effectively. As well as students who used translation to facilitate the meaningful interaction, some teachers were also found in my data using a short Thai translation in their content teaching. The following exchange was with a German (T1) teacher who used some Thai translation to help his Thai students understand some technical terms. The discussion leading towards this particular extract was about the general details of the subject and/or classroom that had been observed. The following exchange started when I reported what I found in classroom (Field-notes: T1/CRO1; T1/CRO2 and T1/CRO3).

Extract 9[11]:

1   P: from my observation, I saw some Thai translation in your lessons, like, you translated

---

[11] The conversation was originally in English.

cubic metre and/or port authority into Thai in order for Thai students to understand or sometimes you ask them to say the words in Thai, why did you do that=

2   T1:   =for two reasons, **one is I want to make sure that people understand**

3   P: yeah

4   T1:   and sometimes also today maybe in the morning or maybe in the afternoon when you were not there, I explained custom and I asked the students how they say in your language=

5   P: =yeah yeah

6   T1:   so even they told me in Chinese or Myanmar language, I don't understand that language but when they have the translation I can assume that they understand what I'm talking about I don't want them to guess what this is **REALLY** meaning or what **COULD** that be but **I want them to understand what I'm talking about**=

7   P: =sure

8   T1:   in addition, we are in Thailand when I talk about the port authority of Thailand and there are Thai students, they need to know the Thai words also they see that every day, but they don't bring it together with classroom, but when they drive by **<LNth>การท่าเรือแห่งประเทศไทย<LNth>** they know **ah::** what this building for. *<LNth>the port authority of Thailand<LNth>*

9   P: yeah sure

In line 2 shows a latching responding move which indicates T1's engagement in the topic of discussion. Here he is really passionate about the use of other languages to enhance his EMI teaching. His strong feeling is also evidenced in line 6 when he says with some emphasis that the key issue with the L1 translation is to make the Thai, Chinese or Burmese students understand the English term which is very important in content teaching in EMI classroom. Furthermore, the vocalisation (ah::) in line 8 demonstrates his active engagement in the topic under discussion. Interestingly, in line 8 T1 translanguages between English and Thai. The translanguaging indicates his true and strong feeling towards the use of Thai translation. This also reflects that T1 is very multilingual: in his interview, he said he could speak eight languages including Thai and he had lived in Thailand for more than 20 years. Basically, the data from interview was in line with his classroom practices as discussed in the previous chapter.

Moreover, another Thai teacher, J, also used some Thai translation to help him explain some key terms and concepts in English. For example, J used some Thai to explain the differences between the words, 'freedom' and 'freewill' in one of his visited lessons, as discussed in the previous chapter. When I asked him in interview he said, "because these terms are very similar and students particularly Thai students don't understand the differences between them so I use the Thai translation to make them understand". In my study, the use of L1 to explain or deal with some English difficult terms and concepts was found to be the most popular function of

translanguaging or L1 translation. This finding confirms many previous EMI studies like Tian (2014), Goodman (2017), Mazk et al. (2017), Groff (2017), Gierlinger (2015) and Carrol and Hoven (2017) who reported that teachers used the students' L1 to help students understand some English words and expressions, thus enhancing the content teaching and learning experiences. The next sub-theme to be explored is the use of Thai to talk about non-word related topics.

Using Thai for non-work related issues

The findings showed that the local language was often used for informal and managerial rather than content teaching purposes. For example, Thai language was often used inside and outside EMI classrooms for informal talks among Thai participants as the following two extracts will show. The first extract was with a Thai teacher participant (M2). I asked her whether she used English only or other languages in her teaching and/or during her lesson time. She said when teaching she would normally use English only, but there were times when she also used Thai during her lessons.

Extract 10[12]:

1	M2:	often Thai students like during the break will come and talk to me personally and they will normally talk Thai
2	P:	yeah
3	M2:	sometimes I respond in English but they keep talking Thai with me and in the end I have to use Thai this is because perhaps I am also Thai. I know that I should not speak Thai, it should be English only.
4	P:	yeah, what kinds of topics or questions they ask you in Thai
5	M2:	**they often talk about general topic that is not related to what I teach** like they ask me whether there will be any classes next week, and/or they ask for my permission to leave the lesson early because some urgent things happen to them, they never ask me about the content teaching and learning like marketing strategies

The prolonged responding move in line 5 shows M2's engagement in the topic discussion. Here she develops her argument at length by providing more details about how Thai is used. Although she feels she should use English only during her lesson time, she admittedly says that Thai is sometimes used. The finding from interview was in line with my classroom observation: I observed that M2 spoke Thai with her Thai students during the break and/or in informal situations when they talked privately. This finding is in line with some previous EMI studies (e.g. Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017), Humphries (2014), Canh (2014)) that found Emi teachers often used students'

---

[12] The conversation was originally in Thai.

L1 for announcement, giving instructions etc. Humphries (2014) categorised these functions of L1 under managerial purposes.

In addition, Thai was also used to discuss other non-work related issues in a group discussion among students. Often there were Thai and non-Thai members in the group work, but the Thai participants still chose to speak Thai to his Thai friends in the group. The following extract was from a Thai student (D2) who talked about he often used Thai to talk to his Thai friends in the group consisting of other non-Thai friends too. He gave an example of his group work and there were one American, a few Chinese and Thai, but there were more Thai members than other non-Thai. I then asked how he used Thai during the group discussion.

Extract 11[13]:

1	D2:	in group conversation that there are both Thai and non-Thai people I always use English to communicate with everyone when I talk about work or project that we are working together, but sometimes when I talk personally with my close Thai friends in the group, and when I talk about other things that not everyone is interested in I will use Thai
2	P:	yeah
3	D2:	this is because it's easy to understand each other if we talk Thai and **I don't talk about work but I talk about something else** and it's a personal topic I don't want to include other members and I want to talk to only my Thai friend. but when I address the whole group I will use English

The continuing moves in lines 1 and 3 show D2's engagement in the discussion. He continues to explain and provide information at length. My interview data matched my observation data. D2 worked on a group project with his Thai and non-Thai friends in J's classrooms. I observed that D2 often translanguaged between English and Thai when working with his friends. He used English when he talked to all the members, but when he turned to some of his Thai friends he used Thai. In short, in multilingual classroom, the use of the local language or L1 can be for informal and managerial purposes (Cincotta-Segi, 2011; Doiz and Lasagabaster, 2017); Humphries, 2014; Canh, 2014).

Showing affiliation, solidarity and connection

In my data, I found translanguaging between English and Thai was used to establish affiliation and connection among the interlocutors. I found that the Thai language was used to show affiliation

---

[13] The conversation was originally in Thai.

between the Thai and non-Thai people. This was because sometimes in EMI setting the use of

English was not always working or practical and did not contribute to any mutual understanding.

Therefore, the use of local Thai was employed to deal with the communicative problems. The

following exchange was with T4 who was a Vietnamese staff. In his interview, he talked about the

role of Thai language that helped him connect with the local Thai people.

Extract 12[14]:

1	T4:	the reason that I learn Thai is **when I speak Thai to other local Thai**, **they will feel like more connection and closer**=
2	P:	=alright [I see
3	T4:	[**I feel like there is some kind of connection because I speak their own language**, so so they will listen to me more and and it's more like you know somehow different kind of people have different kind of listening right, sometimes I speak English, they don't listen but sometimes I speak Thai they listen to that
4	P:	alright sure sure er (1) can you give me an example of your last time of talking Thai in order to connect with the Thai people, can you remember that=
5	T4:	=yeah it just happened yesterday when I went to the building 23 where I have to book a room for a meeting, I first spoke English to the lady who manage the room and everything but she couldn't understand any of it, so I speak Thai she then feel more like **OK::** because at first if some strangers come and speak English to you and if you don't understand then you feel **PANIC** and feel like oh what they are talking about, but if you speak their local language and if they understand they feel **RELIEVED** and feel better.

The overlapping turn in line 3 shows T4's active engagement. Here he uses a continuing move to

elaborate how his use of Thai helps him connect with the local Thai people. The length of his turn

also indicates his involvement in the topic under discussion. Moreover, the latching response in

line 5 also demonstrates his enthusiasm for the conversation. Here he takes a prolonged turn

telling me a story that has just happened. He talks with strong feeling and passion as revealed

through the emphasis highlighted in his turn (OK::, PANIC, RELIEVED). My interview data seemed to

match what I observed in the lesson where T4 was teaching. He was one of the teaching assistants

at the department and was helping the teacher (J) from time to time during the course of my

fieldwork. From my observation, I saw that T4 often translanguaged between English and Thai

when he talked to different students during the lesson time. From the interview, he could speak

---

[14] The conversation was originally in English.

three languages (his L1 Vietnamese, English and Thai). He had been in Thailand around eight years, and he also mentioned that "I love speaking two languages first English and then Thai".

Moreover, Thai was not only used by the non-Thai as described above to establish social connection, it was also used by some Thai teachers to establish interpersonal relationships with their Thai students outside classrooms. T2 said, "I use English only in class, but outside classroom I use Thai with my Thai students to create interpersonal relationships with them because if I speak English all the time they won't talk to me". Similarly, K said that "while I use English 100% in class, outside class I use Thai otherwise the students might not talk to me at all". In short, in this EMI setting Thai language was sometimes employed to deal with communicative problem especially when the use of English was not practical. It was also used to show affiliation and connect between Thai and non-Thai speakers. This finding is in line with some previous ELF studies (Cogo, 2009, 2012) and some previous EMI studies (Makalela, 2017; Martin, 2014; Tien, 2014). Makalela (2017) showed that in multilingual community (or classroom) EMI participants used a range of home languages in communication during their discussion to concur that they had/shared similar language experiences and/or repertoires with their interlocutors.

Use for teaching non-Thai students some Thai words

In my data, English plus Thai was also used to create a learning situation where a local language was learnt by international students. I found that Thai students sometimes used English mixed with Thai when teaching some Thai to their non-Thai friends. For example, the following exchange was with a Thai student, V2. He told me how he taught some short Thai expressions to his Dutch friend.

Extract 13[15]:

1	V2:	I usually use English with my international friends, but **sometimes I use Thai to teach them some simple Thai**, I teach the words that are used very frequently in informal and gossip situations so we can have fun in these events.
2	P:	do they like that?=
3	V2:	=oh yes
4	P:	can you give me an example of the Thai word that you teach your friend
5	V2:	usually I teach them the complimentary remarks like <L1th> จ๊าบมาก <L1th> and I explain that this mean really cool and you say it with your thumb up

<center>*<L1th> cool <L1th>*</center>

---

[15] The conversation was originally in Thai.

6	P:	yeah
7	V2:	so after my friend learn it he can understand Thai people and connect with them more
8	P:	and who did you teach that.
9	V2:	a friend from the Netherlands

Line 1 shows V2's engagement with the topic. He uses an engaging move to explain the kind of informal situations when he teaches some Thai words to his non-Thai friend. His engagement also shows in line 5 where he provides an example of the Thai word that he taught to his friend. In addition, there were other two Thai student participants who mentioned that they sometimes taught their non-Thai friends some Thai. The first one was S. S said that he often taught his Cambodian friend some Thai idiomatic expressions.

Extract 14[16]:

1	S:	I have a Cambodian friend and I talk to him in Thai and English because he can understand Thai and speak it fluently, but sometimes he can't understand some Thai idiomatic expressions, so **I will translate that into English for him to learn and use**

Another Thai female student (P2) said that she often helped her Chinese friends learn some Thai. She said, "some of my Chinese friends can speak Thai a bit and also want to learn some Thai, so I teach them some Thai words and we chat in Thai". In essence, in this EMI setting the local Thai participants taught their non-Thai friends some Thai through the use of English plus Thai. This finding is in line with Palfreyman and van der Walt (2017) who found that EMI settings often create a learning opportunity where a local language is learnt by the international students.

However, although the use of Thai could create a learning situation and many other advantages as describe above, it could also exclude the non-Thai participants from the group discussion and often resulted in a very negative feeling among them. This topic will be explored next.

Exclusion of non-Thai students

Local Thai students often used Thai among themselves in various social events like group-work or classroom discussion due to ease of understanding and communication. Often they constituted

---

[16] The conversation was originally in Thai.

the majority of people in these events and their use of Thai often excluded and resulted in a negative feeling of their non-Thai peers. The following exchange was from the second conversation with a Dutch student (N2) who was on an exchange programme at the time of my fieldwork and was back to tell me another story. She knew the kind of stories that I was investigating from her first interview. She came to tell me about her bad experience during an ambassador activity where she and other non-Thai students were excluded from the discussion due to the use of Thai. The ambassador project was designed for all freshers and organised by a team of senior students who had done it before in the past years. The event entailed selecting a representative or ambassador from each group who would then involve in a competition. There would be two winners who would finally represent as the ambassadors of the international college. So it was a big event for all the first-year students. In the exchange below N2 told me her story and expressed her feeling as a result of too much use of Thai by the senior students during the course of the project.

Extract 15[17]:

1	N2:	for me I was like I understand if they talk in Thai to Thai students to explain better because I know some first year students have problem with English, I also had problems with English when in my first year at university, because I'm third year now so you changed and developed your English=
2	P:	=yeah [I see
3	N2:	[also then I understand that the senior gets the score not teachers, so I understand that they sometimes wanted to translate in Thai but a lot of moments they gave examples and explained things and get critiqued in Thai=
4	P:	=oh?=
5	N2:	=and they're not specially to me but to the whole group, and most of those students are Chinese, from Myanmar, or Germany and the Netherlands, **so we were quite STRUGGLING in understanding so we COMPLAINED=**
6	P:	=ya

The overlapping turn in line 3 shows N2's active involvement in the story being told. Also, the emphasis in line 5 shows her strong feeling of annoyance due to too much use of Thai by the senior students. Later on in the interview, N2 described the use of Thai during the project as "**SUPER annoying**". Here she said with some emphasis which shows her great disappointment and she was so deeply annoyed by the use of Thai.

---

[17] The conversation was originally in English.

In addition, other two Chinese student participants (V1 and A2) also experienced the exclusion due to the use of Thai in this EMI setting. V1 told me about her negative experience during the sport days when she joined a cheer-leader team. V1 said she was the only non-Thai member in the team that other members were all Thai. In group discussion when the team members were brainstorming how they should have performed dancing, V1 told me that.

Extract 16[18]:

1   V1:   they speak Thai everything is in Thai and after they have finished talking, one Thai girl just explained to me, so I didn't know what they were talking about and I can't give them some suggestions on how we should dance and do other actions, so I just stared and looked at them while they were talking.
2   P: oh? and how were you feeling at that time in the group
3   V1:   **I feel a little lonely** because I can't join the conversation, they talk to each other and **IGNORE** me, **I feel very lonely** and I don't have any friends in that group who I can talk to.

In line 3 V1 talks about her feeling with some emphasis. Also, she mentions the word (lonely) twice. This shows her deep annoyance and great disappointment. Later on in the interview, when I asked how she would describe the use of Thai in classroom and/or group discussion, she said with some emphasis showing her strong feeling and disapproval.

Extract 17[19]:

1   V1:   I think it's really **BORING** because I cannot understand, in the classroom, there are international students I think they should not speak Thai because the foreigners cannot understand I think it is **IMPOLITE**

Similarly, another Chinese student, A2, also said that it was true that non-Thai students were often excluded from the group discussion where the majority students were Thai, because Thai language was used all the time. He said:

Extract 18[20]:

1   A2:   in group work where students are Thai, Chinese and from other countries, sometimes they will not speak English like **in a group where most students are Thai and they will speak Thai most of the time**

---

[18] The conversation was originally in English.
[19] The conversation was originally in English.
[20] The conversation was originally in English.

Given the fact that the use of Thai or too much use of Thai by the Thai students in multilingual setting resulted in a kind of exclusion among the non-Thai students as described above, I further investigated how the non-Thai students felt about the use of some translation in EMI classroom for teaching and learning by the teacher. I wanted to know whether the non-Thai students would feel that same. I then asked N2 who was attending T1's lessons where there were a few instances of translation between Thai and Chinese. I specifically asked her how she felt about T1's translanguaging during his lessons.

Extract 19[21]:

1   N2:   **I think you should speak English as a teacher, but I don't think it's wrong to translate some words if you say them before in English** because some teachers tend to just say them in Thai if they think the Thai students don't know the English words which is frustrating because I don't understand but this teacher (T1) never says it in Thai first

This extract shows N2's active engagement in the discussion. She expresses her feeling at length. She feels it is ok for any teachers like T1 to translate some English words to Thai or Chinese for the students to understand as long as English is mentioned first. Also, as she points out teachers should speak English mainly so that all the non-Thai students could understand what is being said. Her argument highlights the principal role of English as a lingua franca in any multilingual communication. In addition, she also supports the use of other languages for mutual understanding as long as these languages are used with caution like English should come first for the inclusion of everyone in the setting before other languages can follow in a form of translation. This is a very complex issue and more research should be carried out to investigate the choice of language or how people make a language policy in a certain setting and the effect of this policy that may have on other people involved.

To sum up, this section has discussed a wide range of roles of Thai language alongside English in this EMI setting. It revealed that the use of Thai has resulted in both positive and negative outcomes. Thai was used to explain some difficult English or unknown words, to show affiliation and solidarity towards the interlocutors, and to create a learning situation where the Thai was learnt by the non-Thai persons. Nevertheless, the use of Thai could cause a kind of exclusion

---

[21] The conversation was originally in English.

among the non-Thai group if used without caution. Next, I will move on to discuss the second sub-theme which is 'English plus Chinese'.

6.5.2   English plus Chinese

In my data, I found different ways of using Chinese in addition to English inside EMI classroom for various purposes. The following exchange was with a native English teacher (A1) who sometimes used Chinese in his teaching. A2 told me about when he used some video clips in Chinese in his class.

Extract 20[22]:

1	A1:	normally all the materials is provided in English and speaking in English=
2	P:	=sure [sure
3	A1:	[but some of the cases and **examples I use video clips from TV, specifically use video clip in Chinese from Chinese TV** to illustrate some kind of examples of behaviours how people interact as a discussion point=
4	P:	=yeah=
5	A1:	=this was subtitled in English, the purpose of choosing this is really **to get the attention from the Chinese students**, the problems the problems with the Chinese students they tend to find it hard to concentrate, they actually they were **WELL AMAZED** to hear and see

The overlapping turn in line 3 shows A1's enthusiasm in telling the story. Here he uses a continuing move to explain how he uses the video clip in Chinese in his lessons. Also, the latching uptake in line 5 indicates his further engagement in the topic. Here he justifies why he uses the Chinese footage which is to gain some attention from the Chinese students. The emphasis in his utterance at the end of line 5 demonstrates his strong feeling and emphasises the positive outcome of using the video. Later in the interview, when I asked him to evaluate the use of video he said, "I felt you know it's actually beneficial in the sense that people felt more integrated in these kinds of specific example". He et al. (2017) reported a similar finding that showed in EMI programme in Hong Kong EMI teachers often found using Chinese and English in their powerpoint slides when teaching.

Moreover, I also heard a similar story while I was interviewing a Thai teacher (M2). M2 told me about sometimes her Chinese students used some Chinese in their presentation. She said, "in their

---

[22] The conversation was originally in English.

powerpoint presentation some Chinese students show their Chinese language in their slides along with English translation, so everyone can understand". I then asked M2 how she felt about that, she said, "I think it's really interesting". Also, in her interview I also found that M2 too used English plus Chinese herself to establish some kind of social and interpersonal relationship with some Chinese students in her class.

Extract 21[23]:

1	M2:	in my class, **I also emphasise interpersonal relationships between me as a teacher and my students**=
2	P:	=yeah=
3	M2:	=so at the beginning of the term when I meet new students, **I will try to break the ice to get to know them better by talking in their mother tongue, like, I talk Chinese to Chinese students** who are quite shy and lack confidence=
4	P:	=yeah=
5	M2:	=when I talk to them in English, they respond with short answers, but as I notice this **I then switch to talk Chinese because I can speak it a bit**, they become more relaxed and more talkative, so my relationship with Chinese students improve we get to know each other better

A glance at the extract above shows M2's engagement in the conversation because she mainly contributes to the interaction with very input from me: I take only two small and short turns in lines 2 and 4 while M2 is doing most of the talking with long stretches of utterances as shown in lines 1, 3, and 5. Her uptakes show active involvement in the topic. Her account of using Chinese to establish a social relation with her Chinese students seemed to match the data from classroom observation. In her lesson, during the break I observed that she went around the room and talked to various students using other languages like Thai with Thai students and Chinese with Chinese speakers. The interview data also showed that she could speak three languages (her L1 Thai, English and Chinese). So, her interview seemed to match what was observed. Similarly, previous EMI studies like Tian (2014), Humphries (2014) and Tayjasanant (2014) reported that EMI teachers often used students' L1 to establish a good relationship and rapport with them. Tian (2014) notes that L1 use can develop a more informal relationship between teacher and students, a function that can be considered communicative rather than pedagogical or linguistic.

I will move next to explore the last sub-code under the main theme (English in practice: English plus) which is 'English plus Thai, Chinese and others'.

---

[23] The conversation was originally in Thai.

6.5.3   English plus Thai, Chinese and others

This sub-code is different from the other two sub-codes, 'English plus Thai' and 'English plus Chinese', that have been discussed above in the sense that it covers the use of three languages including English, Thai and Chinese. Also, this section will cover other languages too that emerged from my interview data like the use of German and Vietnamese. The perceived outcomes and effects of use of these languages will be discussed as well.

In the following extract, a Thai student participant (T3) told me that he often used three languages when working in a group-work with his classmates inside EMI classes. In the interview, he stated that.

Extract 22[24]:

1   T3:   **I use three languages**, I mainly use English because in my group there are six Chinese, five Thai, two Vietnamese and one Burmese. I first use English=
2   P: =yeah=
3   T3:   =I then ask the Chinese members in English whether they understand me if I learn that there are some points they still don't understand, **I will then use Chinese** to explain to this particular group till they understand
4   P: yeah=
5   T3:   =**I finally use Thai** for checking understanding of the content with the Thai members they then talk to me in Thai

T3 uses a continuing move to continue to provide details of how he uses English, Chinese and Thai with his classmates in lines 1, 3 and 5. This shows his engagement in the topic. The latching turns in lines 3 and 5 also indicate his willingness and involvement in telling a story. His use of Chinese and Thai in addition to English seem to show that his classmates who are both Thai and Chinese are weak in English language proficiency, while it is normal to see a range of languages to be used in any multilingual communication. Similarly, EMI studies like Abdullah and Heng (2014), Evans and Lee (2014), Makalela (2017), and Daryai-Hansen et al. (2017) showed that L1 was used to facilitate the understanding of students in EMI classroom. My finding from interview seemed to match what I observed. I observed T3 worked with his friends in J's lessons and I heard him talking in these languages when communicating with his team. Also, from interview, T3 stated that he could speak five languages including Thai, English, Chinese, Malay and Hokkien. He said he learnt Malay

---

[24] The conversation was originally in Thai.

and Chinese when he lived in Malaysia where he attended a primary school there. After that he moved to the US to live with his parents where he learnt English till he finished a high school. He then returned to Thailand for his degree programme at the international college under question. T3 seemed to speak English and Chinese very well.

In addition, a similar story was also told by another Thai student (B3) who said he too had to use English, Thai and Chinese in his group-work. B3 mentioned that.

Extract 23[25]:

1   B3:   basically, in my group, **we will always use English** to communicate to all members first, but in some cases when some members, not all, still don't quite get it, **we will have to use other languages like Thai or Chinese** to make them understand before we can work on the given task together

B3 also worked in J's lessons and I observed his use of these languages too. Again, his classmates seemed to have a low level of English language skills. EMI studies like Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017), Dearden (2014) and Galloway et al. (2017) also showed that EMI students tended to have a low level of English proficiency, thus impeding them from understanding their lectures and participating in their classroom discussion. In addition, B3 said since he had to use three languages when explaining something to the group, this took time before every member understood the task and before they started to work on it.

Moreover, not only students used a few languages in their communication with friends, but also some teachers employed the same strategies in their teaching. The following code was with a French teacher (E) who stated that he used English, Chinese and Thai in his classroom teaching.

Extract 24[26]:

1   E: yeah I taught classes with Chinese and:: I find out that sometimes (1) er speaking a word or **translating a word into Chinese** is **REALLY** a short-cut a little bit like in **Thai**=
2   P: =yeah=
3   E: =and and it really simplifies things **REALLY REALLY** quickly and allows you to basically get on with with with the class**,** if for example I have to, you know, try to explain a concept 100% in English, it takes me around three to four times the time that it would, so I do it in Thai and I know a bit of Chinese and I do it in Chinese too **I see the use of languages or other languages in the class as a kind of lubricant**=

---

[25] The conversation was originally in Thai.
[26] The conversation was originally in English.

4	P:	=yeah yeah it facilitates=
5	E:	=it facilitates the class, but it also gives my students confidence as well
6	P:	yeah ₍yeah
7	E:	₍because what happens is my students know that if they don,t know something, if they need certain vocabulary point, they can ask me and it makes the class much easier because it,s kind of like it,s not a one-way communication, it,s a two-way communication, basically if they don,t know something in English, they can ask me in Thai

The extract above shows E actively participates in the discussion. He often says with some emphasis which indicates his strong feeling about the use of other languages like Chinese and Thai in addition to English. Like in line 1 he puts some emphasis on the word (REALLY), and he does it again in line 3 where he says the word (REALLY) twice. Also his strong feeling about the topic under discussion reflects the metaphor he uses in line 3 (a kind of lubricant). Furthermore, the latching turn in line 3 and the overlapping uptake in line 7 all show his engagement in the conversation which indicates he really means what he says. The prolonged turns in lines 3 and 7 also demonstrate E,s passion about the use of other languages. These languages help him save time in explaining and teaching. This finding confirms the findings by Tian (2014), Tien (2014) and Groff (2017) who found that L1 use helped EMI teachers save time. In addition, my analysis shows that E believed that the use of students, L1 boosts their confidence. This finding is in line with some previous EMI studies like Makalela (2017), Daryai-Hansen et al. (2017) and Abdullah and Heng (2014).

Moreover, the German teacher (T1) also used a few languages (Thai, Chinese and Myanmar) in classroom discussion. In his interview when asked for the reason why he used these translations when teaching, T1 said he tried to reduce the language barrier inside classroom and tried to make the students feel comfortable, "I want to make them feel comfortable, I try to reduce the distance, the language barrier that is supposed to be between the students and me". This finding confirms some previous EMI studies like Carrol and Hoven (2017) and Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) and Tayjasanant (2014) who found that L1 use makes some students feel comfortable.

Furthermore, my interview data also revealed some use of other languages like German and Vietnamese. One teacher (M2) said that sometimes her German students put some advertisement in German language in their presentation. She said, "I have seen some German students show an advertisement in German language and I think it makes their presentation much more interesting and this also shows their identity". This was similar to the teacher (A1) who used some Chinese

video clips in his classroom teaching as discussed above. This finding is in line with a study by He et al. (2017) who reported that L1 or Chinese was used in popwepoint presentation in a Hong Kong university by a Chinese lecturer. Also, M2 mentioned that she used English plus Vietnamese to get to know students from Vietnam better, and to learn Vietnamese from them too.

Extract 25[27]:

1   M2:   with my Vietnamese students, I will try to talk to them in English first **and I also ask them to teach me some simple words or expressions in Vietnamese** since I'm also interested in their first language. So they teach me some of their language

M2 believed that speaking the students' mother tongue helped her establish good relationships them. This finding concur with some previous EMI studies like Tien (2014), Humphries (2014), Groff (2017), and Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) who showed a similar result that L1 use helps establish a good relationship between teacher and students.

To sum up the key findings in this section, the data showed there were a range of languages that played important roles alongside English language in this EMI setting. Thai, Chinese, Vietnamese and German languages were used to overcome communicative problems like the lack of language skills among the students. They were also used to establish and increase students' confidence, social relationship between the teacher and students. However, if used without caution, the use of these languages could cause a kind of exclusion resulting in some negative feelings among the non-Thai students. In the next topic, I will explore the third main theme which is the beliefs of EMI teachers in their use of English.

6.6   Teachers' orientations towards their own and their students' English

This section will explore four sub-codes regarding the teachers' views on English language. The sub-codes are EMI teachers tended to think their English were formal, were not 'good' or 'excellent' but 'accented', therefore they thought they tended to have problem when speaking particularly with native speakers of English. The last sub-code to be explored in this section is how the teachers perceived their students' English abilities. These themes will be discussed in turn.

---

[27] The conversation was originally in Thai.

Firstly, I am going to explore the idea that the teachers tended to think their English were too formal and therefore were problematic when communicating. The following extract was with a Thai teacher.

Extract 26[28]:

1	K:	I think **my English is very formal** most of the time, like when I communicate if I don,t talk about academic subjects I will need time to think about what I,m going to say=
2	P:	=ya=
3	K:	=**my English is often academic**
4	P:	ya
5	K:	I don,t know many English words that are used in everyday lives, my eight year old daughter may know more everyday English vocabularies than I do=
6	P:	=but you can communicate well=
7	K:	=yeah I think so, generally I can travel and communicate and I used to teach at Santa Barbara university in California before I worded here

The teacher seems to feel his formal English is a problem when he uses an engaging move to compare his knowledge of everyday English vocabulary with his daughter in line 5. His view is challenged by a challenging move in line 6 where I question and disagree with him. His latching response in line 7 shows his engagement, and also shows his agreement with my view that in fact the formality in his English is not a problem. His opinion seems to have been changed when he uses a continuing move to provide more details to support my challenging position and his changed opinion about his English ability.

However, while the teacher above seemed to agree with me that his formal English was not problematic, another Thai teacher felt that her English was a problem because it was formal.

Extract 27[29]:

1	M2:	I think **my English is too formal** so the students find it difficult to understand me, like when I ask formal question when I teach, the students don,t understand my question=
2	P:	=why=
3	M2:	=because they are familiar with informal English, the Thai student like to use informal English

---

[28] The conversation was originally in Thai.
[29] The conversation was originally in Thai.

Chapter 6

The immediate response in line 3 shows M2's engagement and strong belief in the formality in her English. This finding resembles Airey's (2015) findings that showed EMI teachers in higher education in Sweden tended to speak and use a formal style of English similar to the English in textbooks.

The second and third sub-codes to be explored were revealed within the same following two extracts. These are the beliefs about English and the perceived problem when communicating with English native speakers. I will next explore the teachers' beliefs about their own English. My EMI teacher participants tended to think their English was not 'excellent' or 'fluent' and therefore problematic when communicating particularly with native English speakers.

Extract 28[30]:

1	P:	what do you think about your English?
2	K:	I think my English is ok, I can communicate in most cases, but **my English is NOT excellent** (2) about my speaking **I speak with wrong grammar** sometimes, but I don't worry about it now and I pay no attention to my grammar when I speak (1) my listening skill is ok, **but I can't understand British English**=
3	P:	=@@[@
4	K:	[@@@ I'm ok with other English, but **I'm always confused when I listen to British people** (1) I can listen to other people
5	P:	ya=
6	K:	=writing is the most difficult part for me and it take a lot of time to write an article=
7	P:	=but you can communicate=
8	K:	= yeah, **but my English is NOT fluent** as the native speaker

The teacher seems to perceive his English is not excellent, and thinks he makes grammar mistakes when speaking. By 'excellent' or 'fluent' English, he seems to mean a native English as shown in line 8 when he compares his English with the native English. This shows a standard language ideology underpinning his belief towards his English. He feels really strongly about this belief as reflected in his disagreement in line 8. Here he disagrees with my previous statement in line 7 which is a challenging move questioning his belief that his English is problematic. In disagreeing with my position, he compares his English with native English speaker. This clearly shows the strong influence of language ideology in his orientation towards his own English. Also, his strong feeling about his English reveals through the emphasis he says in lines 2 and 8 (NOT).

---

[30] The conversation was originally in Thai.

Moreover, another Thai teacher (M2) also showed the same language ideology towards her English. She tended to believe that her English was accented, and therefore needed to improve.

Extract 29[31]:

1	M2:	**I still have to improve my English** because **it is accented**, this is because English isn't my mother tongue and I learnt it as a second language, so **I speak with some accent**
2	P:	ya=
3	M2:	=sometimes I have problem when I communicate, **my American students often don't understand me**, but it take a while before they get used to my accent
4	P:	ya=
5	M2:	=**I often have problem with American students but I can communicate well with students from China, Indonesia, and Vietnam**, they can understand me from the beginning

This teacher seems to believe that her accented English is a problem and is a cause of communication problem with native English speakers. Therefore she needs to improve her English. Her negative orientation towards her English is a result of the standard language ideology behind her thinking. This finding supports Baker and Hüttner's (2016) findings that showed EMI teachers in Thailand tended to invoke the standard language ideology when evaluating their own English, and as a result tended to perceive their English negatively.

Regarding the perceived communicative problem with the native English speaker, the two teachers above (K and M2) also felt that due to their English, they had problem when communicating with native speakers. For example, in the extract 29, in line 3, M2 initially states that because she has accented English, she has problem with talking to American students. Her restatement in the subsequent turn in line 5 indicates her strong belief about the problem with such native speakers because she says it again. Similarly, the teacher (K) felt the same as he clearly indicates in line 2 initially, and in line 4 subsequently in the extract 28 above. But the difference between these two teachers was that while M2 seemed to have problem with American, K appeared to have troubles with the British people. This finding confirms a previous EMI study, like Jenkins (2014). Jenkins notes that native English speakers tend to lack speaking skills or accommodation speaking strategies when communicating in international EMI settings with other participants from diverse linguistic backgrounds. They often use idiomatic or local expressions that most multilingual interlocutors do not understand except their native peers. So, it seems to me that the real cause of communicative breakdown is from the opposite end: while my two teacher

---

[31] The conversation was originally in Thai.

participants tended to blame themselves for not being able to make themselves understood by the native, and/or for not understanding them, the real problem seems to come from the part of the native speakers who lack the communicative strategies needed when communicating in any multilingual settings.

The last sub-code to be explored next is how the EMI teachers viewed their students' English language. Their orientations were quite negative towards their students' English abilities as a result of the standard language ideology. The following extract was with a French teacher. Here I asked how he felt about his students' English.

Extract 30[32]:

1	F:	the **students make a lot of mistakes** when speaking you know they don't know how to pronounce, many words are confusing many times, they forget to pronounce the **S**=
2	P:	=yah=
3	F:	=for example, HE WORK instead of HE WORKS=
4	P:	=yah=
5	F:	=sometimes they forget to say HE WORKED right, but they actually say HE WORK=
6	P:	=but you understand them?=
7	F:	=no, they should have the **correct understanding** and they should GET the pronunciation **RIGHT**

The teacher (F) seems to think that there is a correct way of speaking English. He has this perception because he has the standard language ideology underpinning his beliefs. He feels so strongly about this. For example, the emphasis in his statements in lines 3 and 5 show his strong belief. Also, his strong feeling about the topic shows in line 7 where he disagrees with my challenging move in the previous line 6. In the final line, the teacher also says with some emphasis showing that he really means what he says, and wants me to really understand it.

Moreover, another teacher (T2) showed negative orientations towards his students' English too. He tended to view that his students were always pronouncing English words incorrectly.

Extract 31[33]:

1	T2:	personally speaking, I would like the students to pronounce English **correcttly**, because if they **mispronounce**, I cannot understand it

---

[32] The conversation was originally in English.
[33] The conversation was originally in Thai.

2	P:	yah=
3	T2:	=many students **don't pronounce the word properly,** I'm wondering when they study the word why they don't use the dictionary to learn how to pronounce it **correctly** or they never ask other people how to say it.
4	P:	yah=
5	T2:	=many times Thai and Chinese students never pronounce the final sound of the word and this make the native speak don't understand it.

The use of the words like 'correctly', 'mispronounce' and/or 'pronounce the word properly' show the influence of language ideology in the teacher's belief about his students' English. He seems to believe in the correctness in language that there is a correct way of speaking or using a language. His belief and language ideology is really strong in the extract as it reveals through the engagement of the teacher with the topic. For example, the latching responses in lines 3 and 5 show his active involvement and enthusiasm of his idea. Also, the continuing and engaging moves in these lines show his strong feeling about the idea. Other teachers also held the same belief.

Extract 32[34]**:**

1	P:	how do you feel about your students' English
2	M2:	some students are good, but most students are **very bad**, they use the **wrong words** and **wrong grammar** when they speak and they need to improve their English

In addition, another Malaysian teacher (M3) said, "I find most Thai students are unable to communicate in the English language, they can communicate elsewhere". Then, later on in the interview he said, "their English is **BROKEN**". Again, this teacher was pretty influenced by a strong language ideology when evaluating his students' English. This reveals through the emphasis in his statement (BROKEN). This finding resembles some previous EMI studies for example Baker and Hüttner (2016) and Jenkins (2014) who note that EMI participants tend to hold some language ideology in terms of native English language.

To sum up this section, I have discussed the teachers' orientations towards their own and their students' English. The teachers seemed to be influenced by the standard language ideology when describing their English. They also invoked the same ideology when evaluating their students' language proficiency. I will move next to explore how the students themselves think about their own English.

---

[34] The conversation was originally in Thai.

6.7 Students' orientations towards their own English

EMI students under question expressed both positive and negative attitudes towards their own English, but generally speaking they perceived themselves negatively as a result of standard language ideology as the following extracts will show. The first conversation was with a Thai student (S) who felt 'bad' and 'embarrassed' when he made grammar mistakes when speaking.

Extract 33[35]:

1	P:	how do you feel about your English?
2	S:	**I still speak with wrong grammar** and I want people to correct my grammar when I speak=
3	P:	=really?=
4	S:	=but they don't do it, like when I studied language in London, I spoke wrong grammar but my friend didn't tell me that I made the mistakes instead they tried to understand me
5	P:	everyone makes mistakes when they speak=
6	S:	=but **I feel BAD and EMBARRASSED when I make grammar mistake** I wish I speak correctly

The student above feels so negatively about his English when he makes grammar mistakes in speaking. His strong feeling shows in line 6 when he actively disagrees with me: I use a challenging move (in line 5) to question his idea that he has expressed in the previous turns in lines 2 and 4. Also, in line 6 he passionately says with some emphasis which clearly shows his strong and real feeling towards his 'bad' English. He feels this because he is influenced by a standard language ideology. As Spolsky (2012) notes, the attitude towards language or language policy is often influenced by language belief and ideology.

Moreover, other students also showed the same ideology towards their English language. Another student (B3) felt that while he often makes grammar mistakes when he speaks, he also has problem with some pronunciation too.

Extract 34[36]:

1	B3:	**I have problem with grammar and pronunciation**, I think pronunciation is very important and I need to practice speaking correctly
2	P:	what do you need to practice=
3	B3:	=to pronounce correctly=

---

[35] The conversation was originally in Thai.
[36] The conversation was originally in Thai.

4	P:	=can you give me an example
5	B3:	(2) like how to pronounce the letter **R** and **L** correctly, I often have problem with these two sounds, and **if I pronounce them correctly I will be able to communicate more clearly**

B3's lengthy turn in line 5 shows he really means what he has previously said in line 1 which is his concern with ˌcorrectˌ pronunciation. Here, he answers my question by expanding his idea initially mentioned in line 1. In line 5, he provides further details about what he thinks he needs to improve and to pronounce ˌcorrectlyˌ. The small pause of two second at the beginning of the line suggests he is thinking very hard about his example. Also, the latching response in line 3 indicates his active involvement in the discussion.

In addition, another student (L) felt her English was ˌbasicˌ and ˌbadˌ although she could communicate in English. She also felt that she needed to improve her vocabulary skills.

Extract 35[37]:

1	P:	how do you feel about your English?
2	L:	I think **my English is basic and bad**=
3	P:	=why=
4	L:	=I don't know many English words and I don't know how to construct a sentence
5	P:	can you communicate with your non-Thai friends?
6	L:	yeah I can communicate in general, **but I still need to improve my English like vocab skills**

The student above has a very strong belief that her English is a problem and she needs to improve it. This reveals in line 6 when she challenges my disagreeing position with her view. Although initially she seems to agree with me that she can still communicate with friends at the beginning of the line, then she goes back to her previously stated belief that she still needs to improve her English in the second part of the line. Her negative orientation towards her English is caused by the standard language ideology. Similarly, another participant (B2) compared herself with a native English speaker when evaluating her own English, "my English isn't as good as a native speaker".

However, I found very few student participants who seemed to perceive their English positively despite their perceived ˌincorrectˌ English. The following extract was with a female Thai student (P2).

---

[37] The conversation was originally in Thai.

Chapter 6

Extract 36[38]:

1   P2:   when I speak English, sometimes **my English is correct but sometimes isn,t correct
            and I make grammar mistake**
2   P: but can you still communicate with your friends=
3   P2:   =yeah I can still communicate, **when my grammar isn,t correct my friends don,t
            worry about it because they can still understand me and I can understand them too
            when they make grammar mistake, it is OK=**
4   P: =good?

The student initially appears to have a negative view on her English as stated in line 1. Then I

challenge her idea by using a challenging move in line 2. As a result, in line 3 she seems to change

her opinion towards her English. Here she seems to have a positive attitude towards her English

although as she believes her English is not ,correct,. It appears to me that she has changed her

view because her response in line 3 is prolonged and lengthy which indicates her strong feeling

about her changed belief. Also, P2,s turn in line 3 shows a latching response indicating her active

engagement in the discussion which seems to indicate that she has already changed her

orientation towards her English.

Similarly, another Vietnamese student (D1) shared the similar positive view as described above

that it is normal to use wrong grammar as long as speakers still understand each other. D1 says

with some emphasis showing his strong feeling about his idea.

Extract 37[39]:

1   D1:   in my opinion, I think English is a is a tool to make people understand the others, so
            sometimes they can use incorrect grammar or pronunciation or vocabulary, **but the
            main purpose is that I understand what he is going to say** I think that is the most
            important thing rather than you are going to check their grammar and vocabulary all
            the time, I think it is NOT necessary in my opinion, **the most important thing is
            understand what he is going to say**.

During the interviews with my participants, I was also interested to know how they viewed the

use of English mixed with some Thai. When analysing my interview data, I found that the student

participants tended to invoke the same standard language ideology when evaluating the mixing

---

[38] The conversation was originally in Thai.
[39] The conversation was originally in English.

between the two languages. Thus, the translanguaging received some negative views as the following extracts will demonstrate. The extract below was with a Thai student (P1).

Extract 38[40]:

1	P:	how do you feel about mixing English and Thai when you speak?
2	P1:	**I think it isn't normal**=
3	P:	=why
4	P1:	(1) **it will be good if I use only English, I should NOT use Thai with English**, but sometimes to deal with my communicative problem I have to use Thai with English
5	P:	what happen when you mix the two languages
6	P1:	sometimes my friend understand me, but sometimes they don't, it is difficult to communicate and I have to improve my English

The students really feels the mixing between English and Thai is not good. Her strong feeling about this belief is initially indicated by the one second pause at the beginning in line 4: here she has to think hard before answering my question. Also, the emphasis in the same line shows she feels so strongly about it. She feels this way because she is influenced by the notion of monolingualism. In addition, there was also another student participant (C2) who was under the influence of the monolingual ideology. I asked C2 during his interview how he felt when he had to mix English with Thai when speaking.

Extract 39[41]:

1	C2:	**it's not very good when I have to mix Thai with English** sometimes, this is because I cannot think of the word in English and because I'm not a native English so I have to use Thai word when I don't know the English.
2	P:	yah=
3	C2:	=**it's not good when I have to resort to Thai language instead of English**

C2's strong and negative feeling about the mixing of English and Thai reveals in lines 1 and 3. The student repeats the same idea twice. His repetition shows his strong feeling about the topic under discussion. This negative attitude is pretty much influenced by the notion of monolingualism. He also seems to compare himself with a native English speaker showing the native speaker language ideology in his thinking.

---

[40] The conversation was originally in Thai.
[41] The conversation was originally in Thai.

Chapter 6

However, I found two student participants who showed some positive attitudes towards the use of two languages in communication. The first extract was with a Thai female student (L).

Extract 40[42]:

1	L:	**I feel the mixing between English and Thai is natural and normal** because I do it every day I mix Thai and Chinese at home=
2	P:	=really, can you tell me more about it=
3	L:	=my parents and grandparents were originally from China, so they speak Chinese at home, and I was born in Thailand, so I learnt Thai at school and speak Thai and Chinese at home with my parents and grandparents=
4	P:	=that's really [interesting
5	L:	[**I often mix Thai and Chinese when I speak with my parents**

The student's engagement reveals throughout the extract. First, in line 3 her latching response shows her active involvement in the discussion. Also, she uses a continuing move to provide more details at length explaining how and why she mixes Thai and Chinese at home. The overlapping turn in line 5 also indicates her active engagement. This positive orientation towards the translanguaging is influenced by the notion that language is fluid and dynamic rather than fixed, static or monolingual.

Similarly, there was another male student (B1) who felt that language is fluid and dynamic, and therefore showed some positive feeling about the translanguaging.

Extract 41[43]:

1	B1:	**I think there is no right or wrong ways of communicating**, if I can't think of the English word I will use Thai words, but if I am under pressure to speak English only, I will have difficulties with learning, because when you don't know how to speak English you will not want to speak, but if you know even a little if you try to speak it a bit of English and a bit of Thai, this will be better, **it's good if you try to make people understand although you have to mix two languages**
2	P:	so you think it's a positive thing=
3	B1:	=YEAH, you try to speak although you're using two languages is better than remain silent

The extract shows B1's strong and positive feeling about the mixing between English and Thai. First, it reveals through the prolonged and lengthy turn in line 1 where he uses a continuing move

---

[42] The conversation was originally in Thai.
[43] The conversation was originally in Thai.

to explain his belief. Also, in line 3, he confirms his strong belief with a latching response. The immediate response shows his strong feeling and active engagement in the discussion, and he says it with some emphasis.

In conclusion, I have explored the students' orientations towards their own English language. It revealed that in general they negatively perceived their own English abilities as a result of standard language ideology while I found very few participants who positively perceived their English language. The participants also showed strong negative opinions on the use of two languages or translanguaging. Their views were very much influenced by the monolingual idea of language.

6.8   Conclusion

This chapter has explained how the interview data answered my three research questions. In doing so, it first explored the analytical frameworks for interviews. These entailed the qualitative content analysis (Schreier, 2012) and the Speech Functions Analysis framework (Eggins and Slade, 2006). The chapter then discussed data analysis in practice explaining how the analysis was carried out and how the codes were obtained. After that, I explored the coding frame which consisted of four overarching codes. The key findings revealed that English was used mainly or exclusively since it acted as the main lingua franca in this multilingual setting where participants were from diverse backgrounds. In addition, since the participants were multilingual, other languages were also in use for a wide range of purposes. Thai and Chinese languages were found to be common and used alongside English. For example, Thai was used when participants did not know the English words and explained some concepts in English. It was also used for other social and communicative success like to show affiliation and connection among the speakers, and to teach some Thai to the non-Thai speakers.

In addition, the teachers' and students' orientations towards their own English were also explored. With this respect, the findings revealed that their views were very much under the influence of language ideology. Thus, they negatively viewed their English language including the use of two languages or translanguaging in multilingual communication. Next chapter will summarise all the findings and discuss their relevance and implications further.

Chapter 7   Conclusion

7.1   Introduction

The purpose of this final chapter is to tie together, or integrate all the previous chapters plus to discuss some contributions of my study. This study is all about language policy. I was interested in EMI language policy offered at a Thai (or my) university in higher education in Thailand, and I wanted to know how English is used as a medium of instruction in this EMI setting. Here, Thailand is not an English speaking country, so English is used as a lingua franca by people, in the sense that it is used by NNESs who share different mother tongue coming from different linguistic backgrounds. My university is no exception and this is why I became interested in ELF in EMI setting.

In my EMI setting, English is explicitly stated as a medium of instruction (see a discussion of stated language policy in the introduction chapter) which is different from some universities in some countries where English is not always stated in policy statement. In Thailand, the policy statement of English as a medium of instruction is very typical among the Thai universities where EMI programmes are offered because the institutions would like to attract a large number of foreign or non-Thai students from different language backgrounds mostly from neighbouring countries like China (Galloway et al., 2017; Dearden, 2014). Given the English used as a classroom instruction, I was interested to find out to what extent English is enacted inside its EMI classroom, how far the teachers and students actually use English when teaching and learning, how far English is used only, or how much Thai and/or other languages are used inside classroom by teachers. I also wanted to know how the teachers and students think about the language policies and practices, and the effects of these policies on teachers and students. Therefore, I had three research questions that guided my investigation. They are:

1) **To what extent are the institution's language policies enacted inside its EMI classrooms?**
2) **What kind of language ideologies inform teachers and students' orientations to EMI policies and practices?**
3) **How are the teachers and students affected by such EMI policies and practices?**

I employed a qualitative bottom-up approach to this investigation. I collected data using classroom observation and interviews. These sets of data were triangulated in order to understand how

policies are enacted and how they impact the teachers and students. The answers to the research questions above will be summarised in the following sections. After that, I will discuss the theoretical and pedagogical implications for ELT in general and for EMI in particular in Thailand in higher education. Then, I will discuss the limitations of my study, and finally I will make some suggestions for future research.

7.2 Summary of findings

This section will summarise the findings with respect to the individual research questions above. I will first discuss the research question one.

7.2.1 RQ1: to what extent are the institution's language policies enacted inside its EMI classrooms?

My first research question was explored through classroom observations and interviews. The findings from observation and interviews were triangulated. There were three main themes emerging from my findings. The findings showed the EMI teachers seemed to enact either 'English-Only' or 'translanguaging: English plus other languages' policies when teaching content subjects. Also, when closely looking into the kind of English that was practiced by all the EMI participants, I found there were some linguistic variations which were different from standard native English language. In other words, the teachers and students under question seemed to employ ELF (not ENL) when teaching and learning and/or interacting inside their EMI lessons. These three main themes will be discussed in turn.

7.2.1.1 English-Only policy

Regarding the 'English-Only' policy, the majority of EMI classes that were observed (14 out of 19) featured the use of English only (see Chapter Five, section 5.3 English-Only policy). This meant I did not hear any use of other languages except English by the teachers during their content teaching delivery. This then means the majority of EMI teacher participants enacting the English-Only held the 'virtual position' in Macaro's (2009) categorisation of the amount of English use in EMI classroom. According to Macaro (2009), EMI teachers holding the virtual view tend to think that English only is best and appropriate for EMI teaching and learning, and do not believe in the use of other languages in their EMI lessons. My finding of English-Only policy in this EMI setting is similar to some previous studies like Smit (2010b) and Baker and Hüttner (2017), but is different

from many EMI studies like Tian (2014), Humphries (2014), Tayjasanant (2014), Canh (2014) and Tien (2014). This basically means it is sometimes difficult to predict how EMI policies in one setting are enacted. Therefore, I will call for a more qualitative study of EMI policy and practices from a bottom-up approach that yields a comprehensive understanding of how policies are implemented in one setting, rather than a quantitative study that only tries to predict how the policies are enacted in one setting and generalise such finding to other EMI contexts.

In my data, I found several reasons for this English-Only policy, but the most popular reason expressed by the majority of my EMI teacher participants was that English became a lingua franca in this EMI setting, and using English would result in an inclusion of all the students in the class. They mentioned that they had to use English because there were international students in their classrooms, thus everyone would understand English. Similarly, some said English would open to everyone including local Thai and non-Thai students who shared and came from different first language backgrounds. Basically, such use of 'English-Only' policy fits well with the definition of ELF defined by Seidlhofer (2011: 7) who refers to it as 'any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option'. Indeed, English was used to include all the participants providing them with the communicative medium of instruction that opened learning access to everyone.

The second explanation of why my EMI teacher participants used English only was due to the explicitly stated language policy that requires English as a medium of instruction for this programme. The teachers said that they had to follow the programme policy. Thus, they appeared to be aware of the formal policy statement. As Spolsky (2012) argues, language practices are very much influenced by the stated language policy. So, it appeared that classroom practices were in line with the stated language policy. While this finding resembles one previous study by Baker and Hüttner (2017), it is different from many EMI studies like Tien (2014), Tayjasanant (2014), Hasim and Barnard (2018), Costa and Coleman (2013), Ali (2013), Carrol and Hoven (2017) and Aizawa and Rose (2018) which showed a gap between the formal policy and the classroom practices. It then seems that it is difficult to predict how the formal language policy is implemented, thus there needs to be a qualitative study focusing on the implementation of policy in one local context from a bottom-up perspective.

Another reason for their English-only instructions is that the Thai teachers appeared to have a high level of English proficiency as a results of having high academic achievement. Most of them had a PhD or at least Master's degrees from English-speaking countries, and many of them used to

live and study overseas. They also appeared to have years of teaching experiences with EMI programmes. They all had been teaching EMI programme for nearly ten years. In essence, the EMI teacher participants seemed to be really confident in their EMI teaching because of their academic backgrounds, English language abilities, and EMI teaching experiences. This finding links to the criteria of EMI teacher recruitment in the application processes in which EMI teachers should have both high academic achievement (etc. holding Master's or PhD) as well as years of EMI teaching experiences.

The last reason for English-Only policy expressed by some teachers was that they wanted the students to practice some English while in EMI classroom. They seemed to believe in the idea of 'maximum exposure' or 'absolute exposure' to the target language. They tended to think that English-Only will create the maximum exposure to English, and such environment will improve the students' linguistic performance. My finding resembles some previous EMI studies like Haji-Othman et al. (2014) and Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) who report the similar beliefs among their EMI teacher participants. This has some implications for language policy in Thailand that EMI students in my country will benefit from continued language support throughout their studies that could improve their language competence (Aizawa and Rose, 2018). But, perhaps more importantly, policy-makers, educators and researchers alike need to consider a question, what kind of linguistic proficiency is needed? Or Whose norm of language (or which English) should be adopted and taught? I will next move on to discuss the second main theme.

7.2.1.2 Translanguaging: English plus other languages policy

There seemed to be a mismatch between EMI language policy and language practices. While the policy stated that English should be used as a medium of instruction, my finding showed that some teachers used other languages than English. I found that two (out of eight) EMI teachers employed translanguaging using English plus the use of other languages like Thai and Chinese to help their students understand the content being discussed in EMI classrooms. I found the use of these languages in five observed lessons. The amount of other languages than English used by the two teachers was very small like less than one percent of their classroom talk (see table 5.3 in chapter five). This means the teachers translanguaged only one or two sentences of other languages in their classroom teaching, and thus English was still exclusively dominant or used in these lessons. Essentially, the two teachers enacting English plus policy were still considered as holding the 'virtual position' in Macaro's (2009) categorisation as mentioned above.

The two teachers translanguaged between English and other languages when teaching EMI content subjects because they felt that some students appeared to have a low level of English proficiency, therefore may have had some difficulties with understanding the content being discussed due to their lack of English language skills. Also the teachers felt that in EMI teaching and learning where content knowledge is paramount, understanding the content is the most important goal to achieve. Since the understanding is so important, the teachers did not rely on a priori English knowledge (or content knowledge) because the students were from diverse language backgrounds with varying degree of linguistic proficiency: some may know and understand an English concept or term very well while others with low language proficiency did not. As Jenkins (2015b: 64) puts it, in multilingual communication 'what is shared may not be shared from the start (nor do interlocutors necessarily know from the start what they do in fact share)'. For this reason, in my EMI setting the teachers tried very hard to explain some difficult English terms/concepts. In doing so, they translanguaged between English and students' L1 in order to help them understand the English terms. This translanguaging will have some theoretical and pedagogical implications which will be discussed later on in this chapter.

In EMI classroom teaching and learning, I found different roles of different languages other than English. My findings showed Thai and Chinese were the most frequently used alongside English. I found five roles of Thai in this EMI setting. First, the most popular use of Thai was to explain some difficult English terms and concepts to the Thai students deemed to have a low English proficiency. This finding confirms an EMI study by Tayjasanant (2014) who found that EMI teachers had to use some Thai language in their teaching due to a lack of English language skills among Thai students. Moreover, the Thai language was used to deal with the unknown English words. Third, the language was used among the Thai speakers to talk about non-work related issues such as giving simple classroom instructions, discussing deadlines and general announcements. These managerial roles of L1 were also found by Humphries (2014) who reports in Japanese contexts that Japanese EMI teachers used their L1 to organise the class, to provide instructions or to maintain the pace of classroom activities. In addition, Thai was used to show affiliation and connection between the teachers and students which is similar to Tayjasanant's (2014) finding. Finally, the local language was used when Thai persons taught some Thai words to their non-Thai peers.

Other languages were also found to be used inside EMI lessons for various and social purposes. From a pedagogical point of view, Chinese was used in powerpoint slides by teachers to attract

some attention from the Chinese students. Similarly, the language was also used by some Chinese students to prepare their presentation slides. Translation from English into Chinese was also mentioned by both teachers and students to be useful teaching and learning strategies. These roles of Chinese were also found in some previous translanguaging studies like He et al. (2017) and Tian (2014). In addition, one Thai teacher (M2) reported that she used Chinese to talk to her Chinese students who were shy and could not speak much English to break the ice between the two and to get to know each other better particularly at the beginning of a new term. Also, German and Vietnamese were also found to be used in this EMI setting. One teacher stated that sometimes her students used some German advertisements in their presentation with English sub-titled. The same teacher also mentioned in her interview that she also used Vietnamese to talk to some Vietnamese students for casual conversation and to get to know them. The teacher believed that speaking her students' L1 would help her develop some good interpersonal relationships between her and her students.

7.2.1.3   Linguistic variations

The last theme is about the linguistic variations found in language practices among the EMI teachers and students. The findings showed that my participants tended to use ELF in their classroom teaching and learning. From a linguistic point of view, classroom practices were fluid and dynamic, and therefore did not conform to the standard native English. In other words, the kind of 'E' or English in my EMI setting was ELF or EMF. My analysis of classroom practices revealed six linguistic patterns. It showed the teachers and students tended to omit the plural endings (-S) in countable nouns, and tended to drop the third person present tense (-S). Also, they appeared to ignore dependent prepositions. They employed non-standard use of definite and indefinite articles, and tended to replace the relative pronouns (e.g. *which* and *who*) with the pronoun *that*. Finally, my participants seemed to overdo explicitness and clarity in their choice of words. These non-standard features are typical of the use of English in lingua franca settings (Seidlhofer, 2004, 2011; Cogo and Dewey, 2012; Mauranen, 2012). The variations in linguistic forms happened as a result of language contact situation in which the multilingual conversations were taking place. Although they deviated from the standard English language, such variations did not cause any breakdown in the interactions in EMI classrooms. According to Spolsky (2012), language practice is the real language policy. Since ELF seemed to be enacted in practice inside EMI classrooms, ELF (not ENL) became the real language policy in this EMI setting which has some implications for EMI policy in Thai context which will be discussed below. The ELF use in this setting links to my second

research question that asks how the teachers and students view their use of ELF, the topic that I turn next.

7.2.2   RQ2: what kind of language ideologies inform teachers and students' orientations to EMI policies and practices?

My second research question was explored through interviews. The interviews with teachers and students revealed that in most cases they tended to hold some negative orientations towards their own English, or ELF use, as a result of standard language ideology. This finding is similar to the finding by Baker and Hüttner (2017) in a similar Thai context. I will discuss the teachers' orientations first before I summarise the views from the students.

My teacher participants tended to think their English was too formal and academic, therefore they believed the formality in their English caused some communicative problem when teaching and learning inside their EMI classrooms. This finding is similar to Airey's (2015) finding who reports that some Swedish EMI teachers held the similar view that their English was formal. Also, the teacher participants tended to think that their English was 'accented', therefore, caused some communicative problems when communicating in general, and when speaking to native English speakers in particular. However, as literature shows, native English speakers tend to lack speaking skills or accommodation speaking strategies when communicating in international EMI settings with other participants from diverse linguistic backgrounds (Jenkins, 2014). They often use idiomatic or local expressions that most multilingual interlocutors do not understand except their native peers. So, it seemed to me that the lack of communicative or pragmatic strategies among the native speakers is in fact the cause of communication breakdown, rather than the 'accented' English among the ELF speakers or my EMI participants.

In addition, findings from interviews with teachers showed that they tended to think their English was not 'good', 'excellent', and/or 'native'. They appeared to constantly compare themselves with native English speakers. Thus, they seemed to lack confidence in terms of their use of English. Their negative orientations towards their English are influenced by standard language ideology that the teachers invoked when evaluating their own English language. Baker and Hüttner (2017) report a similar finding in the Thai context. While my EMI teachers tended to hold some standard language ideology and appeared to want to improve their English, some previous EMI studies report that EMI teachers tend to lack the necessary English language skills in order to effectively teach EMI programme or to explain difficult English concepts where English is supposed to be

used throughout the lesson (Galloway et al., 2017; Aizawa and Rose, 2018; Dearden, 2014; Doiz and Lasagabaster, 2017). Therefore, it appears to me that my EMI teachers will benefit from a continued language support where they can continue to develop English language proficiency (Aizawa and Rose, 2018).

Similarly, the teachers appeared to hold the same negative attitudes towards their students' English as they did to themselves. They seemed to think and complained that the students did not speak English 'correctly', they spoke with 'wrong grammar', and they made a lot of 'grammar mistakes' when speaking. One teacher described the students' English as 'broken'. Again the teachers showed the influence of standard language ideology when evaluating their students' English. They tended to believe that there is only one 'correct' way of speaking English, and often failed to consider the language contact in contact zone like in EMI setting where different languages are constantly in flux.

Regarding the students' orientations towards their English, a similar pattern emerged although few students appeared to show some positive attitudes. Most students under investigation tended to think they did not speak 'correctly', or they pronounced 'wrong grammar'. As a result, they tended to feel 'bad' and 'embarrassed' when thinking about their own English. Also, the student participants tended to negatively evaluate the mixing between languages like English plus Thai. They thought English should be used only, thus having some negative attitudes towards their translanguaging. This shows the influence of the notion of monolingualism.

However, while the majority of students showed strong negative views on their English, I only found one or two students who evaluated their 'wrong grammar' English positively. Also these students positively viewed the mixing or translanguaging between languages. They believed the translanguaging is normal and natural. This is because they have a dynamic and fluid view on language, and therefore appeared to be confident and happy when speaking English. In contrast, those who tended to view their language as 'incorrect' English, appeared to have self-doubt, frustration and a lack of confidence, and thus tended to suffer a sense of 'linguistic insecurity[44]' (Jenkins, 2007). While I was able to produce only a small amount of data regarding the students' attitudes towards their translanguaging, there needs more researching into this issue in the future to confirm my findings.

---

[44] Linguistic insecurity refers to the feeling of downgrading their own accents among non-native English speakers who often compare their English with native English speakers.

In short, despite that ELF/EMF was generally practiced, such language practice was negatively viewed by its ELF users (both teachers and students) who appeared to be influenced by the standard language ideology and/or monolingualism when evaluating their own English. I will next turn to the finding summary of my last research question.

7.2.3 RQ3: how are the teachers and students affected by such EMI policies and practices?

This section will summarise the perceived effects of two language policies, 'English-Only' and 'translanguaging: English plus other languages' that may have on teachers and students. I will first discuss the former before I discuss the latter.

From a positive point of view, the English-Only positively affected the way the teachers taught the content subject. The teachers felt that using English when teaching was easy because all the technical terms and textbooks are all in English, so they did not have to translate into another language. But in fact they were very competent in English language appearing to have a high level of English proficiency. Also, the teachers appeared to think that the use of English would help students improve their English skills alongside with their content knowledge. This reason is often stated as one of the aims of EMI education in general EMI literature (e.g. Wilkinson, 2013; Barnard, 2018; Galloway et al., 2017). In addition, as discussed above, the English-Only policy was also good for mutual understanding among the participants from linguistic diverse backgrounds because it was acting as a lingua franca, thus resulting in the inclusion of both Thai and non-Thai students inside the classroom. The use of English helped motivate participation among the non-Thai students who mentioned that if the seminar and meeting were to conduct in English, they would participate, but if it were in Thai, they would not join because they would not be able to understand the content and discussion.

However, some students both Thai and non-Thai were negatively affected by the English-Only policy. The use of English only could cause some stress among the students with low language proficiency. The students reported that the use of English only was 'exhausting' and 'stressful'. Also, they tended to have some difficulties with communicating English only. This was perhaps because they did not have enough English skills in order to function well in EMI classroom. This finding has some implication that the students could benefit from more language support from the university than they were receiving then. Although the English-Only was tough for some students, one participant noted that this hardship could become a kind of motivation for the students to learn and improve their English skills. But some teachers believed that English-Only

was not practical due to the limitations from the students. Therefore, these teachers tended to translanguage by using English plus other languages in their teaching delivery in EMI classrooms.

Regarding the ·translangaging· policy, my findings showed that Thai and Chinese were the most frequently used alongside English. The effects of these languages were both positive and negative. While I discussed the positive benefits of using languages other than English above, I also found that the use of these languages resulted in some negative outcome like it was time-consuming. For instance, in a group-work discussion among students, students reported that using a few languages was sometimes time-consuming. They said that explaining a task in different languages (English, Thai and Chinese) could take some extra time before all the members understood and the work could begin. This view was different from a view expressed by a teacher who mentioned that using a bit of Thai or Chinese translation saved a lot of time in explaining some technical terms and concepts in English. Again, I was only able to produce a small amount of data for this conclusion, therefore there needs more researching into the effects of use of other languages in EMI classroom whether this actually ·saves· or ·wastes· time.

Moreover, students reported that using too much L1 like Thai could result in some kind of frustration and exclusion among non-Thai students in EMI classrooms if used without care. Nevertheless, the non-Thai students tended to be happy if English was used first to assure the inclusion of all the students in the classroom including Thai and non-Thai, after that the teacher could translate that from English into other languages. Some non-Thai participants stated that if the teachers used Thai first before speaking in English, they would feel frustrated because they could not understand what was being discussed. But if the teachers first spoke in English to make sure that everyone in the class understood the topic under discussion, and if they felt that the Thai or Chinese students did not understand and thus needed some translation, the teacher then could translate from English into other languages after they had already said in English. This way, as the non-Thai students noted, would be both beneficial for both the Thai who were weak in English language proficiency, and the non-Thai students who did not want to be excluded from the classroom discussion. This finding has some pedagogical implications that EMI teachers and students could be informed and made aware of the effects of their language choice or policy. Also, what language to use or not to use is a complex issue that needs further research. Equally important, the effects of such use need further investigation from a bottom-up approach. I will move next to discuss the contributions of my study, the limitations, and suggest some future research.

7.3   Contributions of study

This section will deal with the contributions of my study. I will discuss the implications in two areas including theoretical and pedagogical implications for EMI in higher education in Thailand.

7.3.1   Theoretical implications for EMI education in Thailand

Based on my findings, there are three main theoretical implications of my study. My finding showed that there was a mismatch between the EMI policy and practices. While the policy stated that English should be used as the medium of instruction, I found the use of other languages or translanguaging as well. This mismatch means that the kind of 'E' in EMI setting under question was ELF or EMF (see a discussion of ELF/EMF in Chapter two, section 2.4.2 on taking an ELF approach to language policy) involving the use of not only English but also other languages. Therefore, my first key theoretical implication for EMI education in Thai contexts is that EMI policy should expect not only English would be used in a range of different ways or the diverse use of English, but it will not be English-only, it will include other languages as well. Therefore, a university that offers EMI, needs to be not only aware that English is used in many ways, and not to try to enforce any particular kinds of English, but also that ELF/EMF users have other languages that should be allowed and accepted (Jenkins, 2014; 2019). Moreover, since ELF/EMF prioritises successful intercultural communications and accommodation skills, mixing between languages or translanguaging must 'NOT' be considered as an 'error', but be accepted as normal practices, and thus become part of the EMI language policy. Therefore, the use of a wide range of languages either in teaching or learning or in examination should not be penalised, but acknowledged and accepted. I will argue that the current EMI policy in Thailand still needs some radical changes accordingly, because at the moment the policy still prioritises the native standard English norms either British or American English. If the current policy wants to keep up with the latest and new theorisation of language or communication based on empirical evidence as my study has shown, it needs to adapt and adopt accordingly to the new theories, for instance it needs to take theories on ELF or EMF into consideration when issuing its language policy.

In addition, my finding showed that the English found in my EMI setting was influenced by its speakers linguistic and cultural backgrounds, thus my second conceptual implication is that we should reconsider the terms, such as, 'interlanguages', 'L1 interference', 'language transfer', 'fossilisation', and/or 'learner languages'. This is because, as Jenkins (2018a) rightly notes, these terms have become traditional and associated with an old and rather outdated idea of language in

SLA and EFL studies that can no longer account for the current use of English as a global lingua franca. However, with the new theorisation of language, such (two way) influence is best described using Jenkins's (2018a) notion of 'language permeation' as well as Mauranen's (2012) concepts of both 'similects' and 'second-order contact' (see a discussion of these concepts in Chapter two, section 2.4.2). In my EMI setting in HE, the participants including teachers, staff and students were from a wide range of nationalities and a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. When English is spoken by these people, the language is often influenced by the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of its speakers, leading to a complex situation where a language contact takes place among a range of different languages. This contact situation is natural, and language use should be examined in its own right, but the SLA and EFL studies often compare the use of English by non-native speakers against a standard Englisn norm. Thus, a new way of conceptualisation of English is indeed needed in order to fully understand and explain how language or communication actually works, especially when English is used in global contexts in general and EMI setting in Thailand in particular. Surely, research that looks into this in EMI Thai contexts is still scant, and thus there needs more researching into how EMI interactions work in classroom in Thailand.

Finally, my findings showed that translanguaging or other languages like Thai and Chinese were also used alongside English, but the effects of such use were unpredictable. For example, Thai or Chinese were used in classroom teaching and learning by teachers and students, but the result of these uses were both positive and negative. Thus, further research should place more emphasis on the roles and effects of other languages on people. As Jenkins (2015b) suggests, future ELF/EMF research needs to focus on the multilingualism of most of its speakers and to understand that speakers may prefer to use other available languages for all or some of the interaction. Therefore, ELF researchers should pay special attention to other languages than English examining their roles in multilingual interactions, especially in Thai contexts where there is a lack of research in this matter. I will move next to discuss some pedagogical implications for EMI education in Thai contexts.

7.3.2　　Pedagogical contributions for EMI in Thai higher education

Based on my findings, I would like to suggest some pedagogical implications for EMI policy in Thai contexts. There are seven suggestions as follows:

As Macaro (2018) notes, there is still a question about what makes a qualified EMI instructor. So, my first suggestion is to offer one possible answer to such question. My finding showed that my

teacher participants seemed to be really confident and able to teach EMI classes very well, thus to be qualified ones. My analysis showed that this was because the teachers had a high academic achievement: some were holding a Master and/or PhD degree from abroad or countries where English was used as a lingua franca like Japan or South Affrica, and/or English-speaking countries like the UK and the US. Or to put it another way, they were all multilingual individuals. Moreover, many of them had years of not only studying in but also teaching experiences with EMI programme. These qualifications and experiences seemed to constitute the good requirements for EMI teachers. So, my study seems to suggest that any individuals with these qualifications could be looked for when screening for an EMI teacher in the application process.

Secondly, for EMI education in Thailand, EMI students still need more language support than they were normally offered. My finding showed that students often lacked the necessary linguistic proficiency, therefore they expressed fear and anxiety about using English in the programme. This is understandable because they had to communicate in terms of speaking, reading and writing in a second or third language. These tasks can be difficult for them, particularly who were weak in English language skills. In addition, my analysis showed that many EMI students both Thai and non-Thai felt they needed to improve their English skills. It seemed to me that the EAP/ESP courses that were offered by the university were not enough since my students still had some difficulties with English skills after completing the courses. Therefore, the programme should offer continued language support for its EMI students rather than just the pre-sessional courses taken as a remedial course prior to their actual EMI programme. My suggestion is in line with Aizawa and Rose (2018) who rightly suggest a continued language support throughout the programme.

Thirdly, as shown in my findings, there were a range of pragmatic strategies that were found to be effective in EMI classroom teaching and learning. Since these communicative strategies are useful tools for mutual intelligibility, they should be emphasised in the language support unit throughout the programme. In other words, EMI students in Thailand should focus and learn communication skills or strategies. For example, in English speaking lessons, EAP teachers could assign an information gap task to students: students work and talk in pairs, they learn and practice using a wide range of pragmatic strategies after being presented. However, the current EAP/ESP courses, according to Galloway and Rose (2014) and Dewey (2012), often place too much emphasis on teaching standard English language, in the sense that students are often encouraged to mimic the way the NESs do, thus they are not equipped with the necessary skills for communication in a

lingua franca setting. Essentially, EMI students in Thailand and nearby regions should focus on pragmatic strategies, not the native English when it comes to their linguistic developments.

Another suggestion is that EMI students should be given sufficient time to work on their assignments. This recommendation is in line with Jenkins (2014). My findings showed that my EMI student participants needed time or enough time to work on their assignments. This was because they were having to do their assigments in another language which was not their mother tongue. Consequently, this made it difficult for them to work, they had to put more and more effort into it than they would have done in their first language. So, one suggestion for EMI policy is that in terms of assignment deadline, not only the students should be given enough time to work on their given homework or tasks, also the deadline should be made flexible and tailored to suit individual needs and circumstances. The teachers and policy-makers should understand the difficulties and challenges of reading and writing in English, and the extra time and efforts involved in a given task when carried out in another language. Therefore, they should make sure that their students receive sufficient and flexible time frame, help and support for their assignments.

In addition, my fifth suggestion is that EMI Thai students will benefit from raising awareness of Global Englishes if they want to prepare themselves for real-life communication in EMI programme. This implication is in line with Galloway (2017), Galloway and Rose (2014, 2015) and Rose and Galloway (2019). EMI programme is a good example of multilingual settings where participants have to speak English and are from diverse different language backgrounds. Thus EMI students are bound to talk to friends with a wide range of English accents. Therefore, they need to be familiar themselves with different English accents. In this respect, in EAP/ESP courses, students' awareness of Global Englishes should be raised. Galloway and Rose (2015) suggest several ways of raising the GE awareness. One way of doing this could be that EAP listening materials should include the conversations from both NNESs and NESs groups. Galloway and Rose (2014) provided a good example of using listening journals to raise the awareness of global Englishes. Their Japanese students were asked to listen to speakers from a range of English-speaking backgrounds (or ELF interactions) before they had to reflect on what they heard, and make some reflective comments. The results showed that the students became aware of different kinds of Englishes. They also became more confident in their English since they knew that their English did not have to be native-like in order to be able to communicate with other speakers in ELF setting. This ELF-informed pedagogy is very important because most of my student participants often felt a lack of

confidence in their English. They often felt 'bad' and/or 'embarrassed' when they made grammar mistakes when speaking English. They also often compared themselves with native speakers. They then showed a strong negative attitude toward their accented English. It is my hope that the ELF-oriented approach to ELT will help boost some confidence among EMI students. They should be well aware that they will be using ELF/EMF in EMI setting, therefore their English does not have to be native-like in order to communicate with other speakers. They should understand that there are different ways of speaking and using English. Thus, the exposure to different Englishes is needed in EAP/ESL courses in order to get EMI students ready for English use. Also, in terms of teaching pronunciation, the EAP instructors could teach their pronunciation lessons based on Lingua Franca Core (LFC) as proposed by Jenkins (2000).

Moreover, there should be a training for EMI teachers and students on the effect of their choice of language (or policy) on other people. My findings showed that while the use of L1 translation was very crucial in content teaching and learning, it can potentially exclude some students who do not understand the language if used without care. For example, some of my non-Thai student participants felt frustrated and annoyed by the use of Thai in their group-work. The students and teachers regardless of L1 backgrounds should be well aware of the result of their translanguaging which could have both positive and negative outcomes. Also, they too should be made aware of when to use English and how to use it. One way of making them aware is to offer the opportunity to exchange ideas and express views among EMI participants. This could be done in a form of seminar sessions or teaching training programme (Aizawa and Rose, 2018). Also, empirical findings from ELF(A)/EMF studies should be presented and discussed in these sessions where EMI participants will have the opportunity to learn and discuss new theories and ideas about language and communication. They then will become critical about their use of English and other languages in their EMI setting. This is because as my finding showed the EMI teachers and students showed a lack of knowledge about global Englishes.

This leads in turn to the final pedagogical implication which is for language assessment. This is in line with Jenkins (2019). While the use of other languages was found to be beneficial in many ways as my findings revealed, such use should not be penalised when it comes to language testing. English language testing for EMI courses should be revised to include the communicative strategies because at the moment English tests (e.g. IELTS and TOEFL) for EMI programme are based on native standard norm. The revised tests should assess how well ELF speakers adjust their English for promoting intelligibility. For example, as my findings show the speakers may choose to

use other languages than English to show solidarity, or affiliation with their interlocutors, or they may use English to project their identity. These use of English or English plus other languages should not be called 'errors' and/or penalised. In other words, the language assessment should not be based on English native norm, but should be purely based on the real-life communication or ELF interactions. Equally true, the EMI programme should also offer some courses where other languages than English (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, and Thai) are taught to EMI students. I will move next to discuss the limitations of study and suggest some future research.

7.4   Limitations of study and future research

There are three main limitations of my study. First, there was some technical problems concerned about the sound quality of classroom recording. When I checked my recording files after I was back to Soton from the field-trip, I found the recordings of F's lessons were inaudible, therefore were not suitable for coding. I then had to leave them out from my classroom data set. Basically, while other recordings were good and suitable for coding, I lost some recorded files. This was because I placed the two recorders in front of me when recording and I was always sitting at the back of the class during the course of classroom observation. So, the recorders were far away from the teacher at the front of the class. They then did not capture the interactions well between the teacher and students inside the EMI classroom. Also, F was the only teacher who did not use the microphone while teaching, but other teachers did. If I were to conduct the classroom observation again in the future research, I would carefully plan the recording in advance: where to put the sound recorders and checking the sound quality right after the class whether the recorded data is suitable for coding and analysing.

Secondly, my findings were limited in terms of a small number of participants involved. I was able to recruit only 10 teachers who took part in classroom observations. If I had had more teachers, I would have got more classroom data in terms of the effects of language policy on students inside classroom. I observed only one instance when J reprimanded the group of Chinese students who were making noise during his lesson using Chinese language. J's choice of language resulted in both positive and negative feelings among the students. More data could yield more understanding of the effects of language policy on various parties involved. Also, in terms of interviews, more data could provide more functions of translanguaging (or code-switching) inside EMI classrooms. This was because I was the only researcher who collected data. So, the future research could involve a few or more researchers who collect data from a larger number of

participants in various research sites. Also, a multi-site case study which involves a few researchers investigating a few universities, should be promising and encouraged in order to obtain a richer and deeper understanding of how language policy is enacted.

The last limitation was concerned with the time spent on observing classrooms. I was able to visit the classes only a few times during my three-month period of field-trip. Longer time could have yielded more data in terms of how teachers and students make their own policies inside classrooms. Also, the longer period of time will help understand and generate more functions of code-switching and their effects on teachers and students inside classroom. So, a longitudinal study of language policy should be encouraged in order to gain such insights and a comprehensive understanding of the implementation of language policy.

7.5   Final remark

This chapter mainly summarised the findings and discussed the theoretical and pedagogical implications of my language policy study. As the study showed, English has become a global lingua franca and it is used alongside other languages of its multilingual speakers. The findings obtained from my study only offer the preliminary understanding of EMI in Thailand which calls for further empirical study. We know from the findings that the real language policy is ELF/EMF, but the EMI speakers did not appear to accept it or adore it as a good practice. Despite this negative attitude, I would like to end this thesis with optimistic views that ELF/EMF paradigm is a growing field of research which provides both theories and practices reflecting the real use of English in the globalised world. I believe that English will continue to be the global lingua franca, and I am confident that ELF/EMF paradigm will offer the most relevant and comprehensive view on language, particularly when English language will continue to be the global lingua franca in the globalised world.

Appendix A   Transcription Convention

CAPS	Stressed word
:	Long syllable (length indicated by number of colons)
@@@	Laughter (length indicated by number of @)
?	Rising intonation
.	Falling intonation
=	Latching
(.)	Pause of one second or less
(2) etc.	Pause of 2 seconds etc.
[	Overlapping speech
[	
(apples and oranges)	Guess at unclear word or words
xxx	Unintelligible word or words
[…]	Gaps in transcript because material is sensitive or not relevant
P	Interviewer
N, T etc.	Participants
S	A student
SS	Students
<L1th>	Utterances in a participant's first language (L1) are put between tags indicating the speaker's L1, such as 'th' = Thai and 'ch' = Chinese.
<LNth>	Utterances in languages which are neither English nor the speaker's first language are marked LN with the language indicated.
<L1th>yes<L1th>	The parts in italics are translations. Translation line is not numbered to clarify that they are not spoken turns but translations of the line above.

Appendix B   Example of Transcription

The transcription[45] below comes from an interview that lasts nearly an hour. It excludes the first 10 minutes because the material is sensitive and not relevant.

P = Interviewer

M = Interview participant

[…]

P: talking about our off shore campuses in Myanmar, in Yangon and Mandalay er from your experience are there any challenges err that exist OUT there err in terms of language use (1) perhaps the use of English in classroom as a medium of instruction err did you see any kind of problems or difficulties that err the students seem to have or or among the interactions between the teachers and students or also among the students. =

M: = ok ok err when I start with them ⌈ when I introduce myself

P: ⌊ yeah yeah

M: the first thing one of the first thing I do anyway is to thank them for listening to me and my first language ⌈ I mean

 […]

P: talking about our off shore campuses in Myanmar, in Yangon and Mandalay er from your experience are there any challenges err that exist OUT there err in terms of language use (1) perhaps the use of English in classroom as a medium of instruction err did you see any kind of problems or difficulties that err the students seem to have or or among the interactions between the teachers and students or also among the students. =

M: = ok ok err when I start with them ⌈ when I introduce myself

P: ⌊ yeah yeah

M: the first thing one of the first thing I do anyway is to thank them for listening to me and my first language ⌈ I mean

P: ⌊ ya

M: I know they sign up for this ⌈ but I acknowledge we do it in their second language

P: ⌊ ya

M: so I try and err I told them I make allowances if them want me to clarify things err I encourage them to do so =

P: = ya

---

[45] The conversation was originally in English.

Appendix B

M: I try to make them (achieve) with my delivery and of course they're supported by written slides as well =

P: = yeah

M: so so they can read: as well as [listen to me

P   [ya

M: er:: whenever they interact in the tutorial or when they're acting with their neighbours they generally talk in their own language =

P: = yeah

M: which I expect that as my experience in other locations are exactly that err which I don't have any problem with at all [err I (include) them to do it

P: [ya

M: in tutorial I sort of encourage them to make a noise discussing [err and also involve me

P: [yeah

M: what happen there I think err sometimes there are maybe occasionally they go on the mobile phone or err the internet or iPad to translate [xxx

P: [yeah

M: which again I do accept it.

P: yeah

M: the better speakers sometimes oh they do most of the time anyway interact with the less competent speakers to help translate and interpret the problem both obviously numbers and the contexts of those numbers =

P: = ya

M: err:: that again I tend to encourage

P: ya

M: err:: when they speak to me when they got questions in the tutorial mode they obviously do it in English and I respond.

P: yeah

M: NO there is no ENORMOUS challenge

P: ya

M: it's harder =

P: = yeah of course =

M: = processing the knowledge and if you like criticising or critiquing issues are harder I guess [when you are in the second language

P: [ya ya

M: at any level of PhD or Master or undergrad that become a very much a developed skill.

P: yeah =

M: = some of the candidates have studied err abroad themselves probably in the US the UK or whatever so again those people have got relatively well developed skills =

P: = yeah yeah =

M: = not all of them have done that [as I (smell)

P: [I see

M: so again there is a spread [and you have to try to balance that err: I try anyway

P: [ya

M: so you don't all the time speak to the most competent speaker [but to the others

P: [ya

M: within the group over the year apart from giving the exercise that I've got the numbers in them we discuss the contexts err so there is a discussion as well as computation

P: yah yah

M: but I also err: do a little bit of karaoke with them I pass the microphone to them occasionally for them to pass the opinion on something [err I OFFER I don't insist the person speaks

P: [ya ya

M: err I don't put the person into the situation being er focused upon having to speak =

P: = yeah =

M: = I don't MAKE them speak [but I look for volunteer for comments

P: [alright I see

M: I think I think being too authoritative and saying I want you to answer this question is probably too far [err some some teachers are doing it I guess generally speaking

P: [yeah

M: but I think that is putting them under too much pressure =

P: = ya ya I see

M: so I do look for volunteer and generally I get a small number of people willing to speak out in class [with the microphone because they are not children

P: [sure

M: err: and some occasions they like to demonstrate of course if they know so I try I don't focus on individual but I spread it around the room.

P: I see I see

M: err: I'm sure there are challenges =

P: yah yah

M: er: I wish I knew more to cope with the challenges =

P: = err and has there been any instances or occasions err when the students come up to you personally er perhaps after class and to discuss their linguistic problems or or the understanding that they might have and that sort of thing.

M: NO them come up to me after class to discuss issue problems but they're not directly linguistic =

P: = yeah yeah

M: but I do invite them to let me know if they want me to say something [in a different way

P: [ya

M: sometimes they do they raise questions er: which I'm fully supportive of and I try to respond to it and I try to demonstrate that I'm open to they're raising issues (2) err I mean (1) observing that group in particular rather than taking a wider experience of international teaching er: (1) I'm sure some rely more on reading the textbooks or slides rather than listening to me I get the impression slightly that there are somewhat students particularly at the back try to slightly hide away feel they will cover the course by a greater amount of their own reading and efforts [rather than listening to my verbal delivery

P: [ya I see

M: and also also by interaction with their near neighbours of course =

P: = yeah of course =

M: = they usually do collapse into a small working group [all around the room

P: [yeah

M: which is GREAT I like that ENTIRELY because I tell them at the beginning that you don't just learn from me you learn from the textbooks you learn from business experience you learn from each other =

P: = sure sure

M: so I encourage them to learn together

P: yeah yeah er: I guess the content itself is complex @ and the linguistic side is added on [to that effect

M: ⌈ yeah
        that's right I'm sure some of them are not exposed to the business but some HAVE =

P: =yeah

M: so again there is both a spread of er: subject knowledge and also a spread of linguistic
        ability =

P: = ya ya

M: so I have to try to accommodate all =

P: = sure sure

[…]

P: ok let's move on you might possibly see er that here the teachers themselves are quite
        linguistically diverse or culturally diverse =

M: = yeah

P: you will see the teachers from everywhere err China and Europe and Thai and how do you
        feel about this issue the fact that the teachers have diverse backgrounds but they're having
        to to to teach the contents in English

M: right I don't have a problem with it really I think this's quite good er I mean increasingly my
        experiences around the world err faculties are becoming internationally nature ⌈ and er::

P: ⌈ yeah

M: maybe initially without being at all prejudice I was thinking oh that would create possibly
        problems but on balance given time that I've observed this I probably see it as a positive
        really the fact that the faculty and students are international and we exchange and learn a
        lot from each other outlook culture err whatever on balance I would say it's a good thing
        it's a positive thing

P: sure err can you see any negative effects of these kinds of practices err perhaps have you
        experienced any kind of perhaps cultural gaps or or anything like that do you or is there any
        problem that tend to come up as a result of these diverse body of teachers

M: err generally speaking I suppose yeah from my limited international experience relatively
        limited er I think all parties involved in shall we say working together and delivering a
        ⌈ programme have got to think about the fact that they are slightly different

P: ⌈ yeah yeah

M: culture is different and err therefore (1) a time have to think (1) maybe the different culture
        would respond differently some would speak outright and observe the issues

P: ya

M: another would observe it but would not speak it out

P: yeah

M: so you have to almost consciously think through err would my communication with that person er give me the information that I need or not ₍ you know would they not help me

P: ₍ sure

M: err so in all communication not just in the classroom but more widely I think we have to try to be sensitive as possible to that =

P: = ya ya

M: and it wouldn·t have happened in a shall we say a uni err a single language environment or a single culture environment particularly

P: yeah yeah

M: but again even in the same language environment there is different style you will have to prepare to discuss and perform with another member of staff ₍ (xxx)

P: ₍ yeah

M: so even in the same same nation that would apply and probably even more so applied cross culturally ₍ cross internationally

P: ₍ yeah yeah sure

M: and that makes it very interesting ₍ and also challenging

P: ₍ yeah I guess

P: sure I think you touched the point er when the teachers need to be aware of of this kind of cultural differences er when they discuss when they negotiate when they communicate and and all the rest of it and

P: what should be the kind of direction or the solution if you what to put it or how would you raise the awareness among the teachers regarding if this is the possible problems or can be ₍ the possible problem

M: ₍ sure

P: err how would you react to that and how would you kind of encourage or help the teachers ₍ be more aware of

M: ₍ ok

P: what would you do?

M: ok right er:: (2) you·re asking a challenging question ₍ you·re asking me to generate new ideas

P: ₍ @@

M: err: one thing that has happened within my own home uni and I suspect widely anyway has been a greater diversity training ₍ in other words

P: ₍ yeah

M: getting staff to recognise when they're not being overtly shall we say culturally biased but nevertheless they're being almost implicitly culturally biased

P: yeah

M: so training whether in the classrooms or training on international something err to ensure that different groups different racial groups different ethnic origins do see things differently err across race across gender if you like as well

P: yeah

M: so increased diversity training has occurred a lot shall we say the last decade compared to previous decade so so that sort of thing but I think your question is even more detailed than that er you say what could happen =

P: = @@ er: but you have mentioned the kind of having training to raise the awareness and er=

P: = oh what's that noise? whose phone?

[...]

P: let's move on to the classroom in general er perhaps the students are also linguistically diverse as the [teacher I guess as we can see here

M: [hmm

P: in your teaching how do you deal with such a multicultural or multilingual body of students when you teach I think you mentioned briefly er in your previous discussion can you tell me more about =

M: = well er the Myanmar groups that I teach are not really multicultural that much they are mainly all Myanmar =

P: = yeah

M: so that doesn't xxx I had a limited experience on the Bangkok campus and the last group I taught was [...] and it was quite a mixed group Cambodia mainly from Southeast Asia [Cambodia China and occasional Thai

P: [yeah yeah

M: in fact they were very good [the attendance were excellent

P: [yeah

M: time keeping was good err they interacted very well =

P: = sure sure

M: hmm I didn't have to do a lot and I probably wouldn't be that competent in doing it err in managing their interaction and of course that would already be set up by the programme anyway

P: yeah I see

M: I was conscious of that (1) but again because I᾿m teaching in English and they probably know that xxx er they deal with me in English =

P: = yeah sure

M: there was occasional I guess I don᾿t know that would be Chinese that would be Thai and xxx there is the ability of asian students to speak and maybe even to write and read in another language as you can move from Thai to Chinese or from English to Chinese or the Chinese want to learn Thai or something=

P: = yeah

M: they have skills err the brain to pick up that much quicker than I would be able to pick up xxx

P: ya ya

M: so I observed their interaction

P: yeah

M: in any classroom what I don᾿t do is trying to lecture for a long time

P: yeah sure

M: er I try to give them the (phase) that the lecture is a signpost [and then we do the exercise

P: [yeah

M: so that will put them together =

P: = when you observed them observed their interactions what kind of language do they speak er do they use various languages perhaps some groups might use Chinese while the others use Thai or did you notice?

M: er (2) I suspect er =

P: = or they switch to English @ when they know you᾿re coming @@@ =

M: = no no don᾿t worry about that er I occasionally see Chinese version of textbooks that they are looking at =

P: = yeah

M: maybe the English version as well which is ABSOLUTELY fine because of the technical nature of material so they need the definitions

P: yeah

M: and very often I see them translating problems written problems occasional words in Chinese I find that (1) erm quite interesting [quite amazing they᾿re looking at English

P: [yeah

M: amazing is quite a strong word (1) I I was a little surprised the extent to which they do translate putting into their own language but I shouldn᾿t be I᾿m a bit narrow minded or

limited of ME not to realise that they would translate into Chinese so again the technical terms or a business context that they need but absolutely NO PROBLEM

P: [sure

M: [and and I suspect the Chinese groups are conversing mainly socially whatever in   Chinese:: or the others in Thai =

P: =sure sure

M: there is a little bit of reflect from one group er a Thai lady often sat next to a Chinese man now how they interacted I don˼t really know but they worked together well compared numbers [in the right way because they sat at the front and they were both good candidates

P: [yeah

M: but I would have known enough frankly whether they were talking in Thai or Chinese

P: I see

[...]

P: ok talking about the assessment I guess you let the students write how do you mark their writing er in terms of contents and grammar or spelling that sort of things er what is your practice?

M: well (1) I certainly don˼t punish severely minor expressions problems er

P: yeah

M: I notice particularly asian candidates sometimes they miss I said this to a number of them the definite and indefinite articles [THE and A

P: [yeah

M: the sentence makes sense but where if this had been written by an English person it would have had THE and A in occasionally er if it appears to a PhD candidate I would probably point that out and we work on it overtime er for assignment that I˼m now scoring I now don˼t worry about that as long as it makes sense

P: yeah

M: er I suppose (2) having said that obviously a person who corrects the expression with a lot of English skills makes a slightly better impression but I˼m probably looking for content rather than style

P: ok I see

M: so it˼s not that I˼m looking for a beautiful literature all the time it˼s more how can you solve the business problem and what is the contexts

P: I see

M: I try to make allowances for that if the meaning comes through that˼s fine

Appendix B

P: yeah

M: incidentally related to that I've been an examiner for one of the UK professional body that examines accounting internationally and their policy was equally to be considerate of the fact that the person is writing in their second language and the candidate shouldn't be punished for er any mis expressions like that providing the meaning is clear so over the year that has been my style

P: yeah

M: and of course different degrees and quality of writing

P: oh what do you mean by quality of writing? =

M: = well quality of expressions another word whether or not the sentence makes sense and is flowing literally or not

P: sure

M: I mean we all become a specialist in our own discipline in some way and therefore I wouldn't claim to be a specialist in writing although obviously I'm writing English and publish in English er

P: sure

M: er the quality of my writing maybe other people would criticise slightly er I mean the way things are expressed

P: yeah

M: but in some cases of course it's not just the way the sentences are structured but then how the following sentences flow from that er if the sentences flow in a coherent paragraph this makes a better impact than if the sentences are somewhat unrelated

P: sure

[…]

P: er perhaps one more question I think you mentioned that you used English er in your teaching =

M: = you used what? =

P: = you used English when you teach =

M: = oh yeah that's right =

P: = but you also allow any other languages taking place as well [in the classroom in the students discussion and that sort of thing

M: [yeah ABSOLUTELY

P: how about in your slides do you put in any other languages as well or do you put in only English? =

M: = oh only English

P: er (2) I think I have no more question

M: er ok

P: do you have any comments to add =

M: = what follows you stimulate me with that with that question there em in some cases not with the Myanmar programme [I'm speaking more generally and somewhat superficially

P: [sure

M: sometimes I'm required to do lectures and another member of staff er a local member of staff will do tutorial =

P: = yeah

M: so I set up the structure I set problem and I set the exam but they're tutored by the local member of staff

P: yeah

M: now that local member of staff is probably the same nationality as most of the candidates

P: yeah sure

M: (2) I: don't know I don't control how that tutor actually delivers the class er (1) I know in one case I know the individual for about ten years and I know he tutors in English definitely obviously because the students need to deliver an English exam =

P: = yeah

M: but equally at time I believed staff in that sort of situation er also reverse to their own language to explain the point to students =

P: = sure

M: so em it's like er I don't object to that at all =

P: = yeah

M: this is the English version but in some way if the issue would just come over as fully as possible to the students maybe em the second language helps to explain that it's an added value

P: yeah sure

M: sometimes I have had an international teacher says to me (1) I don't speak to them in anything other than in English because they have been told that this's an English programme and therefore they have got to be prepared to speak English and almost disciplining them saying no you can't get me to speak to you in our own language because the programme is English

M: (1) now er strong opinion either way

P: yeah =

Appendix B

M: = if it helps students to understand something I would have thought moving between languages would be an added value er irrespective of the fact that at the end of the day it's just has to be English. =

P: = yeah sure very good opinion

P: and is there anything else that you want to add apart from what we have discussed er

M: I don't think so (1) er er I mean undoubtedly one of the things in my mind when I first meet an international group is to try to make sure that I PACE the delivery to suit [that

P: [yeah

M: they get the slides in advance so they can read it at their own pace if they want to I'm not sure if everybody reads it of course but I feel I want to give them those [em

P: [yeah

M: sometimes the use of textbooks gives you lots and lots and lots of slides too many slides and therefore (1) in the teaching situation the pressure on the staff to talk about those slides where you should have to put yourself in the position of students to say that how is this actually going in their head or how much are they processing while I can talk about the next comments so the use of occasional pause can be quite helpful to allow students to catch up

P: yeah

M: but of course having said that the better student will then say why should you stop

P: yeah

M: because you've got this spread of (performance) that's a dilemma

P: I see

M: if you're speaking within a small group you should not have a problem but if a group of fifty there is a spread of experience of subject matters and of language and you try to pick roughly the middle ground and hopefully the better one would xxx while the weaker one would work hard to catch up

P: yeah I see

M: it's difficult and again from Myanmar point of view there is no small group tutorial but it's a large group delivery for an MBA and it's up to them then to work together

M: incidentally they do work together when the Myanmar group when they break out at five pm not everyday not all the time they do form and work themselves on the campus from five to six or six thirty they would meet and discuss the subject again the more committed ones

P: sure

M: but they do therefore complement each other or complement xxx whether they've got the right attitude to it

P: yeah wow that's very insight er and er thank you very much er unless you do not want to add any more =

M: = I don't er I can't think of anything else occur to me

P: yeah sure and if I have anything or any other issues that perhaps come up later I would go back to you =

M: = ok ok

P: thanks for your time and participation and support and everything so that's the end of conversation.

Appendix C Sample of Thai transcription

Extract 1:

N1:   ฉันไม่โอเคอ่ะ ฉันพยายามบังคับให้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในชั้นเรียนของฉันนะ เพราะมันคือโปรแกรม
        ภาษาอังกฤษ อ่ะเนาะ ดังนั้นพวกเขาก็ต้องสื่อสารกันเป็นภาษาอังกฤษสิ

P: อ่อ

N1:   ถ้าพวกเขาถามฉันมาเป็นภาษาอื่นๆนะฉันไม่ตอบหรอก

P: อ่า

N1:   ฉันพยายามบังคับ ส่งเสริมและกระตุ้นให้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ

P: อ่อ

N1:   ภาษาจีนก็ใช้ไม่ได้นะในชั้นเรียนของฉัน

P: อ่า (1) แล้วเคยมีนักเรียนไทยในชั้นเรียนของเธอแหกกฎและ ถามเธอเป็นภาษาไทยบ้างมะ =

N1:   = ก็มีอยู่ ⌈ช่วงตอนพักน่ะ

P: ⌊จริงหรอ?

N1:   แต่ฉันก็ไม่ตอบเป็นภาษาไทยหรอกนะฉันจะพยายาม พูดภาษาอังกฤษกับพวกเขาน่ะ

Appendix D   Participant information sheet

Study Title: English Language Policy in an English Medium-instruction Setting: An Ethnographic Study of a Thai University

Researcher: Parameth Lord-Asa   **Ethics number**: 20957

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

I am a PhD student in Applied Linguistics (English Language Teaching) at University of Southampton, UK, who is the research sponsor of this study. I am carrying out this project towards an academic qualification, a PhD degree. This research seeks to offer a detailed analysis and an in-depth understanding of an English-medium instruction (EMI) programme. It is particularly interested in finding out what English language policies are and how these are enacted inside classrooms. Also, the study would like to find out how teachers and students feel about such policies and practices.

Why have I been chosen?

You are chosen to participant in this study because you meet the criteria whereby you are involved in the EMI programme: you may be a lecturer who teaches one of the subjects or a student who is now taking part in the programme.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you take part in classroom observation, there will be around 20 visits to your classroom teaching over the course of 10 weeks. This means the observation will take place twice a week for each teacher. For one-to-one interviews, there will be 2 interviews for each participant. While the first interview may last between 60 and 90 minutes, the second may be very short up to 15 minutes and takes place a few days after the first. In addition,

regarding keeping a personal diary, participants should write down their record when they face with any kinds of difficulties with teaching and learning. Each participant holding a diary may be called in to discuss the diary around once every two weeks.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

The study might not benefit any individual, but it will perhaps be very beneficial to others such as adding to the current knowledge of EMI literature, generating more understanding of how EMI programme is implemented. Perhaps more importantly, the results of the study may suggest some solutions to the existing problems which will benefit the society as a whole.

Are there any risks involved?

The study has no physical risks.

Will my participation be confidential?

Your involvement into this study will be totally confidential and your name will not be revealed in public. Each participant will be assigned a pseudo name and/or will be codified using number. We will be in compliance with the Data Protection Act/University policy and we will store the data on a password protected computer in order to assure your anonymity and confidentiality. In addition, the information you provide will not be shared with any third parties except with supervisor of the project and project members.

What happens if I change my mind?

You have the right to withdraw from this study at any time without having to give any excuses.

What happens if something goes wrong?

In the unlikely case of concern or complaint, you can consult the indecent contact person whose details are provided below:

Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee Prof Chris Janaway (023 80593424,

c.janaway@soton.ac.uk).

Where can I get more information?

Parameth Lord-Asa (+447432 477 967 and/or pla1g13@soton.ac.uk)

Appendix E Consent form

CONSENT FORM

Study title: English Language Policy in an English Medium-instruction Setting: An Ethnographic Study of a Thai University

Researcher name: Parameth Lord-Asa

Staff/Student number: 25885464

ERGO reference number: 20957

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected

Data Protection I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password protected computer and that this information will only be used for the purpose of this study. All files containing any personal data will be made anonymous.

Name of participant (print name)...

Signature of participant..…...…

Appendix D

Date...

Appendix F Total of students in EMI programme

The table below shows the multilingual body of students registered for an EMI programme at a Thai university for academic year 2016-17 (noted on 14 September 2016). It shows the origins of students enrolled at different levels: Bachelor's, Master's and PhD.

No	Country	Bachelor	Master	PhD	Total	%
1	Thailand	332	25	12	369	48%
2	China	161	102	3	266	35%
3	Vietnam	21	5	3	29	4%
4	Myanmar	17	2	1	20	
5	Australia		1		1	
6	Bangladesh		1		1	
7	Bhutan	4	1		5	
8	Brazil	2			2	
9	Cambodia	5	3		8	
10	Canada		1		1	
11	Chile	1			1	
12	Congo	1			1	
13	Ethiopia			1	1	
14	Finland		1		1	
15	Ghana		2		2	
16	India		2		2	
17	Indonesia	3			3	
18	Japan	1	1		2	
19	Korea, Republic of	2			2	
20	Laos	1	7		8	10%
21	Maldives	2		1	3	
22	Mexico		2		2	
23	Nepal	7	2	1	10	
24	Nigeria	1	3		4	
25	Pakistan	2	1	1	4	
26	Philippines	1	4		5	
27	Portugal		1		1	
28	South Africa	2			2	
29	Taiwan	1			1	
30	Timor-Leste	1			1	
31	Turkey	1			1	
32	Turkmenistan		1		1	
33	Uganda		1		1	
34	United Kingdom		5		5	
35	United States	3	2		5	
	Total	**572**	**176**	**23**	**771**	**100%**

Appendix G   Information of teacher participants

The table below shows the background information of teacher participants.

No	Teachers	M/F	Age	Nationality	Languages spoken	Highest academic Achievement	Teaching experience	Details of EMI classroom observed			
								Teaching content	Weekly teaching	Number of students	Year of study	Degree levels
1	K	M	40	Thai	Thai, English	PhD	10 years	Economics	2	6	1	PhD
2	M1	M	34	Bulgarian	Bulgarian,English,Dutch French,Spanish,Thai	Master	6 years	Science and technology	3	43	1	Bachelor
3	M2	F	35	Thai	Thai, English, Chinese	PhD	7 years	Retailing	3	17	4	Bachelor
4	M3	M	58	Malaysian	Malay,English,Chinese	PhD	23 years	Market Resear	3	20	3	Bachelor
5	T1	M	53	German	German,English,Thai Italian,Dutch,Chinese	Master	11 years	International Logistics	3	40	3	Bachelor
6	F	M	41	French	French,English,Thai,Span	Master	2 years	Business Eng.	2	17	1	Bachelor
7	N1	M	37	Thai	Thai, English	PhD	6 years	Oper.&Manag.	3	16	1	Master
8	T2	M	42	Thai	Thai, English, Japanese	Master	12 years	English usage	3	36	1	Bachelor
9	J	M	43	Thai	Thai,English,French,Span Chinese,Lao,Burmese, Japanese,Vietnamese	PhD	15 years	Organisation and Management	3	127	1	Bachelor
10	C3	M	27	South African	Afrikaana, Zulu, English, Xhosa	Master	2 years	Marketing	3	18	3	Bachelor

Appendix H   Interviewed Teachers

The table below shows teachers who participated in interviews without classroom observations.

No	Teachers	M/F	Nationality	Languages spoken	Academic Achievement	Teaching Content	Teaching Experience
1	E	M	French	French,Eng.,Thai Protugu., Spanish	Master	Business English	11 years
2	M	M	British	English	PhD	MBA	40 years
3	M4	M	Thai	Thai and English	Master	Language& Culture	12 years
4	A1	M	British	Eng.,Thai,Russi. Germ.,Spani.,Latin	PhD	Business Management	15 years

Appendix I Information of Students

The table below shows background information of student participants in interviews.

No	Names	M/F	Age	Nationality	Languages spoken	Major	Year of study	Degree
1	A2	M	19	Chinese	Chinese,English, Thai	IBM	1	Bachelor
2	B1	M	21	Thai	Thai, English	Accounting	3	Bachelor
3	B2	F	19	Thai	Thai, English	Business	1	Bachelor
4	N2	F	19	Dutch	Dutch,English,Spanish,German,Thai	IBM	3	Exchange Student
5	P1	F	20	Thai	Thai, English	Business	1	Bachelor
6	P2	F	19	Thai	Thai, English	Business	1	Bachelor
7	T3	M	24	Thai	Thai, English,Chinese,Malay,Hokkien	IBM	4	Bachelor
8	L	F	19	Thai	Thai,English,Burmese	Business	1	Bachelor
9	S	M	20	Thai	Thai,English,Chinese,Korean	Business	2	Bachelor
10	V1	F	17	Chinese	Chinese,English, Thai	Business	1	Bachelor
11	V2	M	22	Thai	Thai,English	Logistics	4	Bachelor
12	C1	F	19	Combodian	Cambodian,English, Thai	IBM	2	Bachelor
13	N3	F	20	Thai	Thai,English	IBM	3	Bachelor
14	D1	M	25	Vietnamese	Vietnamese,English	Economics	1	PhD
15	D2	M	20	Thai	Thai,English	IBM	2	Bachelor
16	B3	M	19	Thai	Thai,English	IBM	2	Bachelor

IBM = International Business Management

Appendix J Information of Administrative staff

The table below shows background information of administrative staff.

No	Name	M/F	Age	Nationality	Languages spoken	Academic Achievement	Responsibility	Working Experience
1	H	F	25	Chinese	Chine.,Eng.,Thai	Bachelor	Student advisor	2 years
2	N4	F	26	Thai	Thai,English	Bachelor	Coordinator	4 years
3	T4	M	26	Vietnamese	Viet.,Eng.,Thai	Bachelor	Student advisor	3 years
4	C2	M	23	Thai	Thai,English	Bachelor	Coordinator	1 year

Appendix K   Languages used in interview

The table below shows the language that is used for interviews with participants. This depends on the mother tongue of each interview participant.

No	Name	Mother tongue	Language used for interview
1	K	Thai	Thai and English
2	M1	Bulgarian	English
3	M2	Thai	Thai and English
4	M3	Malaysian	English
5	M	English	English
6	M4	Thai	Thai
7	T1	German	English
8	T2	Thai	Thai and English
9	T3	Thai	Thai and English
10	F	French	English
11	N1	Thai	Thai and English
12	N2	Dutch	English
13	N3	Thai	Thai
14	J	Thai	Thai and English
15	E	French	English
16	A1	English	English
17	A2	Chinese	English
18	B1	Thai	Thai
19	B2	Thai	Thai
20	B3	Thai	Thai
21	P1	Thai	Thai
22	P2	Thai	Thai
23	L	Thai	Thai
24	S	Thai	Thai
25	V1	Chinese	English
26	V2	Thai	Thai and English
27	C1	Cambodian	English
28	C2	Thai	Thai and English
29	D1	Vietnamese	English
30	D2	Thai	Thai and English
31	H	Chinese	English
32	N4	Thai	Thai
33	T4	Vietnamese	English
34	C3	Afrikaans	English

Appendix L Observation guide

Room:

Date:

Time:

By:

Facts or Description of setting:

Reflections:

Questions to be asked:

Appendix D

Appendix M   Interview guide

Interview Guide

1. What do you think is the language policy of this programme?
2. How much should English be used in classroom? 100% or 50%
3. What is your teaching practices in terms of language use? How much do you use English?
4. Do you ever use any other languages alongside with English in your lesson?
5. Is it appropriate to use other languages when teaching?
6. How do you feel when you hear your students talk in their native language other than English? Do you like or dislike it?
7. Are there any challenges in EMI classroom? If so, what are they?
8. How do you cope with the demand of using English in delivering a content subject?
9. What do you think about your own English? And what about your students?
10. What are the effects of EMI policy that have on students?

Appendix D

Appendix N   Coding sheet

Coding Sheet for language use in EMI classroom

Time (mins)	TT talk in English	TT talk in other languages	SS talk in English	SS talk in other languages	Miscellaneous tasks
00:05					
00:10					
00:15					
00:20					
00:25					
00:30					
00:35					
00:40					
00:45					
00:50					
00:55					
01:00					
01:05					
01:10					
01:15					
01:20					
01:25					

01:30					
01:35					
01:40					
01:45					
01:50					
01:55					
02:00					
02:05					
02:10					
02:15					
02:20					
02:25					
02:30					
02:35					
02:40					
02:45					
02:50					
02:55					
03:00					
03:05					
03:10					
03:15					
03:20					
03:25					

03:30					
03:35					
03:40					
03:45					
03:50					
03:55					
04:00					
04:05					
04:10					
04:15					
04:20					
04:25					
04:30					
04:35					
04:40					
04:45					
04:50					
04:55					
05:00					
05:05					
05:10					
05:15					
05:20					
05:25					

05:30					
05:35					
05:40					
05:45					
05:50					
05:55					
06:00					
06:05					
06:10					
06:15					
06:20					
06:25					
06:30					
06:35					
06:40					
06:45					
06:50					
06:55					
07:00					
07:05					
07:10					
07:15					
07:20					
07:25					

Time					
07:30					
07:35					
07:40					
07:45					
07:50					
07:55					
08:00					
08:05					
08:10					
08:15					
08:20					
08:25					
08:30					
08:35					
08:40					
08:45					
08:50					
08:55					
09:00					
09:05					
09:10					
09:15					
09:20					
09:25					

Appendix D

09:30					
09:35					
09:40					
09:45					
09:50					
09:55					
10:00					

Appendix O Sample of field-note

J - 1st Observation
Subject: IB102 Organization and Management
Date: 18/08/2016
Time: 12:30-15:20
Room: 10303

Fact: This is a large class with students year 1&2 that takes place in one of the main theatre lecture rooms. There is a mixed ethnic group of around 150 students who are Thai, Vietnamese, Turkish, Chinese and some who are westerners (Dutch students) and more. Today is the first session during the first week of the term, so the teacher lets the students get to know each other by small-talking and asking a few questions (talk about your first romantic experience). Since the class is huge the conversations give rise to an enormous noise.

The 20-minute break begins at 01:45 and finishes at 2:05. Sitting at the back of the class I hear Thai and sometimes Chinese. There is one black student. This particular lesson features also for recruiting team members: there are different groups/teams that are looking for new members to join their team which will work together throughout the term. The senior students are presenting their visions/ambition/ethos to new students (first year students) who are choosing the team that they would like to join.

This subject is designed for SS to act and perform in group-work.

The SS (นศหญิงไทยกลุ่มนั้น พวกภคคิณี) บอกว่าวิชานี้ไม่มีหนังสือแต่เราจะเรียนรู้จาก group discussion, group work
นศต้องปฏิบัติถึงจะเกิดการเรียนรู้

Feelings:

The students seem to enjoy the use of English as a medium of instruction. Different languages are used to communicate and the students enjoy themsleves. Although the noise is enormous when students are carrying out the talking activity, the classroom atmosphere is extremely vibrant lively and pleasant.

Questions/Issues (for TT or SS):

1. Why Kris is there? He is a staff, and sometimes a teaching assistant
2. Can I see the course syllabus/general language policy/language evaluation criteria?

Appendix D

Appendix P Samples of initial codes

*Initial codes are in bold

P: I would like to ask you about the meeting that has just happened, I saw English was used in the meeting why?

D2: because first there was a member who is international from Cambodia, so we have to use English, this is the main reason we want all the group members to understand which include both Thai and international students [**English is used as a lingua franca among speakers who share different L1**]

P: yeah

D2: but there are other occasions when I can't think of the words in English, so I use Thai language instead, [**Thai is used to deal with the unknown English words**] and then my Thai friends will help me translate that into English so other international friends could understand [**Translation from Thai into English**] for example I couldn't think of the word 'minimum' in English so I used its Thai equivalence, .

D2: this is because I'm not a native speaker [**Language ideology: Native speaker**] sometimes I forget the English words, but then my friends helped me with the translation

P: so English is used as a medium of communication in order for everyone to understand the content

D2: yeah, that's right. This is also because we're international [**Policy: English to show we're international**]

P: but the moment when Thai language is used is when the speaker couldn't think of the English words. are there any other reasons of why Thai is used?

D2: yeah, there are. Sometimes we have to conduct the meeting entirely in Thai because we can't communicate or negotiate in English. Sometimes Thai sentences are very different from English [**Thai is used among Thai speakers in meeting for ease of communication**]

Appendix Q Internationalisation activities

These following are a wide range of top-down policies and/or internationalisation initiatives. These policies and activities were driven by the forces of globalisation and were found in a school prospectus collected during the fieldwork.

Off-shore campuses for Global MBA programme

- ☐ Yangon, Myanmar
- ☐ Mandalay Myanmar
- ☐ (To be launched) in Iran

Global and international networks

- ☐ Washington State University, Washington, U.S.A.
- ☐ University of Massachusetts Lowell, U.S.A
- ☐ Nagaoka University of Technology, Japan
- ☐ Korean University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
- ☐ Yunnan University, China
- ☐ Guangxi University, China
- ☐ Honghe University, China
- ☐ BINUS University, Jakarta, Indonesia
- ☐ Rotterdam Business School, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- ☐ Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Groningen, the Netherlands
- ☐ Universidade De São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil
- ☐ United States International University-Africa, Nairobi, Kenya
- ☐ Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola (USIL), Lima, Peru
- ☐ Condordia University, Edmonton, Canada
- ☐ Hue University College of Foreign Languages, Vietnam
- ☐ Soutsaka College of Management and Technology, Laos PDR
- ☐ Stuttgart Media University, Germany
- ☐ Universidade de Brasília, Brazil
- ☐ Thai Nguyen University, Vietnam
- ☐ Chungnum National University, Korea
- ☐ Kenyatta University, Kenya

- ☐ Shakhes Pajoh Research Institute, Iran
- ☐ University of Finance and Administration, Prague Czech Republic
- ☐ Varna Free University, Varna, Bulgaria
- ☐ College de Paris, France
- ☐ Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina
- ☐ Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway

Academic mobility programmes

- ☐ Student exchange programmes
- ☐ ASEAN leadership camp 2016
- ☐ The Wolf Game: roadshow trip to Scandinavia
- ☐ ASEAN School Networking
- ☐ Open House Global MBA
- ☐ Global Immersion Programmes
- ☐ Company Visit
- ☐ X-Mas Party
- ☐ Valentine's Day
- ☐ Nature Camp

Appendix R Population of language groups in Thailand

The table below shows the population of language groups with more than 50,000 speakers in Thailand (Kosonen, 2007).

Language group	Population	Percent of total
Thai, Central	20,182,571	37.7
Thai, North-eastern	15,000,000	28
Thai, Northern	6,000,000	11.2
Thai, Southern	5,000,000	9.3
Malay, Pattani	3,100,000	5.8
Khmer, Northern	1,117,588	2.1
Chinese, Min Nan	1,082,920	2
Karen, Sgaw	300,000	0.6
Kuy	300,000	0.6
Phu Thai	156,000	0.3
Mon	107,630	0.2
Kayah, Eastern	98,642	0.2
Phuan	98,605	0.2
Lü	83,000	0.2
Akha	60,000	0.1
Karen, Pwo Northern	60,000	0.1
Shan	60,000	0.1
Chinese, Hakka	58,800	0.1

Sô	58,000	0.1
Thai Sign Language	51,000	0.1
Karen, Pwo Western Thailand	50,000	0.1
Nyaw	50,000	0.1

References

Abdullah, A. N., & Heng, C. S. (2014). Codeswitching in universities in Malaysia. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 155-162): Multilingual Matters.

Airey, J. (2015). From stimulated recall to disciplinary literacy: Summarising ten years of research into teaching and learning in English. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education English in Europe* (Vol. 3, pp. 157-176): De Gruyter Mouton.

Aizawa, I., & Rose, H. (2019). An analysis of Japan's English as medium of instruction initiatives within higher education: The gap between meso-level policy and micro-level practice. *Higher Education, 77*(6), 1125-1142.

Ali, N. L. (2013). A changing paradigm in language planning: English-medium instruction policy at the tertiary level in Malaysia. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14 (1)*, 73-92.

Arkin, E., & Osam, N. (2015). English-medium higher education: A case study in a Turkish university context. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe Volume 3* (Vol. 3, pp. 177-199): De Gruyter Mouton.

Baker, W., & Hüttner, J. (2017). English and more: a multisite study of roles and conceptualisations of language in English medium multilingual universities from Europe to Asia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 38 (6)*, 501-516.

Baker, W., & Jarunthawatchai, W. (2017). English language policy in Thailand. *European Journal of Language Policy, 9*(1), 27-44.

Ball, P., & Lindsay, D. (2013). Language demands and support for English-medium instruction in tertiary education. Learning from a specific context. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities, Global Challenges* (pp. 44-61): Multilingual Matters.

Barnard, R. (2018). Setting the scene: EMI in Asian universities. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction Programmes. Perspectives from South East Asian Universities* (pp. 1-14): Routledge.

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

Björkman, B. (2009). From code to discourse in spoken ELF In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 225-251): Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Björkman, B. (2011). Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness? *Journal of pragmatics, 43 (4)*, 950-964.

Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an Academic Lingua Franca: An Investigation of Form and Communicative Effectiveness* (Vol. 3): Walter de Gruyter.

Blommaert, J. (2001). Context is/as critique. *Critique of Anthropology, 21 (1)*, 13-32.

References

Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic Fieldwork: A Beginner's Guide*: Multilingual Matters.

Bolton, K., & Botha, W. (2017). English as a medium of instruction in Singpapore higher education. In B. Fenton, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 133-152): Springer.

Bradley, D. (2010). Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. In M. J. Ball (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Sociolinguistics around the World* (pp. 98-107): Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3 (2)*, 77-101.

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviews*: Sage.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417.

Canh, L. V. (2014). Codeswitching in university in Vietnam. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 118-131): Multilingual Matters.

Carroll, k. S., & Hoven, M. v. d. (2017). Translanguaging within Higher Education in the United Arab Emirates. In C. M. Mazak & k. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 141-156): Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 356-369.

Cincotta-Segi, A. R. (2011). Signalling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: Teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and education, 25 (1)*, 19-31.

Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings.* (pp. 254-273). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cogo, A. (2012). ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1 (2)*, 287-313.

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF communication: From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 5 (2)*, 59-94.

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-driven Investigation*: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education*: Routledge.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*: Sage.

Costa, F., & Coleman, J. A. (2013). A survey of English-medium instruction in Italian higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16 (1)*, 3-19.

Cots, J. M. (2013). Introducing English-medium instruction at the University of Lleida, Spain: Intervention, beliefs and practices. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities, Global Challenges* (pp. 106-127): Multilingual Matters.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches (2nd edition)*: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches (3rd edition)*: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. International student (4th edition)*: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? *English Today, 24 (1)*, 3-6.

Crystal, D. (2012). A global language. In P. Seargeant & J. Swann (Eds.), *English in the World: History, Diversity, Change* (pp. 151-177): Routledge.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual review of applied linguistics, 31*, 182-204.

Darasawang, P. (2007). English language teaching and education in Thailand: A decade of change. In D. Prescott (Ed.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, Literacies, and Literatures* (pp. 187-204): Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Darasawang, P., & Todd, W. (2012). The effect of policy on English language teaching at secondary schools in Thailand. In E. L. Low & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, Policy and Language in Use* (pp. 207-220): John Benjamins.

Daryai-Hansen, P., Barfod, S., & Schwarz, L. (2017). A call for (trans) languaging: The language Profiles at Roskilde university. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 29-49): Multilingual Matters.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition, 10*(1), 7-21.

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a Medium of Instruction – A Growing Global Phenomenon: Phase 1*. London: The British Council.

Denzin, K. N., & Lincoln, S. Y. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In K. N. Denzin & S. Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-19): Sage.

Denzin, K. N., & Lincoln, S. Y. (2013). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In K. N. Denzin & S. Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials (4th edition)* (pp. 1-41): Sage.

References

Dewey, M. (2009). English as a lingua franca: heightened variability and theoretical implications. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 60-83). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1 (1)*, 141-170.

Dewi, A. (2017). English as a medium of instruction in Indonesian higher education: A study of lecturer' perceptions. In B. Fenton, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 241-258): Springer.

Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 157-176): Multilingual Matters.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2013). English as L3 at a bilingual university in the Basque Country Spain. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities, Global Challenges* (pp. 84-105): Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duff, P. (2006). Beyond generalisability: Context, credibility and complexity in Applied Linguistics research. In C. Chalhoub-Deville, C. Chapelle, & P. Duff (Eds.), *Inference and Generalisability in Applied Linguistics: Multiple Perspectices* (pp. 65-95). Amsterdam John Benjamins.

Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics* Routledge.

Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal, 74 (2)*, 154-166.

Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (2006). *Analysing Casual Conversation*: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Ehrenreich, S. (2009). English as a lingua franca in multinational corporations: exploring business communities of practice. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 126-151). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*: University of Chicago Press.

Fenton-Smith, B., Humphreys, P., & Walkinshaw, I. (2017). *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy* (Vol. 21): Springer.

Ferguson, G. (1968). Language development. In J. Fishman, G. Ferguson, & J. D. Gupta (Eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (pp. 27-35). London: John Wiley.

Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language Planning and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of pragmatics, 26 (2)*, 237-259.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In K. N. Denzin & S. Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 301-316): Sage.

Gall, J., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. T. (2005). *Applying Educational Research. 5th Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and Change in English Language Teaching: Attitudes and Impact*: Taylor & Francis.

Galloway, N., Kriukow, J., & Numajiri, T. (2017). Internationalisation, higher education and the growing demand for English: an investigation into the English medium of instruction (EMI) movement in China and Japan. *ELT Research Papers, 17 (2)*.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2014). Using listening journals to raise awareness of Global Englishes in ELT. *ELT journal, 68 (4)*, 386-396.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*: Routledge.

Gierlinger, E. (2015). 'You can speak German, sir': On the complexity of teachers' L1 use in CLIL. *Language and education, 29*(4), 347-368.

Goodman, B. A. (2017). The ecology of language and translanguaging in a Ukrainian university. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 50-69): Multilingual Matters.

Groff, C. (2017). Multilingual policies and practices in Indian higher education. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 121-140): Multilingual Matters.

Gürtler, K., & Kronewald, E. (2015). Internationalisation and English-medium instruction in German higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 89-114): De Gruyter Mouton.

Haji-Othman, N. A., Yaakub, H. Z. H., Ghani, D. L. P. P. A., Sulaiman, H. S. H., & Hitam, S. H. (2014). Codeswitching in university in Brunei Darussalam. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 144-162): Multilingual Matters.

Hamied, F. A. (2014). Codeswitching in universities in Indonesia. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 118-131): Multilingual Matters.

Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2018). Case study: EMI in Indonesia. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction Programmes. Perspectives from South East Asian Universities* (pp. 70-86): Routledge.

Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or paradigms? *Discourse and Society, 14 (6)*, 751-781.

Hasim, Z., & Barnard, R. (2018). Case study: EMI in a public university in Malaysia. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction Programmes. Perspectives from South East Asian Universities* (pp. 29-40): Routledge.

Haugen, E. (1966). *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*: Harvard University Press.

References

He, P., Lai, H., & Lin, A. (2017). Translanguaging in a multimodal mathematics presentation. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 91-120): Multilingual Matters.

Hino, N. (2017). The significance of EMI for learning of EIL in higher education: Four cases from Japan. In B. Fenton, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 155-132): Springer.

Hornberger, N. H. (2015). Selecting appropriate research methods in LPP research: Methodological rich points. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning. A Practical Guide* (pp. 9-20): Wiley Blackwell.

Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *Tesol Quarterly, 41 (3)*, 509-532.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language: Native and Non-Native Perspectives* (pp. 73-89). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2007). The shaky ground beneath the CEFR: Quantitative and qualitative dimensions of language proficiency 1. *The Modern Language Journal, 91 (4)*, 663-667.

Hultgren, A. K., Jensen, C., & Dimova, S. (2015). English-medium instruction in European higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 1-15): De Gruyter Mouton.

Humphries, S. (2014). Codeswitching in Japanese context. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 65-76): Multilingual Matters.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*: Polity Press.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse. English in a Global Context*. London: Continuum.

Hynninen, N. (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference from the perspective of English as a lingua franca: What we can learn from a focus on language regulation. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 3 (2)*, 293-316.

Inbar-Lourie, O., & Donitsa-Schmidt, S. (2013). Englishization in an Israeli teacher education college: Taking the first steps. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities, Global Challenges* (pp. 151-173): Multilingual Matters.

Ingvarsdóttir, H., & Arnbjörnsdóttir, B. (2015). English in a new linguistic context: Implications for higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 137-155): De Gruyter Mouton.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca : Attitude and Identity*: Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes. A Resource Book for Students (2nd edition)*: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2015a). *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2015b). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2 (3)*, 49-85.

Jenkins, J. (2018a). ELF and WE: Competing or complementing paradigms? In E. L. Low & A. Pakir (Eds.), *World Englishes: Re-thinking Paradigms* (pp. 12-28). London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2018b). Not English but English-within-multilingualism. In S. Coffey & U. Wingate (Eds.), *New Directions for Research in Foreign Language Education* (pp. 65-78): Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2019). English medium instruction in Higher Education: The role of ELF. In A. Gao, C. Davison, & C. Leung (Eds.), *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-18): Springer International Handbooks of Education.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44 (3)*, 281-315.

Jenkins, J., & Leung, C. (2014). English as a lingua franca. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The Companion to Language Assessment* (Vol. 4, pp. 1605-1616): Wiley Blackwell.

Jenkins, J., & Wingate, U. (2015). Staff and students' perceptions of English language policies and practices in 'international' iniversities: A case study from the UK. *Higher Education Review, 47 (2)*, 47-73.

Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language Policy*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standard, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures, 2nd edition* (pp. 355-365). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kalocsai, K. (2014). *Communities of Practice and English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. J. (2003). *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kaur, A., Young, D., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2016). English education policy in Thailand: why the poor results? In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English Language Education Policy in Asia* (pp. 345-361): Springer.

References

Kaur, J. (2009). Pre-empting problems of understanding in English as a lingua franca. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 107-123). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of pragmatics, 43 (11)*, 2704-2715.

Keyuravong, S. (2010). Insights from Thailand. In R. Johnstone (Ed.), *Learning Through English: Policies, Challenges and prospects: Insights from East Asia* (pp. 69-95): British Council.

Keyuravong, S. (2015). The implementation of an online collaborative project: Lessons learned from failure. In P. Darasawang & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching: The case of Thailand* (pp. 63-75): Palgrave Macmillan.

Kim, H.-J. (2014). Codeswitching in Korean universities In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 200-213): Multilingual Matters.

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

Kirkpatrick, A. (2017). The languages of higher education in East and Southeast Asia: Will EMI lead to Englishisation? In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 21-36): Springer.

Klaassen, R. G., & Bos, M. (2010). English language screening for scientific staff at Dalft University of Technology. *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 45*, 61-75.

Klimpfinger, T. (2009). 'She's mixing the two languages together' - forms and functions of codeswitching in English as a lingua franca. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings.* (pp. 348-371). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kling, J. (2015). 'You try with little humor and you just get on with it': Denish lecturers' reflections on English-medium instruction. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 201-222): De Gruyter Mouton.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*.

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation—for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and practice in higher education, 17 (3)*, 84-90.

Kongchan, C., & Darasawang, P. (2015). Roles of Self-Access Centres in the uccess of language learning. In P. Darasawang & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching: The case of Thailand* (pp. 76-88): Palgrave Macmillan.

Kosonen, K. (2007). Vernaculars in Literacy and Basic Education in Cambodia, Laos and Thailand. In A. J. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Language Planning and Policy: Issues in Language Planning and Literacy* (pp. 122-142): Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*: Sage.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing (2nd Edition)*: Sage.

Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers' perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 6*(2), 1-21.

Lasagabaster, D. (2015). Multilingual language policy: Is it becoming a misnomer at university level? In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 115-134): De Gruyter Mouton.

Leung, C. (2012). English as an additional language, policy-rendered theory and classroom interaction. In S. Gardner & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography* (pp. 222-240): Routledge.

Leung, C. (2013). The 'Social' in English language teaching: Abstracted norms versus situated enactments. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 2 (2)*, 283-313.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2013). *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*: Routledge.

Little, D. (2007). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Perspectives on the making of supranational language education policy. *The Modern Language Journal, 91 (4)*, 645-655.

Lo Bianco, J. (2004). Language planning as Applied Linguistic. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 738-762): Blackwell Publishing.

Lo, Y. Y., & Macaro, E. (2012). The medium of instruction and classroom interaction: Evidence from Hong Kong secondary schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15 (1)*, 29-52.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85 (4)*, 531-548.

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 35-49): Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2018). *English Medium Instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching, 51*(1), 36-76.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*: Routledge.

Mahboob, A. (2017). English medium instruction in higher education in Pakistan: Policies, perceptions, problems and possibilities. In B. Fenton, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 71-92): Springer.

Makalela, L. (2017). Translanguaging practices in a South African Institution of higher learning: A case of *Ubuntu* multilingual return. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 11-28): Multilingual Matters.

References

Mann, S. (2011). A critical review of qualitative interviews in Applied Linguistics. *Applied linguistics, 32 (1)*, 6-24.

Mann, S. (2016). *The Research Interview: Reflective Practice and Reflexivity in Research Processes*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Maringe, F., & Foskett, N. (2012). Introduction: Globalisation and universities. In N. Foskett & F. Maringe (Eds.), *Globalization and Internaltionalization in Higher Education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management Perspectives* (pp. 1-13): Continuum.

Maringe, F., Foskett, N., & Woodfield, S. (2013). Emerging internationalisation models in an uneven global terrain: Findings from a global survey. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 43 (1)*, 9-36.

Martin-Jones, M., & Martin, D. (2017). Introduction. In M. Martin-Jones & D. Martin (Eds.), *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and Ethnographic Perspectives* (pp. 1-27): Routledge.

Martin, I. P. (2014). Codeswitching in universities in the Philippines. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 163-174): Multilingual Matters.

Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *Tesol Quarterly, 37 (3)*, 513-527.

Mauranen, A. (2006a). A rich domain of ELF – The ELFA corpus of academic discourse. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 5 (2)*, 145-159.

Mauranen, A. (2006b). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in ELF communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of language, 177*, 123-150.

Mauranen, A. (2009). Chunking in ELF: Expressions for managing interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 6 (2)*, 217-233.

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers*: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, A. (2018). Conceptualising ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 7-24): Routledge.

Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N., & Ranta, E. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes, 29 (3)*, 183-190.

Mauranen, A., & Metsä-Ketelä, M. (2006). Introduction: English as a lingua franca. Special issue: English as a Lingua Franca. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 5 (2)*, 1-8.

Mauranen, A., & Ranta, E. (2008). English as an academic lingua franca–the ELFA project. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 7 (3)*, 199-202.

Mauranen, A., & Ranta, E. (2009). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Mazak, C. M. (2017). Introduction: Theorizing translanguaging practices in higher education. In C. M. Mazak & k. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 1-28): Multilingual Matters.

Mazak, C. M., Mendoza, f., & Mangonéz, P. (2017). Professors translanguaging in practice: Three cases from a Bilingual university. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 70-90): Multilingual Matters.

McCarty, T. L. (2015). Ethnography in language planning and policy research. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning. A Practical Guide* (pp. 81-93): Wiley Blackwell.

McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (1997). *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*: Holdder Education.

McNamara, T. (2011). Managing learning: Authority and language assessment. *Language Teaching, 44 (4)*, 500-515.

McNamara, T. (2012). English as a lingua franca: The challenge for language testing. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1 (1)*, 199-202.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*: Jossey-Bass.

Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education* (pp. 35-63): Multilingual Matters.

Metsä-Ketelä, M. (2006). 'Words are more or less superfluous': The case of more or less in academic lingua franca English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 5 (2)*, 117-143.

Metsä-Ketelä, M. (2012). Frequencies of vague expressions in English as an academic lingua franca. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1 (2)*, 263-285.

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in language: Investigating standard English*: Routledge.

Murata, K., & Iino, M. (2018). EMI in higher education: An ELF perspective. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 400-412): Routledge.

Neustupný, J. V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problem. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in Language Planning* (pp. 37-48). The Hague: Mouton.

Nguyen, H. T., Walkinshaw, I., & Pham, H. H. (2017). EMI programs in Vietnamese university: Language, pedagogy and policy issues. In B. Fenton, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 37-52): Springer.

North, B. (2007). The CEFR illustrative descriptor scales. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 656-659.

Ong, K. K. W., & Zhang, L. J. (2014). Codeswitching in university in Singapore. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 163-185): Multilingual Matters.

References

Ordudari, M. (2007). Translation procedures, strategies and methods. *Translational Journal, 11 (3)*, 1-5.

Palfreyman, D. M., & van der Walt, C. (2017). Introduction: Biliteracies in higher education. In D. M. Palfreyman & C. van der Walt (Eds.), *Academic Biliteracies: Multilingual Repertoires in Higher Education* (pp. 1-18): Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical Applied Linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 784-807): Blackwell Publishing.

Pérez-Milans, M., & Tollefson, J. W. (2018). Language policy and planning: directions for future research. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 727-741). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Perrin, S. (2017). The language policy and Transnational Education (TNE) institutions: What role for what English? In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific. From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 153-172): Springer.

Phillipson, R. (2015). English as a threat or opportunity in European higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 19-42): De Gruyter Mouton.

Phillipson, R. (2018). Foreword. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction Programmes. Perspectives from South East Asian Universities* (pp. xi-xv): Routledge.

Phuong-Mai, N., Terlouw, C., & Pilot, A. (2005). Cooperative learning vs Confucian heritage culture's collectivism: confrontation to reveal some cultural conflicts and mismatch. *Asia Europe Journal, 3 (3)*, 403-419.

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal, 78 (3)*, 313-326.

Pulcini, V., & Campagna, S. (2015). Internationalisation and the EMI controversy in Italian higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 65-88): De Gruyter Mouton.

Ranta, E. (2006). The 'attractive' progressive – why use the –ing form in English as a lingua franca? *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 5 (2)*, 95-116.

Ranta, E. (2009). Syntactic features in spoken ELF – learner language or spoken grammar? In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 84-106). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of sociolinguistics, 4 (2)*, 196-213.

Ricento, T. (2006). Language policy: Theory and practice – An introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 10-23): Blackwell Publishing.

Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *Tesol Quarterly, 30 (3)*, 401-427.

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillam.

Robinson, M. G. (2014). Codeswitching in university in Bhutan. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 104-117): Multilingual Matters.

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for Language Teaching*: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, J. (2018). Voices from the field: email interviews with Applied Linguistics in Asia. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction Programmes. Perspectives from South East Asian Universities* (pp. 15-28): Routledge.

Saarinen, T., & Nikula, T. (2013). Implicit policy, invisible language: policies and practices of international degree programmes in Finnish higher education. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges* (pp. 131-150): Multilingual Matters.

Saeed, M., Varghese, M., Holst, M., & Ghazali, K. (2018). Student perspectives of medium of instruction in Malaysia. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction Programmes. Perspectives from South East Asian Universities* (pp. 70-86): Routledge.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*: Cambridge University Press.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*: Sage Publications.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The Idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the Evolution of a Global Language*: Multilingual Matters.

Seargeant, P. (2012). *Exploring World Englishes: Language in a Global Context*: Routledge.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11 (2)*, 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 24*, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes, 28 (2)*, 236-245.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2018). Standard English and the dynamics of ELF variation. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 85-100): Routledge.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*: Routledge.

Smit, U. (2010a). Conceptualising English as a lingua franca (ELF) as a tertiary classroom language. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics, 39 (1)*, 59-74.

Smit, U. (2010b). *English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education: A Longitudinal Study of Classroom Discourse* (Vol. 2): Walter de Gruyter.

References

Smit, U. (2018). Beyond monolingualism in higher education. A language policy account. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 387-399): Routledge.

Smith, L. (1983). English as an international language: No room for linguistic chauvinism. In L. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an International Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Soler-Carbonell, J. (2015). Language policy in Estonian higher education: Internationalisation and the tension over English. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe, Volume 3* (pp. 247-265): De Gruyter Mouton.

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

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012). What is language policy? In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (pp. 3-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*: Sage.

Stroupe, R. (2014). Codeswitching in Japanese context. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 76-91): Multilingual Matters.

Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 30*, 128-148.

Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied linguistics, 32 (1)*, 25-42.

Talmy, S., & Richards, K. (2011). Theorizing qualitative research interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied linguistics, 32 (1)*, 1-5.

Tayjasanant, C. (2014). Codeswitching in university in Thailand. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 92-117): Multilingual Matters.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis*: Sage.

Tian, L. (2014). Codeswitching in a Chinese university. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 24-42): Multilingual Matters.

Tien, C.-Y. (2014). Codeswitching in a university in Taiwan. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives* (pp. 24-42): Multilingual Matters.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*: Longman.

Tollefson, J. W. (2002). Introduction: Critical issues in educational language policy. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (pp. 3-15): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 42-59): Blackwell Publishing.

Tollefson, J. W. (2010). Perspectives on language policy and planning. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 463-472). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (2013). Language policy in a time of crisis and transformation. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language Policies in Education Critical Issues* (pp. 11-34): Routledge.

Tran, T. T. (2013). Is the learning approach of students from the Confucian heritage culture problematic? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 12 (1)*, 57-65.

Trudgill, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*: Edinburgh University Press.

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 22*, 204-218.

Walkinshaw, I., Fenton-Smith, B., & Humphreys, P. (2017). EMI issues and challenges in Asia-Pacific higher education: An introduction. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy* (pp. 1-18): Springer.

Wei, L. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in society, 31 (2)*, 159-180.

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. 3-26): Multilingual Matters.

Wodak, R. (2006). Linguistic analyses in language policies. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 170-193): Blackwell Publishing.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education: The State of Play in 2014*: Lemmens.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*: Sage.