English-medium instruction (or EMI) principally refers to the teaching and learning of an academic subject (i.e. economic history, chemistry, aeronautical engineering, etc.) using English as the language of instruction, and usually without an explicit focus on language learning or specific language aims. However, applied linguistic EMI research has consistently suggested that to fully benefit from EMI, stakeholders need to be able to develop strategies to increase language awareness. In other words, teachers and learners need to display “[a] conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use” (Garrett, 2010: 293). This “heightened awareness may be expected to bring pupils to increase the language resources available to them and to foster their mastery of them” (Donmall, 1985: 7), as well as help develop positive attitudes towards languages, reflect upon their role in effective communication and interaction (Oliveira and Ança, 2011), and promote intercultural competence (Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2014). In view of this gap between EMI practice and policies and EMI research, this chapter will describe the current situation in EMI contexts and, concurrently, argue for a pressing need to reflect on, discuss, and increasingly incorporate language awareness foci in these settings.

Typically, and particularly in research conducted in Europe, EMI is used to refer to higher education institutions (HEIs) where English is not the/a national language and where well-established universities in the country’s respective national languages already exist. EMI programmes generally have two different but complementary objectives: 1) recruiting international talent (students and staff) and thus promoting incoming mobility, multilingual and multicultural groups and increasing revenue from international students; and 2) developing the so-called strategy of “internationalization at home” (Nilsson, 1999), which aims to make internationalization accessible to largely monolingual groups of national students and staff through the use of English and the incorporation of international goals and learning outcomes in the formal and informal curriculum (Leask, 2013: 106).
While EMI is a widespread term, there is still some debate about the extent to which it differs from other closely related concepts such as CLIL or ICLHE. CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is generally defined as a “dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for learning and teaching both content and language” (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010: 1). In other words, in the CLIL teaching context there is attention to both aspects even if the emphasis varies depending on the instructional focus. At present, the term CLIL is often used with a narrower scope in mind to refer specifically to primary and secondary levels of education (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Llinares, Morton and Whittaker, 2012), although some studies have also used it as a general label to include the tertiary level (see Dafouz and Guerrini, 2009; Fortanet-Gómez, 2013). In turn, the acronym ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education), first coined at the University of Maastricht in 2004, is usually reserved for tertiary-level programmes that have explicit and integrated content and language learning aims (Wilkinson, 2004). However, it could be said that, since its inception, the ICLHE focus has been mostly used in research circles that emphasize the importance of addressing language as a key component in the construction of knowledge and view “on-going teacher-student discourse as an integral part of teaching and learning” (Smit and Dafouz, 2012: 4), regardless of whether the programmes themselves include an explicit language focus.

EMI is, of course, not a new phenomenon. Particularly in the Outer Circle countries (Kachru, 1986), English has become part of the nations’ chief institutions as a direct result of their colonial past, and plays an important role as a second language in multilingual settings such as the legislature, judiciary, and also higher education. What is indeed new regarding EMI is the rapidity and the scale of its implementation worldwide, particularly in the Expanding Circle countries where English does not have a historical foothold. It is precisely this Expanding Circle that will be the focus of this chapter. Additionally, to narrow this focus further and offer a coherent account of EMI, it will concentrate on the European context, given that the conceptualization of EMI is most standardized in this setting and that the contextual variables are somewhat shared. For an examination of EMI policies, practices and research beyond the European setting, it is worth consulting the work by van Der Walt (2013) in South Africa, Dearden (2014) in the Outer Circle countries, Taguchi (2014) in Asian and Middle Eastern contexts, Hashimoto in Japan (2013) or de Wit, Jaramillo, Gacel-Ávila and Knight (2005), in Latin America – to name but a few.

Even within a European context, however, EMI cannot be regarded as a uniform reality but rather a complex, dynamic and ever-changing microcosm of programmes, policies and practices, where different stages of implementation, attitudes and reasons sometimes coexist peacefully and sometimes collide. An overview of EMI in Europe, its strong connection with language policies, common or best practices and the opportunities for increasing language awareness must therefore consider the perspectives of various stakeholders in relation to their specific contexts and highlight the mutable nature of EMI according to their demands and resources. In this vein, this chapter begins by providing a comprehensive picture of EMI programmes in the European context, with a special reference to language issues. It then examines common drivers for introducing EMI in European HEIs and introduces the ROAD-MAPPING framework (Dafouz and Smit, 2016) as an integrative model to explain the complex and dynamic nature of EMI and EMI research from an applied linguistic perspective. The chapter concludes with a call for acknowledging the importance of foregrounding language issues and
language awareness in this educational setting while also regarding it as an opportunity for a broad understanding of what teaching and learning in English as an additional language entails.

**EMI in Europe: General Overview**

A recent large-scale survey on EMI programmes in Europe (Wächter and Maiworm, 2014) revealed that a total of 2,637 higher education institutions in the 28 EU countries offer 8,089 courses taught entirely through English in non-English speaking contexts. By country, the Netherlands leads, followed by Germany and Sweden. By discipline, the greatest proportion of EMI programmes are taught in social sciences, business and law (35%), followed by sciences (23%) and engineering, manufacturing and construction (20%). The overall distribution across disciplines differs noticeably by level of study. The subject area group of social sciences, business and law is the clear leader in undergraduate (Bachelor-level) programmes (42%) while programmes in natural sciences tend to be offered more at the Master level (26%). Interestingly, and despite the substantial number of EMI courses offered, only a relatively small proportion of students across Europe are actually enrolled in English-taught programmes. For the academic year 2013/14, the survey yielded 1.3% of total student enrollment in the countries covered, a figure that translates into approximately 290,000 students, and indicates that EMI programmes still reach a relatively small number of students.

In this survey (Wächter and Maiworm, 2014), language issues are loosely grouped under the heading “Language matters” (pp. 21–24) addressing three main areas: the (foreign) language proficiency of students and teachers; language problems, viewed as the heterogeneity found in the classroom and the command of the domestic language by international students; and, finally, language support measures, understood as institutional assistance for improving foreign language competence as well as international students’ command of the domestic language. Concerning language proficiency, the large majority of Programme Directors “rated the proficiency in English of students enrolled in their programmes as good or very good (…). The only exceptions are Spain, France, Italy and Turkey where the proficiency of foreign students was rated higher than that of the domestic students” (p. 21). As regards academic staff, the report generally states that their level of proficiency is also perceived as good or very good (95%). These responses, however, do not match some of the specific research conducted on the language competence of the university staff (see section below on agents) and thus need to be examined in more detail. As for language problems, by and large the greatest language-related challenge reported by teaching staff was the capacity to deal with mixed-ability groups and the lecturer’s low level of foreign language competence. Finally, language support measures vary substantially across countries. By study level, English language training is more often a characteristic of first-cycle Bachelor programmes in south-west and south-east Europe than in other regions. This corresponds to the reportedly lower English proficiency of national students enrolled in Bachelor programmes. As regards training in the domestic language, France and Italy are the most active in this respect, but all in all, more than half of the institutions surveyed claim to offer support for improving the command of the home language (55%). Lastly, about half of the Master programmes and 70% of Bachelor programmes consulted reported that English proficiency is an important selection criterion for the recruitment of new academic staff. However, differences again emerge across countries, and, while in Belgium
59% and in the Netherlands 42% of the programme respondents stated that courses to improve English skills are mandatory, in other countries this level drops dramatically to 19% for a variety of reasons that fall beyond the scope of this chapter (but see Wächter and Maiworm, 2014: 110–12).

Drivers of EMI in Europe

Drivers behind the constant growth of EMI in Europe are closely connected to globalization and internationalization forces, to political economies and to the combination of supranational, national and institutional agendas that trickle down and meet in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Hultgren, Jensen and Dimova (2015: 6–7) offer a clear and succinct overview of the five different levels that, in their view, facilitate EMI at the tertiary level. At the top level, they place global drivers such as the World General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS), which has had an enormous impact on the way tertiary education is perceived and provided, as university students are generally seen as ‘consumers’ rather than learners. Similarly, it has been claimed that, in some countries, “entrepreneurial groups play a stronger role than ministries of education in formulating […] education policies” (Tilak, 2011: 88). Secondly, there are specific European drivers, such as the construction of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in the early 2000s, which has facilitated the free circulation of students and staff across borders, as well as curricular harmonization. Thirdly, we find national drivers from different governments across the continent in the form of policies supporting the internationalization of the tertiary sector and the search for academic excellence. In Spain, for example, in 2014 the Spanish Ministry of Education launched the “Strategy for the Internationalization of Spanish Universities”, which pursues the goal of having one out of three degree programmes taught through EMI by 2020 in order to attract international talent. Fourthly, there are institutional drivers that see an opportunity to add value to universities or programmes which face strong competition from other home universities and neighbouring countries, and thus EMI is perceived as “an excellent chance to create highly qualified workers who could also instantly adapt to working abroad” (Hernández-Nanclares and Jiménez-Muñoz, 2015: 2). In this vein, scoring high in university rankings and gaining quality assurance seals by different accreditation agencies is often seen as a means of measuring HEIs’ excellence – a feature frequently connected to the international profile of the institution and the number of EMI programmes offered (Hultgren, 2014; Komori-Glatz and Unterberger, forthcoming). Finally, at the bottom end of the scale we encounter classroom drivers, where English needs to be used as a lingua franca to facilitate communication and instruction amongst international students, domestic students and teachers (Jenkins, 2014; Smit, 2010).

However, while all these economic, political, social and institutional drivers are clearly listed as reasons to swiftly adopt EMI across non-English speaking countries, language issues are surprisingly low (or simply invisible) in the political agendas of HEIs. Paradoxically, improving student English academic skills is one of the key motivations for implementing EMI, especially at BA level and is thus an expected learning outcome, but it is seldom included in the curriculum. In light of this, the next section will explicitly refer to language issues and the opportunities for language awareness in the implementation of EMI with the help of the ROAD-MAPPING framework and its six intersecting dimensions.
Road-Mapping as a Synthesizing Framework

Though a fast-growing body of literature is gradually providing greater insights and support to the EMI scenario in Europe (e.g. Coleman, 2006; Dimova, Hultgren and Jensen, 2015; Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2013; Smit and Dafouz, 2012, amongst others), one of the first attempts to offer a fully articulated theoretical model for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings (or EMEMUS) is, to our knowledge, the ROAD-MAPPING framework (Dafouz and Smit, 2016). This framework, as Figure 11.1 above shows, places discourse(s) at the centre, “functioning as the point of access to the six different components” (p. 404), which can be analysed in a variety of EMI settings. These dimensions are: Roles of English (in relation to other languages) (RO), Academic Disciplines (AD), (language) Management (M), Agents (A), Practices and Processes (PP), and Internationalization and Glocalization (ING). All six dimensions are examined from an applied linguistic angle, and more specifically, adopt a combination of sociolinguistic, ecoulnguistic and language policy perspectives (see Blommaert, 2010; Hult, 2010; Scollon and Scollon, 2004). This approach thus places language issues, communication and language awareness at the core of present-day communication exchanges in a globalized society with increasing numbers of international, multilingual and English-medium HEIs.

As stated in the opening lines of this chapter, the ROAD-MAPPING framework and its six dimensions are used to synthesize the wide range of research conducted under the EMI umbrella, and to foreground the language focus. While the dynamic and holistic nature of the framework “inevitably implies grey areas” (Dafouz and Smit, 2016: 411), at the same time it enables the researcher to zoom into a particular component without losing sight of the remaining ones. ROAD-MAPPING is therefore particularly useful for analysing a complex and ever-changing phenomenon such as EMI from a range of perspectives.

Roles of English

This first dimension, Roles of English (RO) and its relationship with other languages, is seen as the common denominator for EMI programmes. However, far from being monolithic, English adopts a variety of roles depending on its functions, status and
relation to other languages in a given context. For instance, in a multilingual region, such as Catalonia (Spain), English shares ground with two official languages (Spanish and Catalan). Hence its role and place in the HEI need to be spelt out explicitly since these might “be regarded as threats to [speakers’] identities and to their rights to use their own language” (Cots, Llurda and Garrett, 2014: 311). By contrast, in traditionally and officially monolingual regions or countries, there is not the same concern with language policy and thus the role of English tends to emerge on a more ad hoc basis depending on other drivers. Issues of language policy and management will be revisited and expanded in the section below on the language management dimension.

One of the major transformations that EMI has brought to HEIs is a change of paradigm in how English is viewed, from regarding it originally as a foreign language to be learned in class and used abroad, to conceptualizing it as a lingua franca. From this perspective, English is primarily used to enable the rapidly changing groups of students and teachers to communicate and construct knowledge despite their diverse linguistic repertoires, and its speakers are perceived as being users rather than learners of the language (Björkman, 2013; Hynninen, 2012; Mauranen, 2012). Research conducted within this paradigm analyses the multifunctional roles that English and other languages fulfil in multilingual settings, their subsequent interactional practices (Cogo, 2012; Hynninen, 2012), the way these practices may change over time (Smit, 2010) and also the translanguaging and code-alternation that students and teachers might use in their exchanges (Kalocsai, 2013). Finally, some of the conflicting views that stakeholders may show regarding the use of one vs. various languages in the classroom has also received attention (Bowles and Cogo, 2015). In this vein, studies suggest that there might be a connection between an institution’s prior traditions or an individual’s personal experience in dealing with international classrooms and their treatment of and response to students’ multilingual repertoires (Dafouz, Hüttner and Smit, 2016). In the case of universities or individuals with a shorter tradition of internationalization, the use of various languages in the classroom is often reported in teacher interviews as a “deficiency” and connected to factors such as insufficient teacher or student language proficiency, the use of inadequate materials, or to unnecessary interferences with the target language. In contrast, in classrooms with more experience and tradition of multilingual students, the very same practices may be viewed as a resource rather than an obstacle for communication and learning (Jenkins, 2014).

While the changing role of English, its ideological value and pervasiveness have been strongly criticized in post-structuralist discourse (see Bolton and Kuteeva, 2012; Phillipson, 2006) and seen as a threat to the sustainability of linguistic ecologies, the number of EMI courses continues to grow. Hence, there is an ever more urgent need to develop explicit ELF-oriented pedagogies that show respect for the different languages and cultures of learning, as well as their instructional roles in the classroom, so as to raise language awareness amongst professionals and students. These issues will be covered more extensively in the section below on practices and processes.

**Academic Disciplines (AD)**

The second dimension, *Academic Disciplines (AD)*, is described in relation to the different teaching and learning genres, curricular design, and assessment methods used in the academic setting depending on the inherent characteristics of each discipline or sets of disciplines. Drawing on the classic work by Becher (1989), previous research
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has examined the connections between subject disciplinary language and students’ academic achievement (see Dafouz, Camacho and Urquía, 2014). This study aimed to analyse whether student academic achievement in English varies depending on the discursive construction of knowledge of three different subjects that range from more linguistically demanding (i.e. economic history) to less linguistically demanding (i.e. financial accounting and mathematics). Findings showed that the more verbal subject, namely economic history, yielded slightly higher student results – an outcome that runs counter to the initial expectations raised by the learners themselves who emphasized the linguistic complexity of the discipline. In any case, the question of assessment is a complex one in all educational contexts, “but probably even more so in EMI settings, as issues of foreign language correction tie in inextricably with content achievement” (Dafouz, Camacho and Urquía, 2014: 11) and thus need to be carefully examined.

With a different focus in mind, namely, the development of academic disciplinary literacy, Airey’s studies in Sweden (2010, 2012) point out that when two or more languages are involved (i.e. the local language(s) and English), the balance between the disciplinary languages is somewhat contested and, concurrently, related to the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge and language. In his work in the field of physics, student construction of knowledge in two languages (i.e. Swedish and English) requires the lecturer to become “a discourse guide” (…), as learners run the risk of “code mixing English terms into their Swedish disciplinary discourse even when well-established Swedish terms do exist” (p. 76). Other work by Kuteeva and Airey (2014) goes a step further and, drawing on a mixed data set of policy documents from the Swedish Language Council, teacher interviews and examples from PhD theses from a wide range of disciplines, concludes that the disciplinary variation in the use of English can be seen as a result of different knowledge-making practices and educational goals. This conclusion problematizes language policies that are too broad and only deal with general features of language use, not allowing for discipline-specific adjustments. Such findings have strong implications for policy-makers across Europe, and also for content teachers, especially in those contexts where English is used for academic writing (MA theses, Doctoral programmes, scientific reports, etc.) or for research publications but, paradoxically, where no specific training in disciplinary literacy is offered to students.

The development of such decisive disciplinary practices, which typically belonged to EAP and ESP courses within the degree programmes, has lately been removed from the official curriculum of many HEIs (Räisänen and Fortanet-Gómez, 2008: 45; Arnò-Macià and Mancho-Barés, 2015), as decision-makers (e.g. deans or degree coordinators) wrongly assume that formal English language instruction is no longer needed, since EMI students are totally or partially immersed in an English-speaking setting. To counteract this shortcoming, lecturers may find themselves offering students ad hoc language support in the form of subject-specific glossaries in their first languages, while at the same time resenting this complicated situation and the additional workload it represents (see the section below on practices and processes for a follow-up on this).

Finally, within this dimension it would be interesting to examine whether the same governing principles in, for instance, assessment methods or curricula design would still be applicable in other EMI contexts. The question of whether academic practices from English-speaking HEIs need to be adapted to fit particular national contexts or simply imported needs to be discussed, as it could indeed be viewed as “[a] risk of homogenizing disciplines and following an (Anglocentric) monocultural model for the sake of internationalization” (Smit and Dafouz, 2012: 8–9).
(Language) Management

Dimension three, *(Language) Management*, refers to language policy statements and declarations issued by social agents representing socio-political bodies at various hierarchical levels, as well as the means used by institutions to handle the language situation (see also the section below on agents).

At a macro-level, European agencies and institutions as well as national and regional governments form a group of collective entities that regard EMI as a logical and natural consequence of internationalization, and which often simply identify internationalization with Englishization. These institutions have the power to design and implement policies and measures frequently “charged with implicit value judgements” that are often overlooked (Dalton-Puffer, 2012: 102) and that clearly need to be treated with caution. To this end, the IntlUni Erasmus Academic Project (2015) has developed a set of recommendations designed to enable HEIs “to address the challenges and opportunities of the multilingual and multicultural learning space and to pursue quality teaching and learning in this space” (Lauridsen, Dafouz, Stavicka and Wetter, 2015: 11). These recommendations are a set of guidelines directed at national and regional authorities and European actors, as all three have different levels of responsibility in the implementation of EMI policies in HE.

A substantial body of research deals with the societal mechanisms behind the organization, management and also manipulation of language behaviours in HEIs (Shohamy, 2006; Hughes, 2008). In response to internationalization, Risager (2012) identifies three main types of language policies: (1) a monolingual policy of using English more or less exclusively; (2) a bilingual policy where English is used together with the national language; and (3) a trilingual (or multilingual) policy where English is used with the national and the regional language(s). This type of research, conducted particularly in multilingual contexts with minority languages (see Cots, Lasagabaster, and Garrett, 2012) as well as in Nordic countries (Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011), adopts a critical stance towards EMI, in that it decrccies tertiary education’s views of local languages as a possible obstacle to their internationalization strategies (see also the section below on internationalization and glocalization). All in all, the debate around EMI and language management is indeed “a particular aspect of the complexities faced by the internationalising education provider” (Hughes, 2008: 115), which foregrounds questions of equity, access and quality that need to be taken into account more systematically, especially in settings where monolingualism has been the norm until very recently.

Agents

Dimension four, *Agents*, describes the social players engaged in EMI, whether viewed as individuals (teachers, students, administrators or researchers) or as collective entities (faculty, rectorate, student unions, etc.). While *Agents* may initially seem a straightforward category, it is interesting to identify the multifaceted and dynamic nature of their roles and the importance of raising language awareness precisely at this level of intervention, since they, as decision-makers, usually have the power and the means to introduce (or not) changes as regards language management policies.

Macro-, meso- and micro-levels (Hult, 2010) have often been quoted as a way to group agents and the drivers behind the implementation of EMI policies and
practices (see the section on language management). At the macro-level, internationalization and university rankings have fostered a set of new agents known under the labels of strategic partnerships and networks (e.g. League of European Research Universities – LERU, Coimbra Group, Network of Universities from the Capitals of Europe – UNICA, etc.), which provide opportunities for the exchange of knowledge and experience across countries and governance levels and which also attempt to influence decision-makers at the European level (Yagci, 2014). Similarly, on a national plane, universities are teaming up in so-called alliances to gain visibility, share resources, promote joint actions (in fields related to research and the international and academic mobility of stakeholders) and encourage international liaisons. Given the strategic position of these meta-organizations, it would be advisable to include in their political agenda explicit language-awareness issues that could be articulated more specifically at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels in the form of recommendations for curricular transformation, monetary funding, teacher education programmes and teaching and learning practices.

At the micro-level, we find a myriad of individuals and collective entities that face EMI contexts with very different needs, expectations, and objectives in mind. Students, for instance, usually engage in EMI programmes to gain a competitive advantage and enhance their foreign language skills and their employability. Researchers and lecturers, in turn, view it as a means of international career development, as well as gaining access to innovative and updated information, which is often (first/only) published in English. Teachers may see EMI as an opportunity to use classroom materials (textbooks, slides, media resources, etc.) produced in English and thus find the switch to EMI less threatening than initially estimated.

Finally, administrative staff are hugely under-represented in this equation. Despite being a key constituency at universities, they are “often ignored when analysing policies or attitudes related to higher education” (Llurda, Cots and Armengol, 2014: 376). Yet administrative personnel are habitually the first point of call for students and international staff, as they are responsible for sending out crucial information (e.g. enrollment, the cancellation or relocation of classes, reminders of deadlines, etc.). Since the number of incoming and outgoing international students and staff is gradually increasing (European Commission, 2014), any strategic policy that HEIs design and implement, whether connected to internationalization or university governance, should undoubtedly include administrative agents, given their crucial role in the managing of any innovations. In this respect, the Spanish Rectorate’s Conference (CRUE) has recently published a report on language policies in higher education that includes administrative staff, together with students and academic staff, as a key agent in the successful implementation of such policies (Bazo, Centella, Dafouz, Fernández, González and Pavón, 2017).

**Practices and Processes**

Dimension five, *Practices and Processes*, addresses the teaching and learning activities that construct and are constructed by specific EMI realities. They focus on an individual’s sociolinguistic choices and how they reflect “habitual patterns of selecting among the different varieties that make up a community’s linguistic repertoire” (Spolsky, 2004: 8). This layer connects with the section on the roles of English, where lecturers’ monolingual or multilingual practices in the classroom are seen to be strongly connected to their prior experiences and views of EMI. Such a dimension enables research to focus on
practices that may often go unnoticed, to recognize that practices are equally important as products, and to foreground some of the methodological changes that multilingual universities have brought with them. This dimension is probably less developed than others, mainly as a result of a common lack of pedagogical reflection in university teachers’ practice. However, as this reality gradually changes, supranational EU bodies, for example through KA and Erasmus+ projects, and other national and regional teacher education programmes, are beginning to include methodological components and language awareness strategies as key components in their teacher development courses. An EU example of these initiatives is, for instance, the IntlUni project (2012–15) referred to in the section on language management, which, drawing on data from 27 countries and 38 HEIs, has produced a set of guiding principles for the development of best practices and language policies for teacher education in international settings.

Early research on EMI practices includes a variety of topics ranging from lecturing styles (Dafouz, Núñez and Sancho, 2007), student and lecturer development and the construction of disciplinary content (see the section on academic disciplines) to ELF practices in multilingual contexts (see the section on the roles of English). Additionally, other works (although less numerous) offer insights into how to integrate content and language and develop pedagogical implications (Wilkinson and Walsh, 2015).

One of the most frequently mentioned issues in interviews and surveys when dealing with Practices and Processes is that of assessment. Assessment is referred to as an element that deserves specific attention but is usually avoided (Dafouz, Hüttner and Smit, 2016). This avoidance is very likely connected to the opaque role of language in content teachers’ evaluations of student results and to teachers’ lack of specialist training in this area. While some recent research has purposefully addressed the role of language competence in student academic achievement (see Ament and Perez-Vidal, 2015; Hernández-Nanclares and Jiménez-Muñoz, 2015), there is still a pressing need for awareness-raising on the part of lecturers and researchers, but also university authorities, so that foreign language competence is regarded not only as a requisite for university access to EMI courses but, more importantly, as an outcome of completing a degree.

Internationalization and Glocalization

Finally, dimension six, Internationalization and Glocalization, portrays the tensions but also the synergies that exist between the global and the local forces that are shaping 21st-century universities. As EMI is deemed one of the major strategies to enhance the international profile of HEIs, there is a substantial body of research in this line. Much of the research in this dimension points at language policies and how institutions cater (or more often do not cater) to the language implications of EMI. Studies address questions of equity and quality at national, institutional and individual levels (see Hughes, 2008), advocating that HEIs without a robust but at the same time flexible language policy, adequate preparatory education programmes and on-going support may, in the long term, damage both the quality of teaching and their own (international) brand.

Closely linked to internationalization and globalization factors lie the notions of Intercultural Competence and Intercultural Citizenship (Byram, 2012), understood as the need to respect and value participation in communities at a range of levels from the local to the global. Nevertheless, there is still much debate concerning the extent to which internationalization experiences, such as student and academic mobility, actually
result in the development of intercultural competences and whether these aims should be explicitly included as learning outcomes in the internationalization of the curriculum.

By and large, and in spite of the very diverse nature of EMI implementation at tertiary level, there is a common concern about the effects of EMI on the ecology of languages at each university. This concern should be examined very carefully in multilingual universities where the “weight” of some languages is clearly heavier than others and where respect for a student’s repertoire of languages needs to be developed.

ROAD-MAPPING has been presented here as a conceptual framework for structuring the complexity of interacting dimensions in EMI settings with a language and communication focus in mind. The next section focuses on the research methods that have been used to elicit language awareness practices and help to better conceptualize EMI language policies.

Current Research Methods in EMI

Given the variety of research foci, contexts and practices involved in EMI research, investigation methods vary greatly. Therefore, this section will deal with research that overtly elicits and supports language awareness policies and practices amongst stakeholders. One of the preferred methods for data gathering in early EMI research was the sociolinguistic survey (Fowler, 2002). The choice of survey was regarded as a practical one since it was mostly used to examine agents’ attitudes and beliefs towards language, practices and/or professional identities, and could be distributed amongst a large population (see Lasagabaster, 2015). Information gathered via surveys is also more amenable to quantification, and relative rates of success can then be presented in a manner that is digestible for policy-makers and university or educational authorities (see Dimova, Hulgren and Jensen, 2015: 317–320). However, data obtained using this method, while generalizable and transferable, may fall short of providing the detailed accounts and context-sensitive interpretations needed.

Studies drawing on more ethnographic methods necessarily adopt a variety of qualitative instruments of analysis. One of the most popular in EMI settings has probably been the interview (Aguilar and Rodriguez, 2012; Airey, 2012; Dafouz et al., 2016; Dimova and Kling, 2015; Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011). Interviews may be structured or semi-structured and address smaller samples of populations in specific settings, focusing on participant interpretations, motivations, opinions and practices for implementing or following EMI programmes. In addition, other studies have used questionnaires, whether online or face-to-face, to conduct a needs analysis of academic staff and/or student views and experiences or have relied on focus groups to elicit comments in an interactive group setting where participants are free to talk with other group members and touch upon a variety of topics (Llurda et al., 2014; Studer, 2015). Documentary analyses of policy documents from specific countries and institutions have also been conducted from a qualitative perspective, especially in settings where ministerial orders or decrees have been introduced to regulate the use and status of national and minority languages in relation to English and EMI practices (e.g. Nordic Council of Ministers, 2007; Swedish Government, 2009; Jenkins, 2014).

Comparisons of EMI and non-EMI cohorts examining language variables have also been conducted. In particular, studies have analysed student foreign language competence across the four skills in an attempt to measure the language gains of EMI students (see for example Hellekjaer, 2009 on reading; or Ament and Pérez-Vidal, 2015
on listening, lexis and grammar, and writing). Generally speaking, these studies claim that attention to language issues need to be taken into consideration, should we want EMI programmes to be effective, credible and lasting.

Finally, from the classroom discourse perspective, analyses of instructional interactions have been undertaken since the introduction of EMI (see the section on the roles of English). These discursive studies are probably extended as a result of the strong recommendations of applied linguists in the area (e.g. the CLIL and ELF research networks under the auspices of AILA). In any case, such work is of importance not only because it portrays different classroom practices in a new teaching and learning scenario but also because it reflects ways of dealing with societal and educational changes which have communication issues at their very centre.

**Future Trajectories in EMI Research, Policies and Language Awareness**

The good health of EMI research is unquestionable, as attested to by the number of papers and books published yearly and conferences organized worldwide. However, what arguably needs to be examined more carefully is the type of research conducted and its true impact on raising language awareness in university EMI policies and teaching practices.

Regarding research methods, it would be advisable for prospective studies to search for a broader range of research designs and methodological approaches so that, in addition to the earlier exploratory surveys (mostly of a descriptive nature and focused on teacher and student opinions and individual experiences), more experimental work with controlled intervening variables could be conducted. Further ethnographic research adopting a longitudinal perspective would also be desirable and serve two important purposes: 1) to describe patterns of change and 2) to explain causal relationships. In the particular case of EMI, and applied linguistics in general (see Dornyei, 2007: 79), time is a central concern, as learning (whether of language or content) inevitably happens through and over time. Thus, teaching and learning is most meaningfully interpreted from a fully longitudinal perspective, while a long-term view also enables HEIs and policy-makers to see the fruits of their strategies. Thirdly, cross-national or multi-sited studies (Halonen, Ihalainen and Saarinen, 2014), which are often under-represented in EMI research, would likewise be welcome. A multi-sited data set can help add to the diversity of the data pool and thus provide wider possibilities for identifying traits characteristic of EMI international contexts than single-sited sets of data can, without disregarding contextual factors. Thus future research could well work on developing the mechanisms and conceptual frameworks to broaden this type of investigation (see Nikula, Dafouz, Moore and Smit, 2016). As regards research topics, there is clearly a need for further work on the inevitable tensions between English and other minority languages in the academic context (both in teaching and publication), the (possible) impact of English on student L1 literacy, the concern with L1 domain loss or issues on assessment in EMI settings.

With regard to the observable impact of EMI on raising language awareness at a policy level, some important steps have been taken in the direction of topicalizing the role of language and communication in EMI contexts, as shown by this handbook, the ROAD-MAPPING framework, and the research and reports included in this chapter. Nevertheless, such an ambitious goal definitely needs the collaboration of institutions at European, national and institutional levels as well as the support
of researchers and practitioners, and the accompanying financial provision. At a teaching level, as seen in this chapter, increased language awareness is gradually being integrated into teacher development courses, so that linguistic gains can be clearly appreciated and measured. In the case of the introduction of EMI for the first time, such language guidance becomes even more important, especially since higher levels of language competence and academic abilities seem to have a direct impact on student academic achievement.

Finally, the development of meta-analyses of EMI language policies and language practices is also vital as these offer a systematic way of organizing and synthesizing the rapidly expanding research literature while concurrently allowing for a holistic overview. Nevertheless “the quality of the ultimate analysis depends on the quality of the underlying studies” as Dornyei (2007: 241) rightly argues, and in this matter all of us engaged in EMI have our share of responsibility.
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