Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, Vol 22, June 2022, pp. 619-636
DOI: 10.15738/kjell.22..202206.619

KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

ISSN: 1598-1398 / e-ISSN 2586-7474

http://journal.kasell.or.kr

Bifurcated Language Policy and Practice: English Only Policies vs. De Facto Translingual Practices in English-Medium Instruction Classrooms at a Korean University*

Jung Sook Kim (Daegu University)

Received: May 22, 2022
Revised: June 23, 2022
Accepted: June 30, 2022

Jung Sook Kim,
Assistant Professor
Multiculturalism and Social Policy
Daegu Univ.
Tel: 053-850-4603
jungskkim@daegu.ac.kr

* This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea/ the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2021S1A5B8096275).

ABSTRACT

Kim, Jung Sook. 2022. Bifurcated language policy and practice: English only policies vs. De facto translingual practices in English-medium instruction classrooms at a Korean university. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 22, 619-636.

This study investigates the discourse of the English-medium instruction (EMI) policy and practices at a Korean university from a trans-turn perspective. It analyzes the discourse across different levels of language policy concerning EMI: macro-level language ideology, meso-level language management, and micro-level language practice. The study reveals that the language policy is hierarchically bifurcated among differentially valorized languages and that EMI is entangled with native-speakerism and elitism. Further, it demonstrates that de facto translingual and trans-semiotizing practices were enacted in the EMI spaces, which emerged from the EMI instructors' struggles with the discrepancy between the imposed policy and practice. The findings suggest that despite the perceived monolingual ideology of English Only, an EMI classroom, by its nature, is a heteroglossic space in which multilingual resources are mobilized, and thus, translingual/trans-semiotizing practices are inevitably allowed for meaning negotiation. This study makes a case for the significance of these translingual and trans-semiotic features in multilingual contexts in embracing linguistic diversity as a total semiotic repertoire for meaning-making.

KEYWORDS

translingual practices, semiotic repertoire, English-medium instruction (EMI), language ideology, language policy, critical discourse analysis

1. Introduction

English-medium instruction (EMI) has been considered one of the global trends in educational innovations and the internationalization of higher education (HE) (Bolton and Botha 2020). With the rise of globalization and widespread English worldwide, EMI in content areas has become promoted in Asian universities (Barnard 2018, Kirkpatrick 2017). Walkinshaw, Fenton-Smith, and Hamphreys (2017) point out three critical reasons for the burgeoning EMI in Asia-Pacific HE: the rise in the geopolitical status of English as a lingua franca; the expansion of HE in the region; and the boom in large-scale internationalization education policies by Asia-Pacific governments. The expected positive outcomes of the EMI policy are the improvement of students' English proficiency and the increased appearance of the internationalization of HE. However, there has not yet been reported about the practical outcomes of the EMI policy as it claims as its goal, and the EMI policy has not entailed entirely positive effects (De Costa, Green-Eneix and Li 2021, Galloway, Numajiri and Rees 2020). EMI in non-English speaking countries, like Korea, brings about complicated issues for the stakeholders involved: students, instructors, institutions, policymakers, and so forth (Kim and Tatar 2017, Toh 2020, Wilkinson 2013). Some common drawbacks resulting from the policy are reported as follows: the enforcement of EMI across academic disciplines without considering discipline-specific characteristics and practices; issues due to varying levels of both students' and instructors' English proficiency; the top-down implementation of the policy without thorough preparation in terms of supporting infrastructure; the increased amount of teaching and learning load for the faculty and students (Byun et al. 2011, Kim, Kim and Kweon 2018).

Indeed, EMI is not merely a linguistic change but is a geopolitical, economic, and ideological phenomenon impacting the entire university ecosystem (Madhavan Brochier 2016). An EMI space constitutes both an enabling and constraining context depending on how various semiotic resources can operate in the space. The most debated question surrounding EMI is its feasibility in light of limitations in English language skills which may inhibit students' ability to explore abstract disciplinary concepts (Airey 2015, Duff 1997). Conventional EMI settings disapprove of participants' L1 resources. In such spaces, the use of other languages but English is excluded, and the roles of the languages are overlooked in knowledge construction and communication. Some argue that the EMI may hamper the depth of students' knowledge acquisition, and the students may achieve more effectively and efficiently when done in their L1 with smaller amounts of time and effort than in English (Airey et al. 2017). Many existing studies consistently report that the use of L1 in EMI classes is evident in varying degrees (Kang and Park 2004). In more recent research, the use of L1 and other languages is newly approached in terms of its pedagogical potential, particularly from a translingual perspective, which is advocated by "a trans-turn" in the field of language studies (Hawkins 2018, Zhang and Wei 2021). From this point of view, translingual practices are reconceptualized as the fulfillment of semiotic repertoires for meaning-making (Canagarajah 2021, Lin 2018). In the same vein, the 'E' in EMI is also reconceptualized as English as a lingua franca (ELF) rather than as any single variety of English, such as American English and British English (Baker 2021, Kuteeva 2020). Those reconceptualizations of language and language use underscore that EMI is embedded in multilingual contexts with other languages also in the presence. Such inclusive and transformative moves are underpinned by the argument that the use of L1 and the mobilization of different semiotic resources for meaning-making is sound and legitimate pedagogical practice in educational settings.

With the ever-increasing transnational mobility, the dynamics of meaning-making among a vast array of semiotic resources in communication have come to the fore in the field of language studies. The significance of translingual and trans-semiotic practices is clear, particularly in the era of the trans-turn in language studies (Hawkins 2018). In effect, language ideologies about language mixing may be one major obstacle to moving

towards more embracing and inclusive multilingualism in education. The trans-turn makes it possible for all semiotic resources, otherwise likely subject to the ideological power relations of dominance and subordination, to reclaim their importance in meaning-making (García and Li Wei 2014). The trans-perspective can offer a heuristic lens to investigate how a varied array of semiotic resources are at work in constructing meaning in a multicultural and multilingual space, such as the EMI classroom, which is often imbued with ideological tensions among differences (Kim 2020). The EMI is one instance of the enactment of monolingual ideology by the language regimes (Kroskrity 2000), which often reproduce and perpetuate social inequalities. Thus, substantive attention should be paid to investigating the subliminal working of ideologies and discourse in constructing social order (Fairclough 2015). A growing body of literature corroborates translingual practices functioning in EMI settings in knowledge construction, communication, and meaning-making (Rahman and Singh 2021). Those studies have begun recognizing such translingual practices as common in multilingual and multicultural contact zones in meaning negotiation (Canagarajah 2021, Chang 2019, Kim and Richardson 2018). However, translingual practices in EMI in the Korean context are a relatively unexplored area, and a paucity of research and scholarly work has been conducted. Given the growing scholarly interest in translingualism worldwide and the concept's significance in reformulating innovative and inclusive language pedagogy, it is well worth the heuristic exploration of translingual practices in EMI in Korean HE.

To address the abovementioned issues, this study examines from a trans-turn perspective how translingual practices are actualized in EMI in a Korean context. Building on recent efforts among critical linguists to move toward a more inclusive trans-semiotic reality in language education (e.g., Pennycook 2014, Shohamy 2013), this article explores such emerging translingual practices in a contact zone (Pratt 1991). And it seeks to articulate the processes of trans-semiotizing practices. The present study aims to add to the existing body of knowledge with some empirical evidence of translingual practices gleaned from the EMI settings in Korean HE. The research questions that guide this study are as follows: What are the language ideologies embedded in EMI policy? How are translingual practices enacted in EMI in a local Korean university context?; How are the language ideologies of EMI experienced by EMI instructors?; What challenges and issues may the faculty members encounter regarding EMI in Korean contexts?

The focus of the analysis is on the discourse across different levels of language policy concerning EMI: macro-level language ideology, meso-level language management, and micro-level language practice. For the conceptual framework for the current study, I use Spolsky's (2009) tripartite conceptualization of language policy: language ideology, language management, and language practice. Language ideology refers to attitudes and assumptions about language and language use, "the values or statuses assigned to named languages, varieties, and features" (ibid. p. 4). Language management involves "any specific efforts to modify or influence language practice by any kind of language intervention." (ibid. p. 5). Finally, language practice refers to "the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire (ibid. p. 5)." These three constitutive components of language policy are "interrelated but independently describable." (p. 4). The EMI policy's driving forces often operate on three levels: global or national, institutional, and individual. Spolsky's (2009) framework is suitable to account for these macro, meso, and micro levels of the EMI operation.

I begin by situating the current study of translingual practices within the relevant literature on the issues and concerns entailed by EMI. After a brief overview of the literature on existing work on translingual practices and EMI, I shall provide an example of the EMI practice at a local university, presenting the narratives of international faculty members who perform a role as EMI practitioners. I shall highlight and problematizes language policies among many issues through the illustration of the case of an EMI policy at the university. The findings demonstrate that translingual practices in EMI classrooms de facto promote content learning and students' engagement. The

implications drawn from the study are discussed based on the findings, and then the article concludes with some suggestions for future studies on translingual practices.

2. Translingual Practices and EMI

EMI refers to an educational setting in which English is used as the medium of instruction to "teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the L1 of the majority of the population is not English (Macaro et al. 2018, p. 37)." An EMI model commonly adopted in instructional practices in Korea has often been perceived that an instructor should teach a subject area of the discipline only through English, and students would not be allowed to use their L1 in class (Kim, Kim and Kweon 2018). However, much of the research on EMI has reported the actual use of L1 in EMI classrooms, albeit its functions and roles are not being acknowledged as much as English (Breeze and Roothooft 2021, Kang and Park 2004). Indeed, unlike the ideally envisaged model of an EMI classroom in which English Only is fully implemented while L1 or other languages would never be employed, some research shows that both English and L1 and/or other languages are often utilized in EMI classes (Kang and Park 2004, Toh 2020). The positive effects of the use of L1 in EMI have been consistently documented by a substantial body of research (Jenkins 2014, Lin 2018). Kang and Park's (2004) study found that Korean was mainly used to facilitate discussions and class activities among students, and English was utilized to deliver a lecture or presentation. Their finding indicates that L1 serves to facilitate much more interactional activities, whereas English may be in the service of unidirectional communication.

Yet, while many existing studies advocate the use of L1, they tend to attribute the necessity of L1 to students' insufficient proficiency in English rather than in recognition of L1 as a legitimate and valuable resource for learning available to the students. More importantly, the EMI policy does not ground itself in the principle of student-centered pedagogy, which builds upon what the students already have and thus accommodates their needs and desires. Instead, the policy contributes to the production and reinforcement of ideological discourse about the privileged status of English by legitimating only the knowledge produced in English while devaluing the knowledge constructed in the L1 (Shohamy 2013). Students' L1 thus has often been, explicitly or implicitly, relegated to a status of an illegitimate medium for instruction (Breeze and Roothooft 2021). As such, the EMI policy, as Kirkpatrick (2017) astutely points out, serves as an ideological proxy for Englishization. In this regard, and to a varying extent, EMI results in the perpetuation of linguistic inequalities, which is in stark contradiction to the pursuit of inclusive diversity on campus promulgated by the so-called internationalization initiative of HE.

EMI is embedded in multilingual contexts with other languages also present. Due to the very multilingual nature of EMI, translingual practices and the related ideas of transmodality and transcultural communication are highly relevant (Preece 2022). Translanguaing and other current translingual movements debunk "the misconception of the monopoly of English as the norm in EMI classrooms (Tai and Li Wei 2021, p. 638)." Tsou (2021) makes a case for the research on translanguaging in EMI in Asia's HE, providing an overview of the opportunities and key challenges of EMI at the policy and implementation levels, and discussing the concepts and the use of translanguaging as a glocalized strategy in Asia's ELF contexts. Yuan and Yang's (2021) study investigates a teacher educator's perceptions and translingual practices in EMI teacher education classrooms, revealing three translingual strategies used by the teacher educator: integrating academic discourse with everyday discourse, linking verbal and other semiotic resources, and using students' L1 to create a 'translanguaging space' in the EMI classroom. Notably, students' resistance to the university EMI policy was identified as a challenge facing the teacher educator. Huang (2021) explores the perception of local and international students in EMI in business at a

private university in Taiwan and shows translanguaging as a natural yet limited practice in EMI settings. The author highlights the importance of raising awareness of translingual pedagogy on the part of instructors and policymakers, arguing that using different resources reflects learner enactment of their agency.

Focusing on how language is conceptualized in EMI, the critical scholars on translingual practices (e.g., Canagarajah 2021, García and Li Wei 2014) propose a pedagogical perspective that centers on greater awareness of the multilingual and multicultural nature of EMI and advocates the trans-turn that embraces the full linguistic and sociocultural repertories of the participants. Recent studies on EMI have begun to consider the translingual practices, such as translanguaging, in supporting participants to exploit multilingual and multimodal resources available to them to facilitate content teaching and learning in EMI contexts. Tai and Li Wei (2021) demonstrate that translingual practices can serve as a source of creativity and language play, allowing participants to bring in a range of linguistic resources, multimodal resources, various knowledge and skills, personal experiences, and interests in the EMI classroom. The findings suggest that language ideology at the institutional level or macro-level policy affects how multiple languages and other semiotic resources are positioned at micro-level classroom interaction and implementation of EMI.

To sum up, the EMI policy presents challenges and opportunities to both students and instructors. The literature review on the relationships between EMI and translingual practices makes it evident that a translingual space allows creativity and dynamic interactions to facilitate meaning-making and knowledge construction. At the same time, it becomes clear that EMI is not simply about selecting a language for the medium of instruction in HE. Its ideological signification has far-reaching ramifications not only in HE itself but at all other levels of society. Thus, it needs to identify the challenges and opportunities afforded by EMI. It merits further investigation to explore constraints and affordances facing students, faculty, and institutions. Meanwhile, the significance of the growing scholarly move toward more fluid and flexible perspectives on languages in educational settings should also be noted, affirming the full semiotic resources and repertories of language users. As much of the previous literature on translingual practices and EMI demonstrates, what is needed is the policymakers and leadership's awareness of translingual potential as an empowering resource, which makes them fulfill socially and culturally responsive or relevant multilingual practices (Gay 2002, Ladson-Billings 2014) and thus promote more inclusive diversity discourses on campus in particular and in broader society in general.

3. Methodology

A diverse range of policy documents and initiatives pertinent to EMI in Koran HE were collected to analyze national language ideology, institutional language management, and language practices in classrooms. Regarding the language policy of EMI in Korea, the Ministry of Education (MOE) may be considered a major EMI policymaker, higher education institutions (HEIs) as implementers, and instructors and students as practitioners. The government's attitudes towards and motivation for EMI can be revealed from the pertinent documents, initiatives, and press releases. The EMI policy-relevant data for the current study were mainly searched with some keywords such as EMI, internationalization, Study Korea, international/foreign students, globalization, etc., from the MOE website and 'Study in Korea,' an official online platform run by National Institute for International Education (NIIED) providing the comprehensive information of Korean HE for inbound international students. The data range from an early 2006 initiative of EMI and Korean language program support to the government's White Paper on education, 'Education in Korea,' to more recent press releases concerning the designation of the Korean Council for University Education as the national information center in 2019 (MOE 2019).

In addition, a local Korean university's case was examined to analyze institutional language ideology and language management, illustrating how EMI was enacted in practice at the local level of classrooms. The institutional information of this university, including the number of international students and faculty, was gleaned from the Academy Information Center run by the MOE and the university's website. Furthermore, in-depth interviews were conducted with eleven international faculty members of the university implementing EMI in their classes. The interviews aimed to describe the particularities emerging from the faculty members' lived experiences as individual EMI practitioners and thus better understand their language ideologies and language practices. The international faculty had taught various disciplines, including Education, Accounting, Tourism Management, Psychology, Physical Education, and other fields of studies. Of the eleven, four were from English-speaking-countries, such as the UK, the USA, and New Zealand; the rest were from the Outer Circle countries, such as the Philippines, according to the categorization of World Englishes (Kachru 1992). Three interviewees had prior teaching experiences as language teachers at different Korean colleges and universities. Interview questions were formulated around the themes emerging from the findings from the literature review on translingual practices and EMI in HE. The questions revolved around the following themes: What challenges does an EMI policy pose to the international faculty?; Do they and would they allow students to use the students' L1 in their EMI class?; Why or why not? For what purpose? Each interview lasted approximately 60 minutes. All the interviewing were audio-recorded and then transcribed for the detailed analysis.

All the data were organized in electronic files, using Excel spreadsheets to generate the data corpus. The corpus was initially analyzed using an inductive approach to identify thematic categories, focusing on linguistic features, such as key phrases and notions manifesting in the corpus composed of the documents collected and the interview transcripts. Several rounds of the data review were thoroughly and iteratively made to code entries according to emerging content categories and relationships within the categorical areas. Then some discourse samples were carefully selected for the detailed discourse analysis informed by Critical Discourse Studies (Fairclough 2003) to account for the language ideology pertinent to the EMI policy across different levels of macro-, meso-, and micro-practices. In conjunction with Spolsky's (2009) tripartite conceptualization of language policy: language ideology, language management, and language practice, Fairclough's (2003) three-tiered analytical framework of text, discourse practice, and social practice is useful for analyzing the intertwinement and ideological working of discourse surrounding EMI across the three levels. The method of discourse analysis included the description, interpretation, and explanation of the three dimensions of discourse (Fairclough 2003) and their discursive relations in the local, institutional, and broader policy domains.

4. Finding

4.1 Bifurcated Language Policy: The Paradox of Monolingual Ideology

The ongoing debate about internationalization, globalization, and diversity hinges on a complex politics that pits multilingual and translingual realities against the ideological hegemony of English monolingualism. The EMI policy entails intricate problems in practice, such as the issues of content learning and proficiency in English and the power struggles over legitimacy among languages engaged in the multilingual and multicultural contexts. For Korean HE, in which Korean is the dominant language of instruction, the impetus of EMI stems from the governmental policy against the backdrop of internationalization. The policy was embodied by the Korea Study Project rolled out in 2004 to attract international students and scholars to its universities (Ministry of Education

Science and Technology [MOEST] 2009). The EMI courses are considered crucial not only for facilitating the mobility of those internationals into Korean universities but also for enhancing the global competence of domestic Korean students in more globalized worlds. With the EMI driven by a top-down macro-level language policy and planning, several issues and conflicts have surfaced from the very beginning of its implementation. The Korean government uses various measures to encourage EMI policies to be offered by its HEIs. In earlier phases of the internationalization initiatives, the government linked its selection and evaluation criteria for various incentive projects to the proportion of EMI courses among all courses offered by universities (Ministry of Education of Human Resources Development [MOEHRD] 2007). Brain Korea 21, one of the first major projects to promote the internationalization of universities, nudged universities to provide EMI courses by including the evaluation criteria, particularly for science and technology programs (Kang 2018, MOEHRD and Korea Research Foundation 2007, p. 626). Further, in the selection and evaluation criteria, not only the shares of lectures in English but also the percentage of foreign faculty and international students were weighted (Seong et al. 2008, p. 217), which indicates that EMI was a prerequisite for the government financial support to its HEIs (Byun et al. 2011, p. 435). The policy was necessitated as an indicator of HEIs' internationalization and competitiveness in global markets. Still, there is no clear evidence of the association of EMI with internationalization or the enhanced competitiveness of the HEIs (Kang, 2018). On this wise, the EMI is used as an index set by the policymaker for ranking universities in terms of internationalization (Byun et al. 2011).

The pedagogical impact of the EMI policy on Korean universities is far-reaching. As the number of EMI courses and programs has been rapidly increasing, universities place greater emphasis on English proficiency when recruiting new faculty and evaluating the faculty performance. English language proficiency seems to take precedence over other qualifications (Byun et al. 2011). For the faculty, their proficiency in the English language may be equated to their teaching competency (Kim 2019). It seems evident that an EMI policy causes much frustration for the faculty who practice EMI in their teaching due to a drastically increasing teaching load (Wilkinson 2013). An EMI policy can be even more complicated by the burgeoning number of international students in Korean HEIs. As aforementioned, the Korean government has adopted the EMI policy against the backdrop of the internationalization of its HE in the global education market and caters to an ever-increasing number of international students. Due to the increase in the number of international students, however, mostly from intra-regional areas, namely countries in which English is not used as L1, it cannot be assumed at all that a student population would be as culturally and linguistically homogeneous as mainly composed of Korean students. Universities should cater to those heterogeneous student populations with differing and diverse needs, expectations, and linguistic backgrounds.

The purpose of EMI in Korean HEI, as stated in the excerpt below from the government's document, are twofold: to attract international students to its HEIs; to enhance local Korean students' English competence. Both are driven by the aspiration for internationalization and higher competitiveness in the global markets. In the government's White Paper on education, specifically in chapter 12 entitled 'International Cooperation in Education and Education for Overseas Koreans' (MOEST 2009), the "Study in Korea" project is explained in greater detail.

> The Study in Korea Project" and "Achievement Plan for Study in Korea Project" were established in November 2004 and July 2008, respectively, to attract more foreign students to Korea. The purpose of these projects is to help the country become a knowledge and human resources hub in northeast Asia and strengthen the international competitiveness of its higher education system. As a step towards this goal, The National Institute for International Education, an affiliate of MEST, holds "Study in Korea" fairs in China and Japan annually, and offers online information services (www.studyinkorea.go.kr). The government

> finances English-only classes and Korean language training programs in order to improve the school life of overseas students. They are also simplifying visa application processes and other immigration procedures for foreign students and are helping them find jobs in Korea upon completion of their studies. (MOEST 2009, pp. 170-171, originally in English)

By invoking the narratives and policies of internationalization and competitiveness, international students and scholars are often envisioned in the government documents as integral components of the internationalized outlook of the universities (Kim 2020). In 2019, the MOE designated the Korean Council for University Education as the National Information Center (NIC), intending to scale up the global mobility in HE and enhance the credibility of Korean qualifications in HE. Through the Information Center, the government expects "more foreign students are expected to come and study in Korea, and thus positively impacting universities to improve their global competency" (MOE 2019). The excerpt below is from a press release from the MOE in 2006. The press release shows nine universities received government support for English-taught courses and Korean language programs. It was specified that the support aimed to help universities expand assistance for "foreign students" studying in Korea. The financial support program was a part of the "Study Korea Project" launched in 2005 to recruit "foreign students."

> The financial support program comes as a part of the "Study Korea Project" launched by the ministry in 2005 to recruit 50,000 **foreign students** by 2010. By helping universities expand **courses taught in English** and develop intensive Korean **language training courses**, the ministry seeks **to minimize language barriers, provide a comfortable academic environment**, promote the internationalization of higher education, and **offer easily accessible educational opportunities of high quality**. (. . .) The financial resources will go into textbook development, faculty recruitment, and other necessities in program administration for **foreign students.** (MOEHRD 2006, emphasis given)

The language policy was revealed to be hierarchically bifurcated: On the one hand, through the expansion of the EMI, the status of English is reinforced as the privileged language playing the main role in content acquisition and knowledge construction in academic subjects. On the other hand, the Korean language, supported through "intensive language training courses," presumably for language skills acquisition, seems implicitly relegated to a secondary place in academic contexts. The hierarchy between the languages appears further stratified due to the burgeoning number of international students largely from non-English-speaking countries, such as China, Vietnam, and Mongolia. To cater to the language issues of those students, the government resources and initiatives have been allocated more to the Korean language training programs (MOE 2019). In the meantime, EMI has become geared toward elite universities, particularly some of the prestigious private universities and science and technology institutes (Jon, Cho and Byun 2020, Kim 2017), explicitly or implicitly, thereby resulting in the ideological association of English with elitism and, in turn, deepening the extant stratification among Korean universities.

Whether for English or Korean, however, the policy itself is underpinned by the ideology of monolingualism. In either classroom envisaged by the policy, the monolingual ideology would endorse only one language as a legitimate medium of instruction; thereby, other languages might be marginalized or otherwise excluded. This kind of monolingual orientation, by nature, is restrictive and, in effect, runs counter to creating a comfortable academic environment or promoting internationalization, as stated in the government policy paper above.

The text above appears to acknowledge the role of language in education. The underlying assumption of this language policy suggests that a comfortable academic environment would be created by minimizing the "language barrier," thus promoting the internationalization of HE, consequently leading to high-quality education accessible through languages. With the classic metaphor of "language barriers," however, languages brought with the diverse internationals to Korean universities are framed as obstacles that should be minimized to promote the internationalization of HE. This language barrier ideology is seemingly in opposition to the celebratory diversity discourse promulgated as an ultimate goal of the internationalization or globalization of Korean HE.

4.2 Institutional language Management: English Only and Elitism

The present study's findings have confirmed several challenges and issues documented in the previous research. However, those problems seem even more complicated, coupled with other facets of institutional settings. As illustrated in the preceding section, the Korean government has deployed several strategies to force universities to adopt an EMI policy. For example, the ratio of international faculty and EMI classes used to be linked to the criteria of HEIs' assessment. The policymakers have touted specific criteria as an indicator of internationalization, such as the proportion of international academics and students at universities and the ratio of English-taught courses percentage provided. Again, the evaluation result may have far-reaching impacts on each university.

The ideologies of globalization and elitism through EMI are recontextualized at the institutional level of the university language policy and management, echoing the discourses produced from the governmental project of HE internationalization and Study Korea. Amid external and internal pressures of various stakeholders, some Korean universities attempt to approach the EMI policy by coupling it with hiring international faculty. A good illustration of such an attempt is Southeast University (all the names used in this paper are pseudonyms), a private comprehensive university located in a southern province of Korea. Southeast University hires international faculty for almost all departments and has implemented EMI for years, mainly through those international faculty members. According to the data collected from the Academy Information Center, as of the time of the data collection (the specific data collection date has not been identified here to preserve the confidentiality of research participants), of the 915 full-time faculty members at the university, 103 were from abroad. As evident in the interview excerpt below from KZ, an international faculty member, the EMI policy was stipulated in the contract as one of the employment conditions for the international faculty regardless of whether English is their L1. By that means, the university would be able to fulfill both the required assessment ratio of EMI courses and that of international faculty set as an internationalization index. Further, in so doing, some of the domestic Korean faculty could be relieved from the burden and pressure to teach their discipline subjects through English.

> Yes, it (EMI) was already included (**in the contract**). I was also surprised **all the professors should lecture in English**. I don't know why. Maybe there are some professors who teach in Korean. I don't know. […] I'm teaching mostly content classes, like psychology, and then I've also developed three classes for the students. It's more of the practical side and to teach them also more of **definitely English communication.** (*KZ, an international faculty member*)

The leadership of Southeast University was well-known among the staff for its strong aspiration for an elite university by the internationalization of its campus. Given the position as a key decision-maker, the president's thoughts could lead to the entire policy-making and implementation at the institutional level. The language

ideology of the university leadership could be glimpsed by a narrative of AJ, an international faculty member at the university. AJ recalled the president's remark on diversity when she was interviewed with him for a faculty position. The president's view on diversity and internationalization could be summed up as follows: promoting students' English proficiency; diversifying students' thinking; ranking up the university's competitiveness.

> Maybe I can do something more for sure. It (diversity) is a very great **asset to the difference** because I think that's when I was interviewed by the president. We are here to do **not only English communication but to teach** what we know, uh, **to diversify the thinking of the students**. So, that is what is really embedded in me. OK, I need to teach and do research to contribute to, maybe, the ranking of the university but also do some other services. (*AJ, an international faculty member*)

Another ideologically salient aspect surrounding EMI discourse is associated with how internationalization is defined, that is, what constitutes the internationalization of Korean HE. International academics and students are often referenced as positive agents in the population composition of the internationalization project. Ostensibly, the international students and scholars are conceived of as one of the key components of the internationalization of HE. However, the view that considers the demographic diversity on campus as an indicator of internationalization is problematic. Such a simple view leads to a colonial perspective that equates being an international academic, particularly a native English speaker, with having high intercultural competencies (Kim 2019). In effect, the longstanding debate of native- and non-native speakers of English is again brought to the fore in the EMI context. At Southeast University, one unstated criterion circulating among the HR staff in hiring international faculty members was based on whether the candidates were from English-speaking countries, with its first preference for those from the Inner Circle, such as the US, the UK, Australia, and possibly, then, for those from the Outer Circle countries, such as the Philippines and South Africa, once colonized by Great Britain and the US, according to Kachru's (1992) categorization of World Englishes. Thus, the international faculty, more specifically, native speakers of English, come to assume a relatively privileged status compared to their non-native English-speaking counterparts in Korean HE. Consequently, intertwined with the profoundly ingrained native-speakerism ideology (Holliday 2006), EMI seemed to perpetuate the myth of native-speaker superiority.

4.3 De facto Translingual and Trans-semiotizing Practices in EMI

The analysis of the narratives of the international faculty members at Southeast University revealed that a translingual or trans-semiotizing space in effect was being created by the EMI practitioners and their students via the linkage of linguistic and non-linguistic semiotic resources and the use of multiple languages in the EMI classroom. Unlike the model of the English Only class ideally envisioned by the policymakers, the commonality of the EMI practices illustrated by the international faculty was that multiple languages and multimodalities appeared to be a norm for the EMI classes. It was clear that the international instructors encountered difficulty in conducting the courses entirely in English. In effect, the dual languages of English and students' L1 were mobilized whenever needed. The following are the illustrations of the instructional practices described by an international instructor; what they do in EMI class. This description illustrates how the EMI policy was being practiced at a local and micro-level by those individual policy practitioners.

> They (students) had problems understanding what I presented because they don't speak English. But, we created certain factors in the classroom to help them learn, such as **allowing their peers to speak in Korean**

> and **to give presentations in Korean**. **I go very, very slow**. **I use visual illustrations of not only PowerPoints but videos** that have Korean, the bad translations, I think. But, **they have Korean translations** in them. So, I'm making every effort to help the students understand, **including their books in Korean.** So, the students come back to me. And they explained that we don't understand the book in Korean as much as they don't understand in English. (*SC, an international faculty member*)

> I tried to accommodate those students. I really lecture in English, and then for those students that I know can understand fully, **I let them translate**. That's my style. Since I know if what they're saying in Korean that I will agree with, if that is the right explanation, then, OK, fine. (AJ, *an international faculty member*)

As reported by some of the existing studies (e.g., Kang and Park 2004, Toh 2020) and illustrated in the previous analysis of the governmental policy documents, there was a discernable division of labor between English and students' L1. The roles of the two languages, however, appeared to be reversed. In the learning process, as demonstrated in the excerpts above, it was the Korean language that played a key role as the main medium in learning on the part of students in terms of both the reception and production of content knowledge. The students would read books written in Koran and speak and present in Korean, watching or listening to the lecture aided by multimodalities deployed by the instructor, such as the video clip subtitled in Korean. Simply put, English was employed as the language for teaching. In contrast, Korean was used as the language for learning, even though the divide between teaching and learning may not be clear-cut and pedagogically untenable.

What was happening in the EMI classroom is trans-semiotizing practices, which allow for crossing boundaries between named languages and/or between different modalities for meaning-making. It is not simply alternating or switching between other codes of named languages, e.g., shuttling between Korean and English, but de facto a translingual practice of instruction in which the instructor and students mobilize all semiotic resources available to them for meaning negotiation. What stood out in the narrative is the struggle and effort of the instructor who tried to figure out any strategies to make learning easier for their students: allowing students to speak in Korean; going slow; utilizing various modalities; using the video clip subtitled in Korean. It was evident that due to students' struggles with both the theoretically abstract content and the English language, the teaching and learning process went slower. In other words, the EMI policy was slowing down the process of learning concepts, which could otherwise be achieved in L1 more efficiently and relatively at ease. Consequently, the English Only policy per se turned out to be unfeasible in practice. Despite the rigid, separationist institutional language ideology of monolingual EMI, the instructors utilized the linguistic and multimodal resources at their disposal to make their students engage with subject content, even without the explicit understanding of the concept of translingual pedagogies.

Still, again, the ideological discourse of 'language as a problem' (Ruíz 1984) was intertextually reproduced in the narrative of some instructors describing their EMI class. With the metaphor of "language barriers" in the MOE initiative, an EMI instructor stated that students' English proficiency did not measure up to the level assumed to be adequate for them to take an EMI course, as anticipated by the university and the Korean government. KV was from the United States and was hired as an assistant professor in the Department of Education at Southeast University. He taught the foundational courses of pedagogy in general for undergraduates and a qualitative research methodology course for graduate students. In his narrative, language was framed explicitly as "the biggest hurdle," the "linguistic barrier," and even lame "excuses" made by students who might disguise their lack of content knowledge of the subject matter. Since their knowledge production and content understanding are restricted to one language mode, whether in English or Korean, students may have limited vehicles to express their

ideas and respond to the instruction. In this case, English was drawn as a defense mechanism for students to excuse themselves for being less engaged in the class and making fewer endeavors to learn.

> It might have to do something with **the language issues**. **The biggest hurdle** for me is knowing what a language issue is and what is a challenge students are actually having around comprehending the material, aside from **the linguistic barrier.** So, language is always **one problem,** but here I feel like the students are being given excuses from their peers and from the adults to use **language as an excuse** that 'if I don't understand something,' it is easiest to say that 'the reason I don't understand is because of English,' even though I think the language part of it is very minor. (KV, *an international faculty member*)

> When the students say that they don't understand the material written in Korean, I expect that. But also, I think it exposes the reality that **the language barrier** is only one small barrier. And in fact, I think it offers the opportunity for the students to go slower with the material to try to grasp it better. (AD, *an international faculty member*)

Such a restrictive EMI classroom was portrayed as an insecure space replete with anxiety and confusion. One of the concurrent pedagogical tenets is to create a supportive, non-fearful, non-threatening atmosphere in the classroom. Pedagogically, a classroom should be a space where students can feel secure and comfortable expressing their thoughts and sharing their ideas. The portrayal of the EMI classroom made by an instructor, however, shows that "the insecurity runs very deep" in his EMI classroom, and the language anxiety is often palpable, which results in students not being engaged with the language and walking away from it if given the excuse or the opportunity. Students' avoidance of EMI classes often resulted in the international faculty's discouragement and predicaments. As the students tended to avoid courses delivered in English, some courses taught by international instructors were likely to be canceled, which would impact the faculty's contract requiring a certain amount of credit hours to teach. A college classroom, presumably a space in which knowledge is co-constructed, appeared to be like one kind of ESL class often imbued with language anxiety and tensions occasioned by power differences between languages.

> The insecurity is really deep. It runs very deep, and it may in fact be a reason why if given the excuse or the opportunity to not engage with the language. you can walk away from it, and I understand a lot of these feelings. […] The English class is, and **it is expressed as such an English class**, it is a language course. It is not a theoretical, methodological, or content-based course. So, this is, I think, the controversy that we're facing right now. (KV, *an international faculty member*)

> It's very difficult because it's all in English. And then, I hope that there will be some, maybe, the professors who speak in Korean. Even if I like to but I cannot. I appreciate a professor who can speak Korean to explain it. Then, it will be good, it will be the best for us. Uh, but **this is an English class**. So, they knew it. (RF, *an international faculty member*)

Moreover, the asymmetrical power between English and Korean further complicated the relationship between Korean students and international faculty members, obscuring role expectations and threatening the identities of both. While Korean students would often be positioned, even in subject-matter courses, as English language learners with limited linguistic proficiency, the international faculty members stated that they often got confused

about their identities as they would likely be perceived as ESL instructors rather than academics with expertise on their disciplines. Consequently, despite the façade of internationalization and diversity through the recruitment of international students and scholars on campus, the questions and problems surrounding EMI in Korean HE appeared even more complicated, especially for the international faculty faced with the issues of their roles and identities and students' proficiency in English, coupled with social and institutional ideologies of the grand discourse of internationalization.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The EMI policy has been promulgated in numerous non-English-speaking Asian countries and elsewhere, primarily by the top-down government policies of internationalization. With the new market principles of neo-capitalism that view language as a commodity with exchange value (Heller 2010), multiple languages and cultures come to be reconfigured, and a language hierarchy comes to be forged among differentially valorized resources (Bourdieu 1991). Multiple languages and resources conducive to learning are likely to be disqualified when valorized from the normative perspective of monolingualism undergirded by neo-liberal capitalism and ideologies of globalization. Language ideologies forged at the broader social and the global level come to play themselves out at the local level of language practices, such as in a classroom or on university campuses. Such language ideologies inform the ways in which multilingual students and their cultures are positioned as 'problems or obstacles to learning,' whatever their academic goals and needs might be.

The findings of this study demonstrated the intertwinement of macro-level language ideology, meso-level language management, and local practices in EMI classes in a Korean HE context. The analysis revealed the monolingual ideologies, native-speakerism, and elitism undergirding the EMI policy. Those restrictive ideologies appeared enacted through the bifurcated language policies, reinforcing the privileged state of English while rendering other languages, particularly the Korean language, a less legitimate medium for knowledge construction and meaning-making in Korean HE. The hardening of attitudes toward language diversity, as illustrated in the institutional language policy, is not consonant with its ostensible initiatives for internationalization and thus diversity promulgated by the government. The findings also highlighted the international faculty's struggles with the discrepancy between the imposed policy and practice within the EMI context and how their professional identities were compromised or sometimes negotiated as the EMI instructors.

More importantly, the findings of this study suggest that multiple languages and a variety of semiotic resources are leveraged for the act of meaning-making in the situated EMI contexts. They confirm the understanding of trans-semiotizing practices in which communication does not rest on language but is an orchestration of multiple semiotic resources. What was practiced in the Southeast University EMI classes was the reconfiguring of semiotic resources for meaning negotiation. It illuminated communication and interaction in such a multilingual and multicultural contact zone as the coordination and negotiation among a vast array of semiotic resources entangled with language for meaning-making (Hawkins 2018). The dynamics of the co-occurrence of multiple semiotic modes suggest the need for an inclusive and embracing understanding of the negotiability of multiple languages in a translingual contact zone and socially situated, embedded communication (Dafouz and Smit 2014, De Costa, Green-Eneix and Li 2021, Kim 2017). The hybrid language use and thus messiness is a nature of language, which is not a kind of serendipitous knowledge discovery, but rather quotidian practices encountered in the lives of any social beings. In this regard, the argument for the conviviality among differences (Blommaert 2014) resonates with the findings of this study for evolving consciousness of ever-increasing sociolinguistic diversity. It is not

reasonable and valid to exclude or restrict the translingual moves in education. The confusions, uncertainty, and discomfort that may arise from translingual practices which unsettle the normative consciousness and conventional views should be tolerated and even fostered as part of competencies for contemporary society living with differences and ever-increasing diversity. Given the thorny problems arising from the EMI policy in Korean HE, the affordances of translingual and other trans-semiotic practices should be considered for moving toward a more holistic view of language and language in use. An ideological and implemental space (García and Li Wei 2014) should be constructed in a performative context for translingual agents to craft their identities. In such an embracing trans-ideological space, the old arrangement of power in different semiotic resources could be disarticulated, and the meaning-making elements could be reworked into new configurations.

Several pedagogical implications and suggestions could be drawn from the findings. First and foremost, the explicit goals of an EMI instruction should be delineated in a way in which this type of instruction or program is utilized with its distinct pedagogical objectives. The ambiguity of the goal of the current language policy leads to confusion arising from the reality in which the policy feeds into the practices and identity of those involved. EMI programs and courses should be reconceptualized and driven by pedagogical groundings. To that end, a working definition of EMI should be made to make it more effective than now. The currently prevalent perception of EMI is a context in which English is exclusively used for teaching academic content. To be realistic, two or more languages should be in use rather than ignoring the roles that language plays in constituting the distinct features of EMI different from any typical content class delivered through Korean-medium instruction. In addition, pedagogical expertise should be prioritized for the quality of an EMI instructor (Lasagabaster 2022). Instructors' ability to design a course and teach and assess effectively is essential for any pedagogical context. An EMI instructor should demonstrate such expertise and figure out practical ways to achieve the learning outcomes set by the motivation of the EMI courses in their situatedness. Finally, language support for both international faculty and domestic and international students should be provided to tackle the issues stemming from the different languages at work in their interactions. For the international faculty, Korean language support can help alleviate the challenges they face in their daily life and class. For the local and international students taking an EMI course, Academic English programs, in general, can be offered as a pre-requisite to meet a certain threshold level for the EMI instruction.

There has been a caution against the dominant discourse of English as a global language, given that the privileged and valorized cultural and linguistic resources are considered a capital that enables one to move up a social ladder. As demonstrated in the previous analysis, the typical language issues have surfaced in the EMI implementations. The use of the L1, for instance, was manifested in the narratives of the international academics describing how they had dealt with the role of L1 as a resource to facilitate their students' learning. While the role of English is at the center of internationalization, and thus the EMI policy has been enacted, there is no clear conceptualization of English concerning which English should be used in the EMI (Kirkpatrick 2017). The dominance of English has been constantly challenged, particularly by the advocacy for emerging translingual practices that legitimize learners' linguistic repertoire, ultimately calling for rethinking how English is conceptualized in EMI. In that sense, the interplay between language and power should be placed at the center of the discussion of the complexities and challenges that EMI poses. Some scholars underscore critical awareness of linguistic decisions concerning the choice of which English should be used, namely British or American English, or English as a lingua franca; the determination of the use of students' linguistic repertoire through translingual practices, and the impact of such decisions (Kuteeva 2020). There should be deliberate decisions on those issues concerning the effects and implications of the decision for those involved.

For future research, a more systemic literature review needs to be done to synthesize the current state of knowledge and reality of translingual practices in terms of both theoretical and empirical research across inside and outside classrooms, particularly with a focus on specific Korean contexts. It is worth identifying factors enabling and constraining the implementation of trans-linguistic practices for pedagogical purposes in Korean EMI settings. What is concerned about current translingual practices, albeit its potential for transformative approaches to language education, is how to implement the new and flexible methods in the classroom in which more formal forms of teaching and learning practice seem to be norms. There has been scholarly work that argues theoretically and illustrates the potential of translingual methods, such as translanguaging (García and Li Wei 2014), as an alternative to conventional monolingual ideologies and practices. However, what is now needed is more empirical instances of pedagogical feasibility of translingual approaches rather than merely theoretical arguments. To merely enumerate ideas and themes may not be of great use at this point. Substantive research should be furthered on how ingenuity and creativity of trans-semiotizing practices are possible and going on in reality. Hence, it is worth investigating how translingual practices are, in effect, practiced in EMI or other contexts of language education and how linguistic diversity evolves in Korean contexts. Thus, more empirical research should be done on the dynamic interactions of various trans-semiotic resources.

References

Airey, J. 2015. From stimulated recall to disciplinary literacy: Summarizing ten years of research into teaching and learning in English. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren and C. Jensen, eds., *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education. English in Europe*, Vol 3, 157-176. De Gruyter Mouton.

Airey, J., K. Lauridsen, A. Raisanen, L. Salö and V. Schwach. 2017. The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic Countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education* 73, 561-576

Baker, W. 2021. English as a lingua franca, translanguaging, and EMI in Asian higher education: Implications for pedagogy. In W. Tsou and W. Baker, eds., *English-medium Instruction Translanguaging Practices in Asia: Theories, Frameworks and Implementation in Higher Education*, 21-38. Singapore: Springer.

Barnard, R. 2018. Setting the scene: EMI in Asian universities. In B. Barnard and Z. Hasim, eds., *English Medium Instruction Programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian Universities*, 1-14. New York, NY: Routledge.

Blommaert, J. 2014. Infrastructure of superdiversity: Conviviality and language in an Antwerp neighborhood. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17(4), 431-451.

Bolton, K. and W. Botha. 2020. English in Asian universities. In K. Bolton, W. Botha and A. Kirkpatrick, eds., *The Handbook of Asian Englishes*, 133-168. NJ: Wiley Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Breeze, R. and H. Roothooft. 2021, Using the L1 in university-level EMI: Attitudes among lecturers in Spain. *Language Awareness* 30(20), 195-215.

Byun, K., H. Chu, M. Kim, I. Park, S. Kim and J. Jung. 2011. English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: policy debates and reality. *Higher Education* 62(4), 431-449.

Canagarajah, S. 2021. Materialising semiotic repertoires: challenges in the interactional analysis of multilingual communication. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 18(2), 206-225.

Chang, S-Y. 2019. Beyond the English box: Constructing and communicating knowledge through translingual practices in the higher education classroom. *English Teaching & Learning* 43, 23-40.

Dafouz, E. and U. Smit. 2014. Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics* 37 (3), 397-415.

De Costa, P., C. Green-Eneix and W. Li. 2021. Embracing diversity, inclusion, equity and access in EMI-TNHE: Towards a social justice-centered reframing of English language teaching. *RELC Journal* 52(2), 227-235.

De Costa, P., C. Green-Eneix and W. Li. 2021. Problematizing language policy and practice in EMI and transnational higher education: Challenges and possibilities. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 44(2), 115-128.

Duff, P. A. 1997. Immersion in Hungary: An ELF experiment. In R. K. Johnson and M. Swain, eds., *Immersion Education: International Perspectives*, 19-43. Cambridge, UK: CUP.

Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. 2015. *Language and Power* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge

García, O. and W. Li. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Galloway, N., T. Numajiri and N. Rees. 2020. The 'internationalisation', or 'Englishisation', of higher education in East Asia. *Higher Education* 80, 395-414.

Gay, G. 2002. Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education* 53(2), 106-116.

Hawkins, M. R. 2018. Transmodalities and transnational encounters: Fostering critical cosmopolitan relations. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1), 55-77.

Heller, M. 2010. The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39, 101-114.

Holliday, A. 2006. Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal* 60(4), 385-387.

Huang, Y-P. 2021. Translanguaging in EMI higher education in Taiwan: Learner perception and agency. In W. Tsou and W. Baker, eds., *English-medium Instruction Translanguaging Practices in Asia: Theories, Frameworks and Implementation in Higher Education*, 163-182. Singapore: Springer.

Jenkins, J. 2014. *Global Englishes: A resource Book for Students* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Kachru, B. 1992. *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Jon, J-E., Y. H. Cho and K. Byun. 2020. Internationalization by English-medium instruction? Professors' decoupling behaviors to EMI policy in Korean higher education. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy* 17(2), 297-318.

Kang, K. 2018. English-medium instruction policies in South Korean Higher Education. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 33, 31-52.

Kang, S. Y. and H. S. Park. 2004. Student beliefs and attitudes about English medium instruction: Report of questionnaire study. *Yonsei Review of Educational Research* 17(1), 33-53.

Kim, J. 2017. Translingual identities of international graduate students and monoglossic language ideologies in a U.S. university ESL classroom. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33(3), 3-31.

Kim, J. 2019. International faculty and English-medium instruction in Korean higher education: Challenges and future directions. *Global Studies Education* 11(4), 174-199.

Kim, J. 2020. A critical discourse analysis of language ideologies in ESL class and international students' critical language awareness. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 20, 801-828.

Kim, J. and E. Richardson. 2018. Transnational students and language use. In S. Nero and J. Liontas, eds., *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, John Wiley & Son.

Kim, J., E. G. Kim and S-O. Kweon. 2018. Challenges in implementing English-medium instruction: Perspectives of humanities and social sciences professors teaching engineering students. *English for Specific Purposes,* 51, 111-123.

Kim, J. and B. Tatar., 2017. Nonnative English-speaking professors' experiences of English-medium instruction and their perceived roles of the local language. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 16(3), 157-171.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2017. The languages of higher education in East and Southeast Asia: Will EMI lead to Englishisation? In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys and I. Walkinshaw, eds., *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy*, 1-18. Cham: Springer.

Kroskrity, P. (Ed). 2000. *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Kuteeva, M. 2020. Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23(3), 287-300.

Ladson-Billings, G. 2014. Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0. a.k.a. the Remix. *Harvard Educational Reviews* 84(1), 74-84.

Lasagabaster, D. 2022. Teacher preparedness for English-medium instruction. *Journal of English-Medium Instruction* 1(1), 48-64.

Lin, A. M. Y. 2018. Theories of trans/languaging and trans-semiotizing: Implications for content-based education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22(1), 5-16.

Macaro, E. 2018. *English Medium Instruction*. Oxford University Press.

Madhavan Brochier, D. 2016. 10 Truths (and a lie) about EMI. IATEFL webinar. Doi: https://divyamadhavan.wordpress.com/2016/10/12/10-truths-a-lie-about-emi/

Ministry of Education. 2006. Nine Universities Receive Support for English-taught Courses and Korean Language Programs. *Press Release*. http://english.moe.go.kr/boardCnts/view.do?boardID=265&lev=0&statusYN=C&s=english&m=03&opType=N&boardSeq=1423

Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. 2007. 2007년도 외국인 유학생 유치 촉진을 위한 영어 전용강좌 및 한국어 연수프로그램 지원사업 기본계획[2007 Financial Support Plans for Courses taught in English and Intensive Korean Language Training Program to Attract International Students to Korean HE]. Seoul, Korea.

Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development and Korea Research Foundation. (2007). Brain Korea 21: 1 단계 두뇌한국 21 사업 백서[White Paper on Phase 1 Brain Korea 21]. Seoul: Korea.

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. 2009. *Education in Korea*. Seoul: Korea.

Ministry of Education. 2019. Enhancing credibility on Korean qualification in higher education: MOE officially designates KCUE as the national information center of ROK. *Press Release*. http://english.moe.go.kr/boardCnts/viewRenewal.do?boardID=265&boardSeq=77217&lev=0&statusYN=C&s=english&m=0201&opType=

Ministry of Education. 2019. 교육국제화역량 인증제 3 주기 평가체계 기본계획(안) [Plans for 3rd Stage International Education Quality Assurance System]. Seoul, Korea.

Pratt, M. L. 1991. Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 33-40.

Pennycook, A. 2014. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language.* London: Routledge.

Preece, S. 2022. Developing the multilingual agenda in EMI higher educational institutions. *ELT Journal* 76(2), 183-193.

Rahman, M. M. and M. K. M. Singh. 2021. English medium university STEM teachers' and students' ideologies in constructing content knowledge through translanguaging. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, online first. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1915950

Ruíz, R. 1984. Orientation in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8(2), 15-34.

Seong, S., S. W. Popper, C. A. Goldman, D. K. Evans and C. A. Grammich. 2008. *Brain Korea 21 Phase II: A New Evaluation Model.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Shohamy, E. 2013. A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster and J. M. Sierra, eds., *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*, 196-210. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language Management*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tai, K. W. H. And W. Li. 2021. Constructing playful talk through translanguaging in English medium instruction mathematics classrooms. *Applied Linguistics* 42(4), 607-640.

Toh, G. 2020. Challenges in English-medium instruction (EMI) at a Japanese university. *World Englishes* 39(2), 334-347.

Tsou, W. 2021. Translanguaging as a glocalized strategy for EMI in Asia. In W. Tsou and W. Baker, eds., *English-Medium Instruction Translanguaging Practices in Asia: Theories, Frameworks and Implementation in Higher Education*, 3-17. Singapore: Springer.

Walkinshaw, I., B. Fenton-Smith and P. Humphreysm. 2017. EMI issues and challenges in Asia-Pacific higher education: An introduction. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys and I. Walkinshaw, eds., *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy*, 1-18. Cham: Springer.

Wilkinson, R. 2013. English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster and J. M. Sierra, eds., *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*, 3-24. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Yuan, R. and M. Yang. 2021. Towards an understanding of translanguaging in EMI teacher education classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*. Published online. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820964123

Zhang, Y. and R. Wei. 2021. Strategic use of L1 in Chinese EMI classrooms: A tranlanguaging perspective. In In W. Tsou and W. Baker, eds., *English-Medium Instruction Translanguaging Practices in Asia: Theories, Frameworks and Implementation in Higher Education*, 101-118. Singapore: Springer.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Primary

