

ATLANTIS

Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies

43.2 (December 2021): 219-231

e-ISSN 1989-6840

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.28914/Atlantis-2021-43.2.12>

© The Author(s)

Content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence

The Role of Internationalization and English as a Lingua Franca in English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education A Critical Review of

Hugo Bowles and Amanda C. Murphy, eds. 2020. *English-Medium Instruction and the Internationalization of Universities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. v + 288 pp. ISBN: 978-3-030-47859-9.

Kumiko Murata, ed. 2019. *English-Medium Instruction from an English as a Lingua Franca Perspective: Exploring the Higher Education Context*. London and New York: Routledge. vi + 289 pp. ISBN: 978-0-367-58795-6.

JENNIFER AMENT

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

jenniferrose.ament@uab.cat

The practice of English-Medium Instruction (EMI) is on the rise around the world and as Clive W. Earls points out, though it is complex and challenging it is also full of opportunities and benefits concerning internationalization and globalization (2016). EMI has been the subject of much research in recent years, among which the two books in this comparative book review. The first, *English-Medium Instruction and the Internationalization of Universities*, edited by Hugo Bowles and Amanda C. Murphy (2020), focuses on the intersection of EMI and internationalization by questioning the role of English in internationalization, while the second, *English-Medium Instruction from an English as a Lingua Franca Perspective: Exploring the Higher Education Context*, edited by Kumiko Murata (2019), explores the type of English used in EMI settings from both theoretical and pedagogical perspectives. Despite the many publications on EMI, these two volumes do make a useful contribution to the field, most notably in that they deal head-on with such current concerns as ideology towards English, the roles of English and equity in the higher education (HE) context.

EMI can be understood as the use of English for educational purposes carried out outside English-speaking countries and generally involves both teachers and students whose first language is not English (Murata 2019, 46). The implementation of EMI programs has increased rapidly since 2001 (Wächter and Maiworm 2014). The implementation of EMI at universities is driven by internationalization and mobility of students and staff (Sandström and Hudson 2018; Marinoni 2019). Offering courses in English removes language barriers and increases access to universities for international students, which in turn increases ratings and revenue for the institution. It is thought that EMI can lead to language benefits and increase employability as well as improve cross-cultural understanding and global awareness (Chapple 2015). However, there is debate as to whether these perceived benefits outweigh the drawbacks, which include domain loss in local language, challenges with respect to curriculum and course design, quality assurance and language and content learning outcomes (Wilkinson 2013). It is the interaction of these benefits and challenges, as well as the rapid increase in EMI programs around the world, that has led to an urgent need for empirical, evidence-based research on EMI implementation and practice (Macaro et al. 2018). The two volumes reviewed here answer this call. By describing perspectives and experiences from around the globe, they present current practices and provide valuable insights and informed suggestions for improvements in the implementation and practice of EMI at all levels.

Current findings from EMI research point out that English is, on the one hand, essential to the internationalization of HE institutions, as it opens doors to mobility and the sharing of ideas, while on the other it is problematic, since it can lead to inequality between languages and the westernization of the curriculum (Leask 2015). Bowles and Murphy state that “if the unfettered political-economic drive towards internationalization is to be successful and fair, researchers need to question whether its English language policies actually help the process of internationalization by producing sustainable economic and social development” (2020, 2). Universities seem quick to adopt EMI programs and courses yet often overlook the details, believing that language and internationalization issues will take care of themselves (Saarinen and Nikula 2013). Unfortunately, this is not the case. Despite efforts at both macro—national—and micro—individual faculties and lecturers—levels to put language and internationalization policies and practices into place, research shows that if EMI education is to be equitable, language support is needed for stakeholders together with reflection on what other factors are involved in the internationalization of HE (Macaro et al. 2018). It has also been found that policymakers seem to be unaware of the complexities of language use to the extent that factors such as language identity, language attitudes, content learning outcomes and language equity are often overlooked (Jenkins 2013). The book reviewed here by Bowles and Murphy (2020) critically questions the role of English in internationalization, pointing out the challenges and putting forth solutions for implementing more holistic internationalization strategies that take the role of English, as well as other factors, into careful consideration.

English as a lingua franca (ELF) research, on the other hand, is a younger field that partially overlaps with EMI due to the academic and international nature of EMI classrooms. As English becomes more international and farther removed from the nations and cultures that speak it—Braj B. Kachru's inner, outer and expanding circles of English (1985)—researchers have begun to study the type of communication that is carried out in EMI classrooms. Many of them declare that it is in fact ELF that is used in EMI, and then use their findings to characterize how ELF diverges from other varieties of English (Smit 2010; Bjorkman 2011). ELF researchers argue that English is used as a lingua franca for academic and international business purposes and that it is a language variety in its own right (Seidlhofer et al. 2006). Although there seems to be some disagreement within the field as to the definition of ELF (Mortensen 2013), Alan Firth's is widely accepted: "a contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common culture, and for whom English is the chosen *foreign* language of communication" (1996, 240; italics in the original). ELF not only lacks a clear definition but also a clear description of its linguistic features. Despite this, however, it is considered to be different from native speaker (NS) English because of the communication strategies used (Seidlhofer 2009), such as accommodation, translanguaging or code-switching (Jenkins 2019). In addition, deviations from standard forms of English are accepted and, instead, priority is given to the effectiveness of communication—i.e., whether the message is understood. ELF researchers suggest that a change in perspective from NS English to ELF ideology could benefit many EMI stakeholders and ease political, social, language and cultural identity tensions (Jenkins 2019). These are precisely the issues that the contributions to the volume edited by Murata (2019) address.

To return to Bowles and Murphy (2020), this volume contains eleven chapters and is part of the International and Development Education Series published by Palgrave Macmillan, whose goal is to focus on the key concerns, trends and initiatives in HE at global and international levels by addressing topics such as access and equity in regard to tertiary education and discussing current concerns such as quality assurance, accountability and assessment. The volume attempts to fulfil these objectives by addressing the most current, urgent issues regarding EMI and internationalization in the HE arena. The book offers a truly global perspective with studies from a range of contexts, including Japan, the Netherlands, Ethiopia, China, Malaysia, Mexico, Italy and Denmark. Four main themes run through the book, namely, the challenges and inconsistencies between language policy and practice in HE, questions regarding the quality of education in EMI due to either proficiency level or pedagogical features in the classroom, the threat posed by English to other languages and cultures, and a close examination of the role of English in internationalization and how the curriculum or the university could be internationalized in other ways.

In the introductory chapter, "EMI and the Internationalization of Universities: An Overview" (1-26), Bowles and Murphy introduce these four themes, summarize key research findings on EMI in internationalization and identify the challenges and

tensions in the field. The authors indicate a need for more empirical studies to be carried out regarding the relationship between EMI and internationalization in order to pave the way for a truly global vision of HE. The volume closes on an inspiring chapter by Jennifer Valcke, “Beyond English-Medium Education: From Internationalization to Sustainable Education” (259-79), that adds value to the publication as she reviews the key themes and solutions brought forth in the individual chapters and then ties the ideas together with a look forward that challenges all parties involved in HE. For example, she highlights goals of international education, such as including the teaching of global citizenship and values-based education, as well as the importance of sustainable education. This chapter will be of special interest to stakeholders, particularly university lecturers, language support staff and professional development trainers, although she also addresses policymakers and researchers in her demand for decisions to be based on scientific evidence rather than personal anecdotes.

Perhaps due to the close focus of the entire volume on internationalization and EMI, it is not divided into parts; hence, the contents are introduced here by theme. Firstly, after Bowles and Murhpy’s introduction, three chapters address the challenges that arise as a consequence of discrepancies between policy and practice concerning the implementation of EMI programs. Specifically, Ikuya Aizawa and Jim McKinley, in their chapter “EMI Challenges in Japan’s Internationalization of Higher Education” (27-48), use a multilayered conceptual framework examining the macro-, meso- and microlevels of internationalization and EMI implementation to explore how HE institutions in Japan deal with top-down policies. They emphasize the need for more faculty support, reforms in the pedagogical structure of universities as well as English language support for students to bridge the gap between policy and practice. In line with this, in her chapter “Using English for Interaction in the EMI Classroom: Experiences and Challenges at a Malaysian Public University” (129-54), Jagdish Kaur presents a qualitative study based on her interviews with twenty-four students and academic staff. Through content analysis, the key linguistic challenges EMI participants face are identified. She argues that EMI does not just take care of itself and demonstrates that if explicit language policies were in place they could provide much-needed language and institutional support to both students and teaching staff. Karen M. Laurisden’s chapter, “It Does Not Happen by Osmosis: Creating an Internationalized Learning Opportunity for All Students Requires Careful Consideration and Specific Action” (205-27), furthers this argument by exploring the possible forms that the creation and implementation of internationalized learning opportunities might take. She provides a close examination of what policies, strategies and practices are required. Through her study of four Danish universities, she shows that each discipline differs in its internationalization needs, that EMI cannot on its own automatically lead to intercultural learning and that the international and intercultural goals of programs need to be made explicit in learning outcomes.

Regarding the second theme—the quality of education in EMI—in their chapter “The Challenges of Internationalization in EMI Tertiary Education in Ethiopia” (77-

101), Amanda C. Murphy and Misganaw Solomon Mengistu present the challenges Ethiopia has faced in its implementation of EMI in an effort to internationalize HE. From the analysis of interview and document data, they reveal that the absence of clear national language policies combined with low English proficiency levels has had severe consequences on the quality of HE in the country and that low proficiency creates real barriers to progress for both lecturers and students. They emphasize the criticality of conceptualizing and planning the implementation of an internationalization process and argue that the creation of clear policies would provide the structural and institutional support stakeholders need, as well as give value to and support the use of local languages. The second chapter investigating quality in HE is Christopher Worthmann's "In Search of Internationalization: Changing Conceptions of EMI among Mexican University Instructors" (155-79), which reviews how simply teaching through English does not lead to internationalization and points out that it can actually lower the quality of education. Through an analysis of lecturers' experiences during a teacher-training course on internationalizing the curriculum, he describes how instructor ideologies were transformed and explains that new methodologies emerged that incorporated richer course content and more diverse perspectives. These two chapters show that the careless implementation of EMI programs can have negative effects on the quality of education and provide two different solutions to help solve the problem.

In addition to touching on quality concerns in EMI, the next two chapters focus on the threat that Englishization poses to local languages and cultures. The first, "Resistance to EMI in the Netherlands" (49-75), by René Gabriëls and Robert Wilkinson, reviews a public controversy and court case concerning the role of English in the Netherlands and analyzes perception data from students. The main topics are the quality of education through English, the loss of status of Dutch as an academic language and the consequences this has on cultural identity. Gabriëls and Wilkinson disprove the public belief that English is detrimental to the quality of education while, in contrast, they provide evidence that Englishization can be problematic for the status of the national language and cultural identity. The second of these chapters, "The Role of English in Higher Education Internationalization: Language Ideologies on EMI Programmes in China" (103-28), by Ying Wang, reports on language ideologies associated with the role of English in China's HE institutions through an examination of educational policies, media narratives and grassroots perceptions. The data reveal a few potential problems. Firstly, because EMI is highly celebrated and prestigious in China, it seems to be restricted to small elite groups. Secondly, the overemphasis on English in EMI means that the teaching content and the quality of the English used in the classroom are often overlooked. Finally, EMI in China is still very NS English-focused, which points to a need for more awareness of ELF.

The fourth theme addressed in the volume edited by Bowles and Murphy is the role of English outside the curriculum. For example, in "Language Usage and Learning Communities in the Informal Curriculum: The Student as Protagonist in EMI?" (181-

203) Kevin Haines, Monique Kroese and Diandian Guo go beyond the classroom and examine the role of English among international and Dutch students in student study associations through the analysis of focus group data. They argue for an inclusive use of English and highlight the fact that this interaction can lead to real intercultural and international exchange between local and foreign students. Francesca Costa and Cristina Mariotti report similar findings in their chapter “EMI Students’ ‘International Coexistence’ at One Italian University” (229-58) by showing how university policy supports the role of English in the interaction between local and international students outside the classroom. Through content analysis of questionnaires and focus groups, they conclude that the local students needed more English language support, the international students needed more Italian language support, and that besides the use of English in the classroom, English was used inclusively on campus and in residences.

The second book under review, edited by Murata (2019), is part of the Routledge Research in Language Education Series and focuses on aspects of EMI such as language education, policy and politics, pedagogy, classroom practice and teacher development from an ELF perspective. Although the volume includes eight contributions from a Japanese HE context, a global aspect perspective is provided by chapters from other contexts, such as Austria, Brazil, China, Sweden and Korea. In the introductory chapter, “Exploring EMI in Higher Education from an ELF Perspective: Introduction” (1-11), Murata states the aim of the volume is to “explore the development of ELF research, paying special attention to EMI contexts, [...] deepen our understanding of the meaning of ELF, its role, possibility and implications in real-world contexts: language pedagogy in EMI contexts in HE” (1). Three main themes are dealt with in the book. The first is a critique of the preference for the English NS standard in EMI contexts on the part of students, academic staff and policymakers, a preference that is based on the idea that NS English is superior to other varieties. Secondly, the attitudes of students and lecturers as well as classroom practice in regard to ELF are addressed; here the emphasis is on the need for a shift from NS English to ELF when implementing EMI programs. The third theme looks at ELF from a pedagogical perspective, with case studies presented that describe the effects of using ELF in EMI settings.

The volume contains sixteen chapters divided into three sections. Part one—chapters two to six—deals with ELF in HE from the perspective of language policies at institutional and governmental levels. It opens with Jennifer Jenkins’s “The Internationalization of Higher Education: But What about Its Lingua Franca?” (17-31), which critiques the ideology towards English inherent to HE institutions around the world. Through a qualitative analysis of university webpages, a questionnaire and open-ended interviews, she suggests that universities take for granted the superiority of NS English and understand internationalization as going hand in hand with American or British NS English, unaware that native speakers of English often lack intercultural communication skills. The following four chapters are similar to each other in that they provide detailed reviews of the implementation and practice of EMI in their respective

countries. Firstly, Clarissa Menezes Jordão problematizes NS English versus NNS English ideologies in her chapter “Intelligibility, Mimicry and Internationalization: Localized Practices in Higher Education, or Can the Global South Speak?” (15-31), and argues that the use of English in HE in Brazil is a tool that perpetuates colonialism and English hegemony. She describes the internationalization program adopted at her institution, which aimed to decolonize English by discussing language matters with participants from an English as a medium-for-discussion rather than an instruction perspective. In the next chapter, “English-Medium Instruction at Swedish Universities: Developments over the Past Decade” (46-63), Maria Kuteeva reviews the EMI policy and implementation of parallel language use of English and Swedish over the past twenty years. Using the Road-Mapping framework (Dafouz and Smit 2016) to evaluate EMI in Sweden, she identifies areas for future research, specifically language management in HE and the relationship between EMI, internationalization and glocalization. Joo-Kyung Park then explores EMI policy and implementation in Korea in “English-Medium Instruction in the Korean Higher Education Context: From an English as a Lingua Franca Perspective” (64-77). She highlights two main challenges: policy implementation and lack of English proficiency and confidence. As a solution, she suggests that the adoption and awareness of ELF could help stakeholders to develop positive attitudes towards different varieties of English, and that for EMI to be beneficial, support systems need to be in place for both students and lecturers. Finally, she calls for sociolinguistic and educational reforms to meet the needs of globalization. In the last chapter in this section, “EMI in Japanese Higher Education: A Paradoxical Space for Global and Local Sociolinguistic Habitats” (78-95), Masakazu Iino reviews studies on EMI in Japan to problematize the top-down implementation of EMI policies in this country, considering variables such as globalization and student mobility, official language level testing, university management and how to balance the use of English with Japanese identity.

Part two—chapters seven to eleven—looks at ELF in EMI settings in terms of attitudes, identities and classroom practices. It begins with “Classroom Discourse in EMI: On the Dynamics of Multilingual Practices” (99-122), where Ute Smit presents an ethnographic study of an EMI hotel management course in Vienna and reveals how ELF features and multilingual practices like code-switching and translanguaging are fundamental in EMI classrooms and “help the meaning-making process along” (116). In chapter eight, “Enacting an ELF-Informed English-Medium Instruction Curriculum” (123-36), Patrick Ng details his personal experience as an English teacher in Japan. He describes his teaching context, the ideological shift he experienced when he learned about ELF and how that shaped his pedagogical approach. He also touches on personal identity issues in ELF and ends with some suggestions for teacher education programs. In the following chapter, “Internationalization and the Growing Demand for English in Japanese Higher Education: Undertaking Doctoral Study in English” (137-56), Jaroslaw Kriukow and Nicola Galloway pursue the theme of

language ideology and, through interview data and thematic analysis, report on three PhDs students' conceptualizations of EMI in Japanese HE. The authors show that students are aware of the motives for implementing EMI and have positive attitudes towards it, and that the most serious challenges for EMI are structural rather than linguistic. They propose more dialogue between stakeholders as a solution. Similarly, in "English-Medium Instruction in a Japanese University: Exploring Students' and Lecturers' Voices from an ELF Perspective" (157-75) Mayu Konakahara, Kumiko Murata and Masakazu Iino use an open-ended questionnaire to investigate students' and lecturers' attitudes towards EMI from the ELF perspective in an EMI course and an entire program taught via EMI. They report that students on EMI courses tended to focus on language learning while the lecturers focused on content learning; in contrast, the EMI program students seemed to be more aware of the other benefits of EMI—i.e., internationalization aspects and goals—and were slightly more ELF oriented. The authors conclude that it would be beneficial to diversify the nationalities of both the students and the faculty members on EMI courses to provide a true ELF setting and encourage global perspectives and tolerance towards diverse English. In the final chapter in this second part, "Identity and Pragmatic Language Use among East Asian ELF Speakers and its Implications for English-Medium Instruction" (176-97), Yoko Nogami shifts the focus from attitudes to identity and pragmatic use in EMI, specifically how ELF users construct their L2 identities. Following a qualitative analysis of questionnaires and interviews with fifteen students, she argues there is a clear "us"—East Asians—and "them"—Westerners, including American and British speakers of English—and that when East Asians communicate with Westerners in English they accommodate them in ways they would a NS of English; instead, when they speak English with other Asians, ELF features of communication pervade their speech and they make pragmatic choices to align themselves culturally and show shared identity with their interlocutors.

In part three—chapters twelve to sixteen—light is shed on microlevel EMI policies at individual institutions through the use of case studies. Ying Wang's "The Role of English in the Internationalization of Chinese Higher Education: A Case Study of English-Medium Instruction in China" (201-18) illuminates the role of EMI in internationalization from an ELF perspective. This chapter shows how the university in question adopted an inclusive practice towards language, both using ELF as a communicative instrument in internationalization and recognizing the importance of Chinese by engaging in the parallel use of the two languages and promoting Chinese culture and identity. In the following chapter, "Designing CELFIL (Content and ELF Integrated Learning) for EMI Classes in Higher Education" (219-38), Nobuyuki Hino describes the development of a pedagogy that integrates ELF and CLIL (Content Language Integrated Learning) while emphasizing the importance of authentic and meaningful interactions. On his part, in "Expanding ELF-Informed EMI in Japanese Higher Education" (239-59) James D'Angelo, after carrying out a needs assessment

at a Japanese university, suggests that having a two-track approach to university programs would be beneficial since students who wish to continue their training in English-speaking countries or consider working in ELF settings can partake in more demanding content-based EMI programs, while those who wish to stay local could enroll in a mainstream course. In “Beyond Global English(es): University English Program Transition” (259-70) Masaki Oda examines the gap between the beliefs of those in the English language teaching profession and the beliefs held by the general public regarding EMI at a mid-sized university in Japan. He also focuses on the shift in hiring criteria and the creation of a program that teaches English for academic purposes from an ELF perspective. In the final chapter, “Critical Language Testing and English Lingua Franca: How Can One Help the Other?” (271-85), Elana Shohamy addresses one of the concerns brought up by Oda—namely, the lack of assessment criteria for ELF. She argues that “if ELF is a valid construct in teaching and uses, it should also be possible to use it as a proficiency criterion” (273) and underscores the importance of creating ELF tests if ELF is to be officially recognized.

The two volumes under review here can be considered complementary, in the sense that they provide a clear picture of the current state of EMI at both the micro- and macrolevel of structure and implementation. Examples and experiences are shared from around the world and from different ideological perspectives. The individual chapters flow in and out of one another, as well as across the two volumes. Taking language policy as an example, through their respective case studies the various authors identify the same factors that pose challenges to the effective implementation and carrying out of EMI programs. To begin with, the gap between language or internationalization policies and practice is shown to trigger concerns regarding the quality of education and the benefits of EMI. For instance, Murphy and Mengistu and Kaur in their respective chapters in Bowles and Murphy (2020) argue that in order to maintain quality and equitable education for all, clear EMI policies must be adopted and that it is essential to provide support to both students and academic staff to operate effectively under such policies. This partly contrasts with Aizawa and McKinley’s chapter in the same volume, which shows that the top-down policies enforced in Japan have led to a questionable quality of education, but also emphasizes that providing the appropriate support is a solution to this problem. In Murata (2019), the chapter by Kuteeva follows the same thread: she claims that there is no one-size-fits-all policy and that the needs of each department and discipline need to be carefully considered before deciding what the role of English is in each particular case. Three chapters address the question of quality from a pedagogical perspective, namely, Worthman’s in Bowles and Murphy (2020) and Hino’s and Oda’s in Murata (2019). These authors detail the experiences of implementing teacher or student support centers in their respective institutions to help internationalize the curriculum or support ELF use. Theirs are all valuable contributions to EMI research in that they provide solutions for the lack of support for stakeholders and demonstrate how quality could be ensured by providing it.

Another issue that is woven across several chapters in the two volumes is the lack of attention to language use in EMI practice. It seems that English is essential for internationalization but at the same time is invisible (Costa and Mariotti 2017), and as Bowles and Murphy state, EMI has become the elephant in the internationalization room (8). Factors such as language identity, support for national languages, support for the English language and language equity in the face of Englishization are highlighted particularly well by Jordão in Murata (2019), who offers a thought-provoking critique on ELF in HE. She underscores the need to question the role and motives of English in internationalization and raises the issue of English hegemony, which is also reflected upon by Gabriëls and Wilkinson in the Bowles and Murphy volume regarding the situation in the Netherlands. Language equity is an important theme that is made particularly explicit in the volume edited by Murata, especially in Nogami's and Wang's chapters. Again, both volumes seek to answer similar questions concerning the role of English in EMI and internationalization. For example, Costa and Mariotti and Haines, Kroese and Guo in Bowles and Murphy (2020) point out that the use of English is not only a concern in the curriculum but also on campus and in other informal settings, which impacts on language identity and equity. Similarly, D'Angelo's, Kruikow and Galloway's and Oda's contributions in Murata (2019) focus on the language needs of the students outside as well as within the classroom. The authors converge in their conclusions that local languages should be supported and that language policy needs beyond the curriculum should be addressed.

The third theme that is central to both volumes is EMI stakeholders' ideology towards English in EMI. Explicit discussion of this factor has hitherto been somewhat overlooked and these volumes provide important and timely reports on the topic. Specifically, both volumes call attention to perspectives towards the English variety used in EMI and provide evidence that reforms are necessary as EMI expands in HE. This is especially clear in Murata's volume (2019) as it is written entirely from the ELF perspective. For example, both Jenkins's and Park's contributions begin by pointing out that NS English is often maintained as the standard variety in HE contexts, while Jordão's and Konakahara, Murata and Iino's chapters discuss important instances of inequity that arise when NS English is the standard variety in EMI programs. Finally, the chapters by D'Angelo, Ng and Wang offer solutions as to how perspectives can be shifted to include ELF ideology in EMI. In the volume edited by Bowles and Murphy, the contributions by Gabriëls and Wilkinson, Wang and Worthman also address the matter and provide similar solutions. Finally, both volumes provide strong evidence for the urgent need for policymakers to take empirical research into account when implementing EMI programs and for awareness raising regarding the complex issues relating to language use and the variety of English that should be used to ensure quality and equitable HE for all.

The two volumes make a substantial contribution to the field of EMI research. In regard to internationalization, they provide other researchers, lecturers, students, university management and policymakers with the evidence and key factors to take

into consideration when implementing EMI programs and making decisions on internationalization policies. Both volumes also raise awareness of language issues, making them visible to policymakers. By illustrating the problems that can arise, they highlight the critical need for language to be taken seriously and not be left unaddressed at any level of policy or practice. Importantly, many of the contributions also offer solutions on how to proceed with more equitable, sustainable and higher-quality practices in HE around the world. The volumes agree on many matters, but they differ on a critical point, namely, their ideology towards English and the role of English in EMI. While the essays collected by Bowles and Murphy (2020) center on internationalization and what role English plays in that process from a myriad of perspectives, the Murata volume (2019) focuses more narrowly on the conceptualization of one type of English—ELF—used in EMI. Bowles and Murphy's contributors manage to identify the key concerns and provide answers and strategies to move forward, while those contributing to the Murata volume expend more effort in describing the current situation and problematizing the factors. This is probably because ELF is an emerging field of research, especially in relation to EMI, and is still somewhat controversial.

To point out a shortcoming of both books, although the chapters consider a wide range of factors, language and content learning in EMI is overlooked. There still seems to be very little empirical evidence in this direction. In addition, in the Murata volume (2019) some of the chapters rely heavily on personal anecdotes or experiences and less so on empirical data. Despite these shortcomings, this volume is unique in that it brings together two separate research fields, EMI and ELF, and discusses such questions as: How can advances be made in ELF teaching and testing? What kind of English support do EMI stakeholders need? What are the current perspectives towards English in EMI and how can they be shifted to a more inclusive ELF perspective? Because the ELF perspective challenges EMI and how it has been carried out to date, this is bound to be an inspiring collection of essays to anyone involved in EMI. In particular, the chapters that touch on ELF pedagogy and testing make a substantial contribution and can pave the way for more research in this area, which is badly needed if ELF is to develop as a linguistic standard of quality in EMI. The volume edited by Bowles and Murphy (2020), on the other hand, makes a contribution to the field of EMI research by addressing critical questions such as: What is the role of English and EMI in respect to internationalization in HE? How can policies be more inclusive of local languages and cultures? How can policies help university lecturers and students engage in more realistic and sustainable practices? In addition, this collection stands out because it brings together experiences from around the world that specifically discuss the role of English in internationalization. This is an important step on the way towards equitable HE on a global level and will be of much interest to anyone interested in EMI.

WORKS CITED

- BJORKMAN, Beyza. 2011. "Pragmatic Strategies in English as an Academic Lingua Franca: Ways of Achieving Communicative Effectiveness?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (4): 950-46.
- CHAPPLE, Julian. 2015. "Teaching in English Is not Necessarily the Teaching of English." *International Education Studies* 8 (3): 1-13.
- COSTA, Francesca and Cristina Mariotti. 2017. "Differences in Content Presentation and Learning Outcomes in English-Medium Instruction (EMI) vs. Italian-Medium Instruction (IMI) Contexts." In Valeke and Wilkinson 2017, 187-204.
- DAFOUZ, Emma and Ute Smit. 2016. "Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings." *Applied Linguistics* 37 (3): 397-415.
- DOIZ, Aintzane, David Lasagabaster and Juan Manuel Sierra, eds. 2013. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- EARLS, Clive W. 2016. *Evolving Agendas in European English-Medium Higher Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- FIRTH, Alan. 1996. "The Discursive Accomplishment of Normality: On 'Lingua Franca' English and Conversation Analysis." *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (2): 237-59.
- GAO, Xuesong, ed. 2019. *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Berlin: Springer.
- JENKINS, Jennifer. 2013. *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2019. "English Medium Instruction in Higher Education: The Role of English as a Lingua Franca." In Gao 2019, 91-108.
- KACHRU, Braj B. 1985. "Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle." In Quirk and Widdowson 1985, 11-30.
- LEASK, Betty. 2015. *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. London and New York: Routledge.
- MACARO, Ernesto et al. 2018. "A Systematic Review of English Medium Instruction in Higher Education." *Language Teaching* 51 (1): 36-76.
- MARINONI, Giorgio. 2019. *Internationalization of Higher Education: An Evolving Landscape, Locally and Globally*. International Association of Universities 5th Global Survey. Paris: Duz Medienhaus/International Association of Universities.
- MORTENSEN, Janus. 2013. "Notes on English Used as a Lingua Franca as an Object of Study." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2 (1): 25-46.
- QUIRK, Randolph and Henry G. Widdowson, eds. 1985. *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- SAARINEN, Taina and Tarja Nikula. 2013. "Implicit Policy, Invisible Language: Policies and Practices of International Degree Programmes in Finnish Higher Education." In Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra 2013, 131-50.
- SANDSTRÖM, Anna-Malin and Ross Hudson. 2018. *The EAIE Barometer: Internationalisation in Europe*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education (EAIE).

- SEIDLHOFER, Barbara. 2009. "Accommodation and the Idiom Principle in English as a Lingua Franca." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6 (2): 195-215.
- SEIDLHOFER, Barbara, Angelika Breiteneder and Marie-Luise Pitzl. 2006. "English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for Applied Linguistics." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26: 3-34.
- SMIT, Ute. 2010. *English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education: A Longitudinal Study of Classroom Discourse*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- VALCKE, Jennifer and Robert Wilkinson, eds. 2017. *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: Perspectives and Professional Practice*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- WÄCHTER, Bernd and Friedhelm Maiworm. 2014. *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education*. Bonn: ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education.
- WILKINSON, Robert. 2013. "English-Medium Instruction at a Dutch University: Challenges and Pitfalls. In Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra 2013, 3-26.

Received 24 August 2021

Revised version accepted 25 October 2021

Jennifer Ament is a part-time lecturer in the English and German Studies Department at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Her main research interests are in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). She specifically investigates pragmatics, as well as factors such as context of learning, mainly EMI, and individual differences and how they interact with SLA outcomes.