'I have completely changed my point of view concerning native speakers': An EMI training project promoting emancipatory pedagogy

Paul Roberts, Volha Arkhipenka, Ursula Lanvers and Tetyana Lunyova

BRITISH COUNCIL

TeachingEnglish

UNIVERSITY of York

'I have completely changed my point of view concerning native speakers': An EMI training project promoting emancipatory pedagogy

Paul Roberts, Volha Arkhipenka, Ursula Lanvers and Tetyana Lunyova

Abstract

The increase in teaching via English as medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education (HE) settings, where English is not the normal institutional language, has led to concerns over possible negative effects of EMI, and the lack of staff training to prepare lecturers for EMI. The scant evidence on existing staff training programmes suggests a focus on English language competency at the expense of pedagogy, and a general linguistic and political contextualisation of the phenomenon of EMI. This study set out to develop, implement and test a new EMI training programme designed to raise awareness of changing varieties of English, the link between EMI and the internationalisation and commodification of HE, as well as deliver more practical pedagogical content. The programme was delivered to two small groups at the Poltava VG Korolenko National Pedagogical University, Ukraine: experienced HE staff, and trainee English teachers. Before–after differences in participant attitudes to English were assessed using mixed measures. Results show that the programme promoted a greater shift in attitude in staff than students, and that despite the overall success of the programme, some participants were reluctant to give up engrained attitudes towards English.

Highlights

- Teacher training for lecturers asked to deliver EMI is limited.

- If available, training tends to focus on English language standards and pedagogical skills.

- We offered training with a different focus: developing awareness of issues such as native speakerism, and the pros and cons of Englishisation.

- Results suggest a positive effect on critical teacher reflection on the above issues.

- More teaching time would be needed to engender critical reflection in all participants.

About the authors

Dr Volha Arkhipenka has recently completed her PhD at the University of Manchester and is now Associate Lecturer in Education at the University of York. Her main research interests are in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), teacher development and narrative inquiry.

Dr Ursula Lanvers is a Senior Lecturer in Language Education at the University of York. She has published extensively on the language learning landscape in the UK, and learner motivation. She is interested in the linguistic and political effects of global English, both in Anglophone countries and in countries adopting Englishisation. She has edited a Special Edition in the *European Journal of Language Education* on lay perceptions of the Englishisation of education in Europe.

Dr Tetyana Lunyova completed her PhD in Linguistics at the Kyiv National Linguistic University. She currently holds the position of an Associate Professor in the Department of English and German Philology at Poltava V.G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University. Her main research interests are in cognitive semantics and TESOL.

Dr Paul Roberts was the long-standing director of the Centre for English Language Teaching at the University of York, until 2018. He completed a doctoral thesis, and has published widely, on English as an International Language and English for Academic Purposes. He led the design, implementation and evaluation of many training courses and collaborated internationally on the design and implementation of training programmes for EMI staff.

Contents

1

Introduction

The progressive educator must always be [...] reinventing what it means to be democratic in his or her own specific cultural and historical context. – Paulo Freire (1997)

Over the last two decades, teaching via English as medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education (HE), in settings where English is not the normal institutional language, has rapidly increased, with scholarly work on EMI in HE gradually catching up with actual practice. Arguably, of all education sectors, HE has been the fastest to experience the move towards Englishisation. This term is generally understood to mean the use of English where hitherto a different (e.g. regional, local, national or foreign) language was used (Kirkpatrick, 2011). Englishisation is a contested issue, as embracing the idea of English as a modernising phenomenon is countered by fears of linguistic and cultural imperialism, domain loss of national languages, social division, and the demise of local and national identities (Dearden, 2014).

Senior HE managers' decision to Englishise their institutions is often motivated by a drive towards internationalisation. In some institutions, Englishisation may be perceived to be all that is required in order to internationalise (Jenkins, 2014: 124 Note 2). Internationalisation, in turn, often works in tandem with commodification of HE, whereby education might be considered a product for individual or national consumption, helping students into well-paid employment, or, internationally, as a marketable commodity (Ferguson, 2007: 13–14; Macaro, 2018: 6). Commodification of HE, and its link to Englishisation, has been the subject of controversy for some time (e.g. Karpov, 2013; Matthews, 2014). Indeed, Englishisation can be a (more or less incidental) outcome when universities aim to internationalise their institutions (Saarinen, 2017).

In HE institutions, decisions to implement EMI often taken without much prior consultation, staff training or forward planning (Dearden, 2014) can lead to a range of responses among staff members, from enthusiasm to downright rejection (Macaro, 2018: 93). In cases where forward planning and investment have preceded the implementation of EMI, staff training is provided to assist the switch from 'home' language to EMI teaching, run either by public or private providers (Lam and Maiworm, 2014: 110–115). However, training schemes available for public inspection suggest that they focus on English for specific purposes (ESP), here English for the purpose of teaching subjects other than English (Macaro, 2018). What tend to be missing from such training schemes are wider contextualisations, such as rationales for the move towards EMI, and implications, both conceptual and practical, for the staff members involved. From a conceptual point of view, the move to EMI could imply changes in how staff members see themselves, and from a practical point of view, EMI is likely to include interacting with more heterogeneous groups of students than staff have been used to, with all that implies in terms of possible changes in pedagogy.

Furthermore, the very notion of *English* tends not to be considered a problem, and is mostly represented as a monolithic entity, bounded by 'native-speakerist' standards, ignoring the literature generated, especially in the last two decades, on notions of English as lingua franca, World Englishes and English as an international language. While the globally oriented aspirations leading HE institutions to EMI might align well with modern polylithic understandings of English, such conceptualisations of English have made little impact on critical reflective EMI practice and EMI training to date.

Thus, in the context of contested meanings of *English* and its standards, *all* EMI practices, and institutional policies to introduce EMI at HE, are ideologically charged. This contribution takes no specific stance in this debate per se, but highlights the pedagogical need for including such issues in EMI staff training. The study presents a pedagogical training programme designed for linguistically emancipatory EMI staff training, and reports on an empirical validation of such a training scheme. With this background in mind, the project reported in this article had two aims:

- to help staff prepare for, and engage in, EMI in HE in a critically reflective manner. We adopt Freirean principles of emancipatory pedagogy and aim to empower EMI practitioners to develop their own stances towards phenomena such as Englishisation, the commodification of HE, and standards of English. Critical reflections on native-speakerism, and the changing nature of English due to its status as global lingua franca, are key parts of this training programme. We consider this aspect especially important since the vast majority of EMI teachers are non-native speakers, including the participants in this study

- to observe the effects of the emancipatory training programme we delivered. The programme foregrounds the political and ideological contexts of the internationalisation of HE, and worldwide use of English, but also offers pedagogical practical advice for EMI teaching.

The following review discusses the move towards EMI in HE in the context of economic liberalism and the commodification of education. We end this section with a consideration of how a training programme might be designed, using two-way communications and input from practitioners engaged in EMI teaching processes, in an attempt to be true to our emancipatory principles. The subsequent sections present this study, describe the teaching materials, and report on the intervention, participants, data collection and results.

1.1 EMI in the context of Englishisation, commodification and internationalisation of HE

The link between Englishisation, commodification and internationalisation of HE generally has been aptly described (e.g. Jenkins, 2013; Hultgren et al., 2015), as well as vehemently condemned (e.g. Phillipson, 2013; Teekens, 2007) elsewhere. Hence, the focus in this review will be on inherently ideological issues in EMI practices, and on raising awareness of such issues in EMI training.

The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), in 1999, can be seen as a cornerstone of the commodification of education, including HE: the agreement included the framing of HE as a service business, promoting and marketing products for sale in a global marketplace (World Trade Organization, 1999). Lemoine et al. (2017) suggest that, as a result of the Agreement, 'Universities are now battling, borderless, global competitors moving into the business of education' and postulate that 'To stay viable in the knowledge economy, post-secondary institutions need(ed) to become business-like entrepreneurs by marketing themselves' (2017: 59).

HE institutions' management increasingly see internationalisation as key to building and maintaining their viability. Universities have become international players in the education market, aiming to attract students in a global market, and to provide domestically recruited students with global possibilities. Where universities are ranked on international league tables, EMI has become a 'terrain on which universities compete' (Piller and Cho, 2013: 25) making EMI or Englishisation an essential part of the process of marketisation and competition (Hultgren et al., 2015: 1). National governments, for their part, often either directly encourage or facilitate the dual drive towards Englishisation and marketisation of their HE institutions (e.g. Rose and McKinley, 2018 for Japanese context; for Ukrainian context, see below).

A long-standing argument against EMI practice is a concern that learning outcomes might suffer due to the dual demands on students to cope with both content and a second language; this concern has been largely refuted in empirical studies (e.g. Dafouz et al., 2014; Dafouz and Camacho-Miñano, 2016). More fundamental arguments against EMI concern its role in the global move towards Englishisation. Some academics view the spread of English as part of a neo-imperialist move (Phillipson, 1992), and many share the fear that Englishisation indicates 'a loss of diversity and creeping homogenisation' (Sonntag, 2003: xi), the degradation of other languages and threats to cultural identities (e.g. Geertz Gonzalez, 2017: 56; Li, 2013; Salomone, 2015). Opponents of the imperialist argument reject Phillipson's (1992, 2015) notion of Englishisation as a top-down force and argue that, on the contrary, English may be *appropriated* by the world as a way of resisting imperialist forces (Canagarajah, 1999). Indeed, *participants* in EMI tend not to describe English as a threat to their local cultures (e.g. Goodman, 2013; Lazaretnaya, 2016). McPherron's (2017) longitudinal study of Englishisation in China, for example, shows how 'Western' teaching reforms are hybridised and assimilated into 'traditional' Chinese classrooms.

Others counter that such adaptations of 'Western' practices to other contexts still imply Western dominance: glocalisation (global principles, local adaptation) 'does very little if anything to promote socially just pedagogies in education' (Maringe, 2017: 66–67).

1.2 A third way?

One argument against the 'imperialist Englishisation' stance lies in the fact that English itself is constantly being reconceptualised. We have seen early proposals for English as an international language (e.g. Smith, 1978), Kachru's circles of World Englishes (1992), and attempts at codifying English as a lingua franca (see e.g. Seidlhofer, 2002, 2003). Increasingly, researchers have to face the reality of diversities of Englishes. If we consider English not as one named language variety (see Hall et al., 2013; Saraceni, 2015), but 'as a set of circulating, complex communicative resources' (Heller and Duchêne, 2012: 4), which are constantly 'constructed, negotiable and contested' (Baker, 2015: 106), we allow English to be conceptualised as a resource shaped by all users. Thus, these reconceptualisations of English offer avenues for EMI practitioners for non-imperialist practices.

1.3 EMI training programmes

The following overview of EMI training programmes is brief out of necessity: not only are HE EMI training programmes rarely reported in the literature, they are also rarely empirically evaluated (Macaro, 2018). Having said this, existing reports on EMI training tend to address the following challenges: standards of English, teaching a diverse body of students, and cultural expectations. We shall report on each.

The lack of EMI staff training has been lamented by several (Dearden, 2014; Macaro, 2018); furthermore, training schemes available for public inspection suggest a focus on English language skills rather than pedagogy (Macaro, 2018: 237–242). Different approaches institutions may adopt to facilitate the implementation of EMI tend to focus on the *student* body, and on their *linguistic* competence (Macaro, 2018: 232–233). Initiatives to help prepare *staff* are rarer (see Lasagabaster, 2018); even rarer is information on what such training may look like, and what effect it might have.

Klaassen and Bos (2010) report that a university in the Netherlands implementing EMI has obligatory English language proficiency screening; seven other universities have adopted voluntary screening. They do not refer to training schemes intended to help staff achieve appropriate levels of proficiency. Staff are tested via a combination of the Oxford Quick Placement Test and an oral proficiency test, with some universities demanding IELTS scores of 7.5 for EMI staff. The process resulted in only a temporary reduction in student complaints about staff's English (Klaassen and Bos, 2010: 68) – perhaps a reminder that in any standardised language test, both linguistic and pedagogical issues are at stake (see Macaro, 2018).

The University of Copenhagen developed an in-house assessment scheme for English language proficiency tailored for EMI needs in HE, and thus potentially offering a better fit for purpose than the above-mentioned tests (Kling and Staehr, 2013), including the criterion 'lecturers' intelligibility to students from a range of different language backgrounds' (page 24). As Lam and Maiworm (2014) remind us: 'strong English proficiency of the teaching staff does not imply that they can readily handle the heterogeneous command of English, academic and cultural differences of the students in the classroom' (page 106). In a rare departure from most approaches, Dimova and Kling (2018) and Kling and Dimova (2015) focus on the intersectionality of pedagogical and English language skills in their assessment of EMI staff's oral proficiency. However, overall, existing approaches to testing staff English language proficiency for EMI suggest a native-speakerist approach. The Oxford Placement Test and IELTS are clearly related to standard Englishes while the University of Copenhagen descriptor for the highest level states that 'The lecturer has demonstrated English language proficiency for university teaching equivalent to that of a highly articulate, well-educated native speaker of English' (Kling and Staehr, 2013: 26).

Empirical research on EMI suggests that, despite institutional policies and teachers' concerns regarding 'nativeness', teachers and students tend not to share such concerns when actually using English, both informally and formally, for academic purposes (e.g. Mauranen, 2012). Thus, evidence suggests that the key stakeholders concerned (staff and students) have more tolerant attitudes towards English than official EMI policies might suggest.

In addition to issues of language proficiency, EMI practitioners need to deal with challenging pedagogical contexts, such as a culturally and linguistically heterogeneous student body. A rare example of a focus on such pedagogical issues is reported by Soren (2013), who proposes locally developed proficiency tests, and assessment criteria focusing on the most significant communicative tasks used by EMI practitioners. Studies investigating learner and teacher experiences of the introduction of EMI highlight the need to adapt pedagogical approaches, to increase interaction (e.g. Ball and Lindsay, 2013) and to consider how to make use of students' first language (e.g. Lam and Maiworm, 2014: 106). However, cultural expectations and culture clashes in the internationalised classrooms of EMI also mean that lecturers need to decide whether or not to adopt a more 'Western' style of teaching in order to respond to the supposed needs of international students, and how to respect local cultural backgrounds and expectations of pedagogical practices. In order to address the practicalities of EMI, many HEIs have put in place systems intended to facilitate its introduction and implementation.

Jordão (2016) reports on a course at a Brazilian university, intended to help participants reflect critically on EMI, rather than to enhance their English proficiency or to provide pedagogical training for EMI. However, Jordão reports that participants were resentful that work had been rejected by publishers because it failed to meet appropriate language standards, and felt the need to become more 'native-speaker-like'. The author concludes that teachers' reluctance to implement EMI is closely linked to how they conceive of the language, and that training should aim for more pluralistic and localised understandings of English. Troia (2014) presents pioneering work in designing and implementing programmes for university teachers at a university in the Netherlands. The programme combined English enhancement with work on an 'international' pedagogy and reflection on political aspects of internationalising the curriculum. Unlike Jordão, Troia's approach is practical, and based on staff self-identified need for support and guidance to improve participation in discussions around issues of policy. Using a bottom-up design of needs analysis of staff, this programme included discussions of intercultural competence and reflections on own practice. Ball and Lindsay (2013), reporting on EMI in the Basque Country, offer some evaluation of EMI training programmes, with staff reporting feeling insecure when faced with tasks needed to be carried out in English (page 48).

Summarising the literature on EMI training courses, Macaro (2018) concludes that training is insufficient, in particular in the area of localised programmes responding to the needs of actual teachers. In sum, in addition to the lack of EMI training models, training courses that do exist tend not to include awareness-raising of inherent ideological issues in EMI, such as the following:

■ standards, native speakerism and varieties, and how delivery of desired (negotiated) standards can be safeguarded

■ contexts and rationales for EMI

■ culture and language, cultural hegemony, inter/transcultural communication, safeguarding of local languages

■ teaching practices for international and heterogeneous classrooms.

The training programme developed for this study rests on the notion that such ideological issues, inherent in all EMI practices, are better openly discussed with EMI practitioners, rather than adopting what Macaro (2018) names the 'Ostrich approach' to the issues. Only critical, open reflections of the power dynamics of 'setting standards' permit local EMI stakeholders to develop *their* own shared, localised understandings of English. For these reasons, our programme is mostly concerned with awareness-raising of the above-described ideological issues, although pedagogical techniques for EMI teaching are included. Our project set out to design, implement and evaluate a training programme which would:

■ offer practical help to practitioners in their contexts

■ be flexible and responsive to participant input

■ offer platforms for discussion of the following topics:

– native speakerism, normative and monolithic versus polylithic versions of English

– ideological currents underlying the internationalisation and Englishisation of HE

– purposes and visions of EMI for practitioners' institutions, themselves, and their students.

Well aware of the tension between these aims and the danger of being perceived as 'inner circle' British academic elite, the researchers stressed that their own heterogeneous groups include predominantly English L2 speakers, and that academic English is a native language for no one. In designing and implementing this programme, we aimed to contribute to a *transformative approach in EMI pedagogy*. We understand transformative practice in EMI as one that:

- foregrounds rather than downplays the ideological dimensions of Englishisation

- embraces principles of emancipatory pedagogy, following the Freirean (1997, 2002) framework.

These principles include:

- empowering learners

- utilising the democratic potential of education

- devolving power from teachers to students

- co-constructing knowledge with a focus on human agency rather than achieving goals pre-determined by educators or educational managers.

2

Study design and aims

The programme was implemented in a much-overlooked type of setting, a Ukrainian HE university, working in a context where both Englishisation and a general orientation to the West have become explicit political agenda in recent years.

2.1 Aims

The primary aim of this project was to design, implement and gather feedback on a programme for EMI trainers and teachers which, unlike others, includes the above-mentioned elements of *transformative EMI pedagogy*. A secondary aim was to use staff feedback to refine and adapt the training to local concerns, and to implement this with a different cohort of participants. More broadly, the project aimed to contribute to the literature on EMI by introducing the concept of transformative EMI practices and demonstrating how theory and pedagogy could be combined. The research questions were:

1. Do university staff at the Ukrainian university think differently about EMI before and after the intervention? If so, in what way?

2. Do experienced university staff and future English teachers relate differently to the intervention? If so, how?

2.2 National context

The intervention was delivered in a region of Ukraine some 300 km from Kiev. Ukraine is a relatively homogeneous country where the majority of the population speak Ukrainian as their first language (67.5 per cent of population according to the National Census (State Statistics Service of Ukraine, 2001)). The second most popular first language is Russian (29.5 per cent of the population according to the same source), which is mainly spoken in the eastern part of the country. Since the conflict with Russia, the use of Ukrainian has been promoted (President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko, 2018), a change reflected in educational policy and practice. In 2017, a new education policy was introduced. The policy forbade education in any language other than Ukrainian beyond the primary school (age ten), making an exception only for Tatar and Karaim – two indigenous languages used mainly in Crimea (Verhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2017). In Russia, the policy was interpreted as an attempt to dislodge the use of Russian as a medium of instruction in Ukrainian schools and HE institutions (Fahrutdinov, 2017).

In this complex language context, English received heightened attention, reflecting Ukraine's intention to be closer politically, economically and culturally to the European Union, and more generally to Western countries. Historically, English was just one of several studied modern languages and a subject within the National Curriculum. Now, according to website entries by the President of the Ukraine (President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko, 2015; 2016a; 2016b; 2017), the government recognises English as 'open[ing] horizons for everyone who want to be a part of the modern world'. Raising proficiency levels in English among Ukrainians became a national priority and was described as 'one of the steps to be made on the path to Europe' (*ibid*.). The year 2016 was declared the Year of English Language in Ukraine; substantial funds were allocated for further training of English language teachers, and the intention to introduce compulsory tests in English for all public servants was announced. Public servants working in the President's Administration were tested, and promised a ten per cent increment to their salaries if they passed the required level (*ibid*.).

In 2017, the Ukrainian government passed legislation supporting a nationwide introduction of EMI. It is now permitted to teach 'one or more subjects in educational establishments following the national curriculum [i.e. nearly all educational establishments providing compulsory primary and secondary education] <…> in two or more languages – in the state language [Ukrainian], in English or in other official languages of the European Union' (Verhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2017: article 7). The recentness of this change does not permit evaluation of its effect yet, especially since, as Bolitho and West (2017: 83) observe, '[t]here is a lack of a national strategy for introducing and promoting EMI programmes, so that current EMI provision is varied and sporadic'. Nonetheless, these legislative changes, and governmental interest in Englishisation, make Ukraine an especially interesting context in which to implement and investigate EMI staff training. Given the general lack of EMI training and 'good practice' guidance on the issue, we sought to address the gap by offering content not hitherto tried and tested, but reflecting our aims to raise awareness of ideological issues pertaining to EMI practice.

2.3 Institutional context

The participating Ukrainian university offers education at all levels, including undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research, and has over 6,000 students. A typical undergraduate programme is four years long and leads to a qualified teacher status. Like many other universities around the world, this university sees internationalisation as a priority and has already established connections with 27 institutions abroad, with institutions in both former USSR countries and other countries around the world, e.g. Belarus, Canada, Germany, Kazakhstan, Poland, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the UK and the US. The university also participates in a wide range of academic mobility schemes and international scientific projects. The majority of academic staff and students are Ukrainians, while those who are not are largely citizens of the former USSR countries. There are very few staff or students from other countries, and few are proficient in English. The university was a very apt choice for the intervention: a leading academic from the institution had already been in contact with the UK university with a view to collaborative work and internationalisation. Given its specialisation in pedagogy, the university could potentially reach a wider, even national audience. Finally, the British Council, funding the project, had an ongoing strategic partnership with the Ukrainian HE sector.

2.4 Intervention and participants

The intervention consisted of two courses. The first course was prepared by academics from the UK university and delivered to ten staff, all experienced English language teachers. Their experience ranged from six to nearly 30 (14 years on average). They were all highly trained with most of them holding a degree of *kandidat nauk* (PhD equivalent). Nearly all of them received their training in Ukraine: either at the university where the intervention took place or other major universities in the country. The teachers were fluent in English and were research-active. Some held the Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults and/or had passed international English tests such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) or C2 Proficiency with high scores. They published widely on English language linguistics and pedagogy in national and occasionally international outlets, and some of them had attended international conferences and short courses. They largely taught the language as well as a range of linguistic, literature and pedagogy courses (e.g. country studies, English linguistics, linguistics,

translation studies, essays writing, modern English literature, methodology of teaching English, and education systems in the EU countries). None of them had any experience of EMI. With the university heading towards internationalisation, these teachers are expected to provide the necessary assistance and guidance to their colleagues from the other departments who are preparing to start teaching their subjects through English. Thus, the teachers felt the need for an efficient introduction into EMI pedagogy.

The second course was an adapted version of the first one. Two of the ten teachers who took the first course adapted the Course 1 materials, and delivered them to nine master's students specialising in English language pedagogy. All were Ukrainians in their early 20s. Most of them had completed their undergraduate degrees and started the master's programme immediately afterwards. All of them had some teaching experience; however, most of this experience was gained through placements, but not as professional teachers. The students' proficiency in English was intermediate, on average. Most of the students had learned English as a subject but had never had a chance to use it for communication. They had well-developed receptive skills but struggled with expressing themselves in English. All were studying for a master's degree in English language education, but not all necessarily planned to become English language teachers, mainly because teachers' salaries are very low in Ukraine. Those who do follow a teaching career are likely to face the challenge similar to that of their university English teachers, i.e. the expectation to help schoolteachers of various subjects to switch (partly) to English in their teaching. The course was offered as an elective module to master's students, i.e. they were not required to take it, but completion counted towards their degree. The course was not assessed. Thus, the main difference was that Course 1 was delivered to experienced practitioners educators, and Course 2 to students in training to become such.

Typically, the course delivery in the university where the intervention took place is done via a combination of lectures and seminars with lectures mainly in the form of a teacher doing most of the speaking and presenting the new material and students listening and taking notes. The seminars are viewed predominantly as a way of checking the adequacy and depth of students' understanding of the material delivered. Students mostly work on their own with very few group or team tasks or projects.

2.4.1 Course 1

The first course included five sessions, the content of which was as follows:

- *Session 1*: Getting to know each other, foundations for effective group work, understanding the contexts and goals of internationalised HE, intercultural communication, HE goals of internationalisation and teacher orientation to internationalisation and language standards

- *Session 2:* EMI within the internationalised HE. English as a foreign language versus English as a lingua franca, own use of English

- *Sessions 3–5*: Teaching formats in EMI: one-to-one, small groups and lecture. Reflections on teacher roles within these, lecturing styles to maximise communicability, teaching culturally heterogeneous groups.

The course was delivered over one week in October 2017. Each session lasted between 60 and 150 minutes.

2.4.2 Course 2

The second course closely followed the outline of the first one but was delivered over ten sessions, providing more space for practice, reflection and discussion. The course was structured in the following way:

- *Session 1*: Internationalisation

- *Session 2*: Internationalisation, English as international lingua franca

- *Session 3*: Transcultural communication.

These three sessions covered the same topics as the original course and near-identical activities, but at a slower pace. The sessions were planned as a theoretical introduction to relevant concepts and ideas. A substantial amount of time within each session was allocated to group and class discussion.

- *Session 4*: Conceptualising teaching and learning

- *Session 5*: Lecturing styles and strategies

- *Session 6*: Running small group work

- *Sessions 7–8*: Practice – lecturing strategies and running small group work.

Following the experience of delivering Course 1, Session 4 aimed to prompt the students to reflect on their understanding of the roles of teacher and students. Sessions 5 and 6 discussed two common forms of teaching: lectures and group work. Materials on one-to-one interaction (part of the original course) were mostly covered in sessions 5 and 6.

Sessions 7 and 8 were designed as an opportunity for practice. During these sessions, the students were expected to prepare and deliver a short lecture and then to design and implement a group work task.

- *Session 9*: Assessment criteria

The local facilitator suggested this session; the first author provided materials and resources.

- *Session 10*: Practice – discussion seminar and (self-) assessment

The final session aimed to discuss the larger context, such as:

- Is it possible that persistent use of English will diminish local languages?

- What will Ukraine's contribution be to progress in research and knowledge?

- Is HE a marketable commodity or a common good?

The course was delivered through weekly sessions lasting one hour 20 minutes, from the end of winter to early spring 2018. Sessions were co-taught by two Ukrainians and an academic from the UK university.

2.5 Data and method of analysis

To evaluate the impact of the two courses on the participants, a questionnaire was administered before and after each course. The questionnaire was tailor-made and addressed the following constructs:

- international communicative competence/culture and language

- appropriating English for own purposes

- standards at HE

- English lingua franca as variety

- understanding language change.

The questionnaire included 19 statements about which participants were invited to express their opinion using a five-point Likert scale (see Table 1). The questionnaire was piloted before it was used in the study. Cronbach's alphas of all constructs were above 0.7. Within this study, participants were asked to choose a pseudonym for themselves and to write it on both the pre- and post-course questionnaire forms they completed. This allowed pre- and post-course questionnaires to be matched for each participant and the impact of the intervention on both individuals and the group as a whole to be evaluated.

To triangulate, extend and provide context for the questionnaire data, a variety of other data was collected. This included:

- feedback forms completed by participants of both courses

- individual and group interviews with the participants conducted after each course (see Appendix A for the interview guide)

- ethnographic notes taken during the delivery

- post-course group interviews with the Ukrainian facilitators about the second course (see Appendix B for the interview guide)

- audio recordings of group discussions during some sessions.

The questionnaire data were analysed using frequency analysis. The participants' responses were converted into numbers (1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree). Each participant's responses to the pre- and post-course questionnaires were matched and entered next to each other (see Table 1). Individual participant responses to items were compared to evaluate the extent and nature of the change in beliefs each participant had experienced. The results were compared to the results of analysis of the impact of the courses on the groups as a whole, including comparison of pre–post intervention means, undertaken separately for the two courses.

All qualitative data was transcribed, filed and coded deductively, using the same five constructs that had informed the design of the questionnaire (see below).

Table 1: An extract of the table with the questionnaire data

Statement # in participants' version	Pseudonym and years of experience of teaching at university level	VLK 16/17		QOH 8		CHV 10		MTL 17	
	Before (B)/After (A) course	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A
	SECTION ONE: ACADEMIC ENGLISH								
1	People using English in higher education should use existing standards – British or American English.	5	4	5	5	3	2	4	2
3	English at university should be adapted to local norms and needs – when in Rome, do as the Romans do.	3	3	2	3	2	4	2	4
18	Disciplines in higher education should model their English on prestigious publications in their discipline.	4	3	5	4	4	3	4	3
4	Everyone using English in higher education should try to use English like native speakers.	2	4	4	4	4	3	4	2
16	Staff and students in higher education institutions should not be concerned about English standards and norms.	3	4	1	4	3	2	2	2

3

Results

3.1 Course 1: Academic staff

Prior to the course, all ten teachers agreed that learning English meant learning how to communicate within an international community. Except for one teacher who neither agreed nor disagreed, they all also thought that learning English included learning how to communicate differently with people from different cultures. Most of the teachers (n=7) considered that English used for international communication was different from British and American English. Yet, they also thought it was important to learn how to communicate with British and American people.

The teachers were aware that English changes. However, they were not sure about who contributes to these changes. The majority agreed (n=7) that people all over the world are creating new forms of English, but most participants respected native speakers and their opinion, and thought that English native speakers determine how English develops and changes. They did not see people using English as an international lingua franca as contributors to change. Only four believed that people using English as an international lingua franca establish their own standards and communication behaviour; this was associated with lowering standards. Most thought that when English is used as an international lingua franca, standards are bound to be lower. However, most conceded that anyone teaching EMI was automatically contributing to developing new ways of using the language. The teachers overall saw helping students to achieve global communicative competence as one of the aims of using English at university (n=9). Yet, they were certain that they had to use British or American standards of English (n=9). They believed that it was only if they used these standards that their university would be respected internationally (n=8), and doubted whether English could be adapted to local needs. They largely thought that everyone using English in HE should try to use it like native speakers (n=7). They also thought that English at HE should be modelled on prestigious publications in the respective disciplines (n=8) and that people involved in EMI should keep up with changes in English (n=9).

The course did not change the teachers' beliefs considerably. The only exception was their beliefs concerning standards in English in HE. Following the course, three teachers disagreed that they had to use British or American standards, compared to none before, two more teachers switched from 'strongly agree' to just 'agree'. Four teachers started to think that their university could be respected internationally even if they did not use British or American standards of English. Only one did before the course. Ultimately, five teachers thought that English at university could be adapted to local norms and needs. Only one teacher agreed with this statement before the course. The change in the teachers' beliefs regarding the standards of English at university was reflected in the comments they made during the group discussion at the end of the course. One teacher said:

> I have completely changed my point of view concerning native speakers and non-native speakers. There is no use to try to get the blah blah blah of the native speaker if you are teaching. So the more important things are to be clear and to choose an appropriate style of teaching or lecturing. So pay attention to audience and to sound, to sound understandable to your students. (Post-course group discussion.)

The teachers were better able to link their reflections on standards to the global trend of EMI and, more generally, Englishisation. During the same group discussion, one participant said:

> What I particularly appreciate is that it helps me to understand that EMI is not such a local problem, or a short-term problem, or an urgent problem, but it's kind of part of the bigger changes which go all over the world and which shape the education now and eventually shape our society. (Post-course group discussion.)

Another one made a similar point:

> [...] participating in such kinds of things I, we can, we see and feel ourselves as part of the whole stream and whole world and see that people all over the world have the same problems. (Post-course group discussion.)

This discussion gave teachers impetus to thinking about their practice:

> Those workshops we've had during this week have definitely influenced our, my approach to teaching in general and, and to EMI in particular. It has pushed me to reconsider some techniques, methods of teaching, my skills as a teacher of English, as well as the syllabus drafting, which, in my opinion, it's one of the most difficult tasks. (Post-course group discussion.)

3.2 Course 2: Master's students

The nine master's students who took the second course completed identical pre- and post-course questionnaires to the ones completed by teachers taking the first course. The pre-course questionnaire revealed that the students' beliefs were very similar to those of the teachers. However, unlike the teachers, who reconsidered some of their beliefs following the course, the students barely changed their beliefs. This might be because the students found it difficult to relate to the theoretical content of the course, or the course was not ideally suited to their needs. The preference for practical ideas for teaching was reflected in the students' feedback on the course. When asked to comment, the students typically said that they found the course useful and highlighted the practical knowledge they had gained from it:

> This course was very interesting and useful for me because, as I have told you, I have some experience in teaching. And some new information which I obtained on this course, I think I will use in my practice with my students. (Post-course interview.)

The students responded with particular interest and enthusiasm to the sessions on the group work and highlighted in their feedback that was something new compared to the traditional training they had been getting in the university (explained above in Section 2.4) and that they would like to have more of such activities in their own classes and use them in their own teaching practice.

> I really liked the most the way groups work. There are many types. And all of them I liked. And I think it will be really interesting for my future pupils when I will be using these group works. (Post-course interview.)

When asked about their views on EMI or English as a lingua franca, the students typically said that what they had learned about EMI and English as a lingua franca had changed their thinking. However, they struggled to explain what exactly they had learned, and in what way it had changed them. Ideas around internationalisation, commodification and English as a lingua franca were interesting and novel to the students, but remained rather distant and abstract to them. Some of them did not understand them at all. The culturally bound differences in pedagogical approaches used in our intervention, and their commonly experienced transmission model of pedagogy, might have contributed to the students' reluctance to change their traditional monolithic view of the language and norms. One student, having said, 'I think this programme makes my knowledge bigger,' later defended native speaker, and in particular British, standards in the use of English:

> In my vision, I think that as other universities, we ought to come to the British translation, pronunciation, more than to American. And I think some, in some places British and American, they are not the same, the pronunciation in some ways I think. (Post-course interview.)

Lack of international experience among the students is one likely explanation as to why they found it difficult to embrace polylithic understandings of English. Except for one student who had been on an exchange programme in Germany, none of the students had been abroad, or had meaningful contacts with foreigners. The student who had travelled abroad was able to relate the notion of different varieties of English to her personal experience. She was most vocal throughout the entire course and had the most to say during the post-course interview:

> **Researcher:** Can you tell me if your view of English, the English language has changed at all through doing this course? The way you thought about the English language before you started, is that different at all from the way you think about the English language now? Or is there no change?

Student: I wouldn't say that it changed like at all (in hesitant voice, feels like she wanted to say completely rather than at all). But yes, something has changed. For example, I realised that English… It's not like about British English or American English. It's something bigger, deeper, and even wider. Especially after my own experience while I was talking to people, to people from Spain and from Italy. Their English is very different. And I realised from other point 'Yeah, it's also English, and it's okay. It's not a problem'. So if, while for that moment when I understand people using their English even with some kind of accent, some kind of their own language influence, it's OK, and it is still English.

In sum, all participants appreciated the course, but there were marked differences between staff and student pre–post differences, as well as the concepts most subject to change. The MA student cohort in particular showed little shift in native-speakerist attitudes. Future studies might investigate how students of different ages, and in different EMI learning contexts, could engage with such conceptual issues more fruitfully. The students were very much engaged with the more practical pedagogical teaching. In contrast, staff overall demonstrated a considerable shift in their thinking about standards and varieties. They said that the linguistic and political contextualisation was instrumental in their re-thinking of native-speaker standards.

4

Conclusion

This project explored the effect of a unique, tailor-made EMI training programme. The first course was evaluated via multiple communications between participants receiving the training and the researchers who designed it. Although the results on some issues pertaining to more conceptual issues, such as native speakerism, were somewhat mixed, the intervention nonetheless succeeded in changing thinking on *all* issues, in most staff participants, and some student participants. From the changes we observed, we understood that the Ukraine EMI HE practitioners who participated in this project were not always aware of the degree to which they are an active part of a global drive towards internationalisation of HE, and that such awareness-raising itself can have an empowering effect on lecturers' notions of standards – an observation that supports the inclusion of language-related political issues in future EMI staff training.

However, the fact that conservative views on native speakerism, and a monolithic view of English, persisted in some participants, especially among student participants, needs addressing. The brevity of the intervention itself might be one reason for this: it is possible that more materials, and reflection and discussion time on these issues, are needed. Furthermore, we consider that if the course participants themselves major in English (as in Course 2), they might set native speaker standards for themselves, and also lack the (teaching) experience to adjust their expectations for their future EMI students. The national context, with its strong emphasis on using Englishisation for future European integration (rather than, for example, a more global outlook), may also contribute to a reluctance to give up norms possibly associated with British and/or European English. Future studies, undertaken in different national and local contexts, and with different participant groups, might be able to shed light on the conditions that influence beliefs around EMI, such as native speaker standards.

A more general observation concerns participants' enthusiasm for any practical applications of the intervention, such as assessment, and the challenges for teaching EMI in different formats (e.g. lecture, group work and pair work). Such issues should also form a key element of future EMI training. Overall, adaptive elements of our design, i.e. using Course 1 experience and participant feedback to tweak the content of Course 2, and local teachers, allowed us to improve the local adaptation of the programme.

We hope that this project has contributed to the literature on EMI by providing a training programme situated in the framework of emancipatory pedagogy. In doing so, we adopt a postmodern view of language ourselves, i.e. we understand language as a semiotic resource (Canagarajah, 2013) rather than a fixed entity, and aim to propagate this view in our EMI training. In short, the programme intends to combine emancipatory EMI practices with a theoretical stance on Englishisation (including EMI) that is highly critical of some elements of it (such as commodification, or homogeneous views on standards) but invites participants to view English as an opportunity to appropriate it for their needs.

5

Limitations

Given the innovative nature of our EMI training programme, integrating practical pedagogical and conceptual issues around EMI, the limitations of this study need to be stressed. This intervention was implemented in a single political context of one HE institution; furthermore, it is a small-scale study, using mainly qualitative evaluation. Ideally, future studies would implement interventions based on our principles in a variety of HE contexts, and using larger-scale data, to investigate effects and effect sizes in different contexts.

References

Baker, W (2015) *Culture and identity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Ball, P and Lindsay, D (2013) 'Language demands and support for English-medium instruction in tertiary education. Learning from a specific context', in Doiz, A Lasagabaster, D and Sierra, JM (eds) *English-Medium Instruction at Universities.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 44–61.

Bolitho, R and West, R (2017) *The internationalisation of Ukrainian universities: The English language dimension.* London: British Council.

Canagarajah, AS (1999) *Resisting linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, AS (2013) *Translingual practice.* London: Routledge.

Dafouz, E, Camacho, M and Urquia, E (2014) 'Surely they can't do as well': a comparison of business students' academic performance in English-medium and Spanish-as-first-language-medium programmes. *Language and Education* 28/3: 223–236.

Dafouz, E and Camacho-Miñano, MM (2016) Exploring the impact of English-medium instruction on university student academic achievement: The case of accounting. *English for Specific Purposes* 44: 57–67.

Dearden, J (2014) *English as a medium of instruction – a growing global phenomenon.* British Council. Available online at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_-_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf

Dimova, S (2017) Life after oral English certification: The consequences of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff for EMI lecturers. *English for Specific Purposes* 46: 45–58.

Dimova, S and Kling, J (2018) Assessing English-Medium Instruction Lecturer Language Proficiency Across Disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly* 52: 634–656.

Fahrutdinov, R (2017) Poroshenko forbade Russian in schools. *Gazeta.ru* 25 September 2017. Available online at: https://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2017/09/25_a_10906640.shtml

Ferguson, G (2007) The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Iberica* 13: 7–38.

Freire, P (1997) *Pedagogy of the heart.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, P (2002) *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Geertz Gonzalez, R (2017) Internationalization at a German University: The purpose and paradoxes of English Language Master's and Doctoral Programs. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 16/2: 49–62.

Goodman, BA (2013) English in a Ukrainian university: A lingua franca, not a lingua frankenstein. ВІСНИК ДНІПРОПЕТРОВСЬКОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ ІМЕНІ АЛЬФРЕДА НОБЕЛЯ. Серія «ПЕДАГОГІКА І ПСИХОЛОГІЯ». *ПЕДАГОГІЧНІ НАУКИ* 2/6: 53–57.

Hall, CJ, Wicaksono, R, Liu, S, Qian, Y and Xiaoqing, X (2013) *English reconceived: Raising teachers' awareness of English as a 'plurilithic' resource through an online course.* London: British Council.

Heller, M and Duchêne, A (2012) 'Pride and profit: Changing discourses of language, capital and nation-state', in Duchêne, A and Heller, M (eds) *Language in late capitalism.* Abingdon: Routledge, 1–21.

Hultgren, AK, Jensen, C and Dimova, S (2015) 'English-medium instruction in European Higher Education: From the north to the south', In Dimova, S, Hultgren, AK and Jensen, C (eds) *English-medium instruction in European Higher Education.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1–18.

Jenkins, J (2013) *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy.* London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J (2014) *English as a lingua franca in the international university.* London: Routledge.

Jordão, CM (2016) Decolonizing identities: English for internationalization in a Brazilian university. *Interfaces Brasil/Canadá* 16/1: 191–209.

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

Karpov, AO (2013) The commodification of education. *Russian Social Science Review* 54/5: 22–37.

Kirkpatrick, TA (2011) *Internationalization or Englishisation: Medium of instruction in today's universities.* Centre for Governance and Citizenship, The Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Klaassen, R and Bos, M (2010) English language screening for scientific staff at Delft University of Technology. *Hermes Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 45/1: 61–70.

Kling, J and Dimova, S (2015) 'The Test of Oral English for Academic Staff (TOEPAS): Validation of standards and scoring procedures', in Knapp, A and Aguado, K (eds) *Fremdsprachen in Studium und Lehre: Chancen und Herausforderungen für den Wissenserwerb.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 247–268.

Kling, J and Staehr, LS (2013) *The development of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS).* University of Copenhagen, Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use (CIP).

Lam, QKH and Maiworm, F (2014) 'English in the classroom and beyond', in Wachter, B and Maiworm, F (eds) *English-taught programmes in European Higher Education.* Bonn: Lemmens Medien, 98–118.

Lasagabaster, D (2018) Fostering team teaching: Mapping out a research agenda for English-medium instruction at university level. *Language Teaching* 51/3: 400–416.

Lazaretnaya, O (2016) 'Linguistic purism', in Proshina, ZG and Eddy, AA (eds) *Russian English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 234–243.

Lemoine, PA, Jenkins, WM and Richardson, MD (2017) Global Higher Education: Development and implications. *Journal of Education and Development* 1/1: 58–71.

Li, DCS (2013) 'Linguistic hegemony or linguistic capital? Internationalization and English-medium instruction at the Chinese University of Hong Kong', in Doiz, A, Lasagabaster, D and Sierra, JM (eds) *English-medium instruction at universities.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 65–83.

Macaro, E (2018) *English as a medium of instruction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maringe, F (2017) 'Creating opportunities for a socially just pedagogy: The imperatives of transformation in post-colonial HE spaces', in Osman, R and Hornsby, DJ (eds) *Transforming teaching and learning in Higher Education.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 59–78.

Matthews, D (2014) 1,300 universities, one shared fear: the commodification of education. *Times Higher Education* 5 April 2014.

Mauranen, A (2012) *Exploring ELF. Academic English shaped by non-native speakers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McPherron, P (2017) *Internationalizing teaching, localizing learning: An examination of English Language Teaching reforms and English use in China.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Phillipson, R (1992) *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R (2013) *Linguistic imperialism continued.* London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R (2015) 'English as threat or opportunity in European Higher Education', in Dimova, S, Hultgren, AK and Jensen, C (eds) *English-medium instruction in European Higher Education.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1–16.

Piller, I and Cho, J (2013) Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society* 42/1: 23–44.

President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (2015) President declared 2016 the Year of English Language. Available online at: https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/prezident-ogolosiv-2016-rik-rokom-anglijskoyi-movi-36317

President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (2016a) President summed up the results of the Year of English in Ukraine: Knowledge of foreign language opens up a new world for Ukrainian citizens. Available online at: https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/volodinnya-inozemnoyu-movoyu-vidkrivaye-novij-svit-dlya-ukra-39326

President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (2016b) President: Go Global initiative on teaching children English will promote restoration of peace on our land. Available online at: https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/iniciativa-goglobal-po-navchannyu-ditej-anglijskoyi-movi-spr-37527

President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (2017) President and his wife presented certificate for over half a million hryvnias for scholarships of English teachers. Available online at: https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/prezident-razom-z-druzhinoyu-peredali-sertifikat-na-ponad-pi-40258

President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (2018) President: Switch to Ukrainian – Ukrainian books, tickets to Ukrainian movies, use Ukrainian websites. Available online at: https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/prezident-perehodte-na-ukrayinsku-kupujte-ukrayinski-knizhki-46238

Rose, H and McKinley, J (2018) Japan's English medium instruction initiatives and the globalization of higher education. *Higher Education* 75: 111–129.

Saarinen, T (2017) Special Edition editor of *Higher Education* 73/4: 'Language' Indexing Higher Education Policy.

Salomone, R (2015) The rise of global English: Challenges for English-medium instruction and language rights. *Language Problems and Language Planning, Linguistic Equality* 39/3: 245–268.

Saraceni, M (2015) *World Englishes: A critical analysis.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Seidlhofer, B (2002) 'The shape of things to come? Some basic questions about English as a lingua franca', in Knapp, K and Meierkord, C (eds) *Lingua Franca Communication.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 269–302.

Seidlhofer, B (2003) *A Concept of international English and related issues: from 'real English' to 'realistic English'?* Language Policy Division, DG IV – Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Smith, LE (1978) Some distinctive features of EIL vs. ESOL in English language education. *The Culture Learning Institute report* June, 5–7 and 10–11.

Sonntag, SK (2003) *The Local Politics of Global English.* Lanham: Lexington Books.

Soren, JK (2013) Teacher identity in English-medium instruction: Teacher cognitions from a Danish tertiary education context. *Linguistics.* University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Humanities.

State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2001) National census. Available online at: http://database.ukrcensus.gov.ua/MULT/Database/Census/databasetree_uk.asp

Teekens, H (2007) 'Internationalisation at home: An introduction', in Teekens, H (ed) *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals.* Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, 3–12.

Troia, M (2014) *Supporting staff development for international teaching.* Groningen: Kenniscentrum Arbeid Hanzehogeschool.

Verhovna Rada of Ukraine (2017) On education. Ukrainian law 38–39 (380). Available online at: http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19/page

World Trade Organization (1999) *An introduction to GATS.* Geneva: World Trade Organization.

Appendices

Appendix A: Guide for the interview with the course participants

1. Can you tell us about your experience of the course?

2. What did you find most interesting/useful? In what way?

3. Can you tell us something about your view of English? Has it changed in any way because of the course?

Appendix B: Guide for the interview with the course facilitators

1. Can you tell us about what happened between October and February [time between the two courses]? What did you do? How did you do it?

2. Can you tell us about the course that you delivered?

3. In what way do you think the course changed, if at all, the students' perceptions of English?

4. If you run the course again, what will you do differently? Why?