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Abstract
This critical exploratory study investigates the perceptions and practices of Norwegian lecturers on the implementation of a policy of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) at their Higher Education Institution (HEI). It focuses on their attitudes towards English usage, how they have been prepared and cope in the classroom, and looks at their language and pedagogic competences. The socio-cultural context of using English inside and outside the auditorium is explored and leads to questions of Anglo/American influence and Norwegian domain loss.

The study is informed by critical Applied Linguistics (CALx), linguistic imperialism and Bourdieu’s theories on social capital and power. It examines teaching through critical pedagogy and Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory of learning to aid understanding of classroom engagement and communication, and successful learning. This study has been informed by the critical approach to challenge normative assumptions of the use of EMI. Qualitative methods were used to collect data; twenty Norwegian teaching academics were interviewed, of whom five were observed whilst teaching. Careful coding and analysis of the data revealed surprising attitudes and perceptions varying from enthusiasm to anxiety for EMI.

The participants generally accepted the top-down decision making on the increase of EMI and English usage. The influences of globalisation and commodification at HEIs combined with the rapid increase in English usage seem to have led to increased power of the management and bureaucratization. Some participants, mostly from the humanities, felt they lacked voice and agency in the implementation and their preparation for EMI, whilst some from the sciences actively embraced English and some wanted English as the working language in HEIs. There was a general feeling that more time and language resources were needed for professional development to cope with the change to EMI. All the participants worked hard to succeed in EMI; they were aiming at NS language competencies and wanted to be better at grammar, pronunciation and terminology, but seemed unaware of the pragmatic level of communication required for teaching and did not recognise the necessity of pedagogic training for EMI. There was a lack of dialogic teaching making co-constructed learning challenging and transformative pedagogy more difficult to achieve. They adapted to the multi-cultural/lingual classroom in a
pragmatic manner, but were not given spaces for counter-pedagogies, critical pedagogy and the ideals of the transformative intellectual.

The research reveals five areas of concern: a) inadequate English language at the pragmatic level for the demands of EMI, b) inadequate pedagogic skills for the multi-lingual and cultural classroom, c) concern over local and international students’ level of English, d) standardized, Anglo/American teaching materials leading to a lack of diversity and critical approaches, and e) the threat to academic Norwegian from international academics not learning Norwegian, the publishing reward system at Norwegian HEIs and the perceived status of English, and the resultant decline in dissemination to the general public. However juxtaposed to the above points, most participants experienced the international classroom positively and were well-received by and pleased to be in their academic Community of Practice resulting generally in an ambivalent attitude to EMI.
Dedication

To Jan,
Amelia, William, Jacob and Autumn
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my great appreciation to Dr. Salah Troudi, my first supervisor, for his encouragement and direction without which this thesis would not have been possible. Most of all I wish to thank him for opening my mind to thinking critically, finding my own position on issues, and questioning injustice, inequality and marginalisation in the TESOL world. I am also in debt to Dr Shirley Larkin, my second supervisor, for her invaluable insight into methodological issues and her constructive feedback on my thesis from which I learnt so much.

The support of my institution in Norway during my years of research is much appreciated. In addition, I am grateful to the respondents who gave up their time and offered candid and pertinent views, and especially to those who provided rich data by allowing me to film them whilst they taught in EMI.

I would like to thank my family and friends for their support and unwavering confidence in this project. Finally, I am grateful to the staff and colleagues at the University of Exeter and Graduate School of Education for their kindness, support and time for discussing my work with them.
Contents

Abstract ................................................................................................................................. 3

Dedication ........................................................................................................................... 5

Acknowledgements ............................................................................................................. 6

Contents .............................................................................................................................. 7

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH STUDY ....................................... 13

1.1 Rationale for the study ............................................................................................... 13

1.2 Nature of the research problem ................................................................................ 14

1.3 Significance of the study .......................................................................................... 15

1.4 Research Aims .......................................................................................................... 16

1.5 Research questions .................................................................................................... 16

1.6 Organisation of thesis ............................................................................................... 17

CHAPTER TWO – CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH ............................................................ 18

2.1 English in Norway ..................................................................................................... 18

2.1.1 National language policy ...................................................................................... 18

2.2 English in Norwegian tertiary education .................................................................. 20

2.2.1 The Bologna Process ......................................................................................... 21

2.2.2 National educational policies .............................................................................. 21

2.3 English at the faculties ............................................................................................. 22

2.4 Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 22

CHAPTER THREE – THE LITERATURE REVIEW ............................................................ 24

3.1 A critical philosophical framework ............................................................................ 24

3.1.1 Critical applied linguistics .................................................................................... 25

3.1.2 Critical Pedagogy ................................................................................................. 26

3.2 Power and language .................................................................................................. 29

3.2.1 The power of Global English ................................................................................. 31

3.2.1.1 Linguistic imperialism .................................................................................... 32

3.2.1.2 English as a lingua-franca ............................................................................. 35

7
3.2.2 Domain loss ........................................................................................... 38
3.2.3 Bourdieu’s contextualisation of power ....................................................... 39
3.3 English as a Medium of Instruction .............................................................. 41
3.3.1 Medium of Instruction policies ............................................................... 42
   3.3.1.1 Strength of English usage in tertiary education .................................. 43
   3.3.1.2 Commodification of Higher Education ............................................. 44
3.3.2 Teachers’ role in policy .......................................................................... 46
3.3.3 Local implementation of English as a Medium of Instruction in Higher
    Education Institutions ................................................................................. 47
3.4 Teachers’ sense of self .................................................................................... 48
   3.4.1 Sense of self and identity ......................................................................... 49
   3.4.2 Beliefs, values and reflection .................................................................... 50
   3.4.3 Socio-cultural teaching and learning ...................................................... 50
   3.4.4 Communities of Practice ........................................................................ 52
3.5 Conclusion ................................................................................................... 53
CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY ....................................................................... 54
4.1 Theoretical perspectives .............................................................................. 54
   4.1.1 The interpretive paradigm ...................................................................... 55
   4.1.2 The critical paradigm ............................................................................. 56
   4.1.3 Post-modernism ..................................................................................... 58
4.2 Methodological assumptions ........................................................................ 59
4.3 Research design .......................................................................................... 61
4.4 Research questions ...................................................................................... 62
4.5 Data collection methods ............................................................................... 63
   4.5.1 Justification of data collection methods ............................................... 63
      4.5.1.1 Interviews ........................................................................................ 63
      4.5.1.2 Observations ................................................................................... 64
   4.5.2 Selection of Participants ......................................................................... 66
4.6 Procedures................................................................................................... 67
  4.6.1 Interviews .............................................................................................. 67
  4.6.2 Observations.......................................................................................... 68
4.7 Data analysis................................................................................................ 70
  4.7.1 Data management ................................................................................. 71
  4.7.2 Describing, classifying and interpreting ................................................. 72
4.8 Dependability and credibility........................................................................ 76
4.9 Ethical considerations .................................................................................. 78
4.10 Limitations of the study................................................................................ 78

CHAPTER FIVE - THE FINDINGS............................................................................ 80
  5.1 The lecturers' reaction to implementation of EMI – “it’s natural” .............. 80
  5.2 EMI and English in other academic situations - usage and attitude ............ 83
    5.2.1 Internally – teaching - “a sense of necessity to be able to teach in English” ................................................................. 83
    5.2.2 Language considerations – “In a teaching situation it’s your language”  84
    5.2.3 Pedagogic considerations – “I just throw myself into it” ....................... 86
    5.2.4 The learning environment – “it’s a positive experience” ....................... 88
      5.2.4.1 The students’ language competency ............................................... 89
      5.2.4.2 The students’ academic competency ............................................... 90
      5.2.4.3 The multi-cultural classroom ........................................................... 90
    5.2.5 Teaching materials – “I usually want to have the best textbooks” ........ 91
      5.2.5 Internally – administration – “they are expected to learn Norwegian” .... 93
    5.2.6 Externally - “it’s a must” ..................................................................... 96
      5.2.6.1 Conferences .................................................................................... 96
      5.2.6.2 Publishing ........................................................................................ 97
  5.3 Teachers’ views on their EAP language competence “you always like to be better” ........................................................................................................ 99
  5.4 Preparation for EMI and feelings about the preparation ............................. 102
5.4.1 Professional development – “it’s all based on myself” ...................... 102
5.4.2 EAP courses – “it made you more confident” ........................................ 104
  5.4.2.1 Learning outcomes ........................................................................ 104
  5.4.2.2 Lack of pedagogy for EMI ............................................................. 105
5.4.3 EMI without preparatory courses – “There is no back up from the university” ........................................................................................................ 106
5.5 Coping strategies ....................................................................................... 106
  5.5.1 Language – “we get a little … multi-language” .................................... 106
  5.5.2 Pedagogy – “you have to kind of force them to mingle” ..................... 107
5.6 General perceptions on the teachers’ experience of using EMI............... 109
  5.6.1 The power of global English – “the only language where the term ‘I’ is capitalised” ................................................................. 109
  5.6.2 Status of English – “one is so very cool and international if one uses English” ................................................................. 110
  5.6.3 Identity and EAP – “a person can be two different persons speaking two different languages” ................................................................. 111
  5.6.4 Domain loss – “for we have pretty good words” ................................ 113
5.7 Conclusion ................................................................................................ 115

CHAPTER SIX – DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS ....................................... 117
6.1 Power and language .................................................................................. 117
  6.1.1 The power of global English ............................................................. 117
    6.1.1.1 Commodification of education ................................................... 120
  6.1.2 Linguistic imperialism ........................................................................ 121
    6.1.2.1 Anglo-American culture ............................................................ 123
  6.1.3 Domain loss ...................................................................................... 123
    6.1.3.1 Publishing reward system .......................................................... 125
    6.1.3.2 Parallel language policy .............................................................. 125
6.2 Equality .................................................................................................... 126
  6.2.1 Democracy ........................................................................................ 127
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH STUDY

The introduction starts by explaining the rationale behind the study (1.1), then informing on the nature of the study (1.2), before going on to show the significance of the research (1.3). The research aims (1.4) follow, then the research question is stated, and the section ends by outlining how the thesis is organised (1.6) to answer the research question.

1.1 Rationale for the study

The rationale for the study is to critically question normative assumptions of the use of EMI in tertiary education. Equality, justice and inclusion ground the study as I see teaching academics being squeezed by policy makers keen to internationalise for financial and prestigious reasons and student demands for English for employability. The teachers’ role and their responses seem to have been overlooked, thus my study wants to give voice to the teachers.

I question the traditional English for Academic Purposes (EAP) preparation of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) lecturers that neglects an individual’s identity in relation to power and access to a socio-cultural diverse world (Norton, 2000). I am concerned about the quality of EMI teaching (Hellekjær & Westergaard, 2003), the role of the teacher (Benesch, 2001) and hope that teachers can be transformative educators (Giroux, 1988), who can problematize practice and make change possible (Freire, 1972). The rationale for my study also concerns the lecturer’s EMI pedagogical possibilities, their opportunities to put their beliefs and values into practice in their teaching (Borg, 2006) and chances to reflect and question them (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Therefore, this thesis examines aspects of language, society and power that are relevant to access, disparity and difference and challenges mainstream educational reproduction (Pennycook, 2001).

During the last decade of my practice I have experienced an immense increase in EMI and commodification of education (Molesworth, Scullion, & Nixon, 2011; Wilkinson, 2013) and want to understand the forces behind the changes. The power of EMI policies needs to be questioned and the present situation problematized. I am also concerned about academic Norwegian domain loss at HEIs and the role of English as a lingua-franca not just for teaching, but

\(^{1}\text{Numbers in brackets refer to sections in the thesis}\)
generally within Norwegian HEIs (Crystal, 1997; Phillipson, 1992). I want to explore issues of socio-linguistic power and how they connect to the classroom. However, I am not advocating the linguistic equivalent of protectionism, for it is necessary to have a lingua franca for international trade and academic meeting of minds, but I want to investigate radical ways of thinking to create new forms of linguistic democracy and raise awareness on the role of globalisation on local languages, cultures and ideologies. The rationale behind my research is critical in not accepting the status quo, but confronting and challenging assumptions, and hope that I can bring about insight and maybe small changes into my EMI situation in Norway (Gur-Ze'ev, 2005; Troudi, 2009a).

1.2 Nature of the research problem

This study aims to look at teachers’ perceptions of implementation and current use of EMI at HEIs in Norway. It defines teaching in its widest meaning of the practice of imparting knowledge to students. The small classes in Norway result in the observed lectures being in the form of dialogic lectures requiring tight engagement with the students. I want to investigate classroom practice concerning language usage, pedagogy and the learning environment when information is imparted to the students as lectures in the teacher’s L2.

I want to examine how EMI policies are functioning and find out how involved the field executers are in the changes. The study will elicit the teachers’ views on their position, and the influencing factors, both positive and negative, will be useful to assess the effects of previous policy decisions and can be used to inform future policies. On a practical level EMI seems to change the dynamics and engagement in teaching, and thus the role of the teacher. Issues of power and identity of Non-Native Speaker (NNS) EMI teachers from a traditional EAP environment need to be investigated. Teachers’ professional development and how they are coping with practice is fundamental to EMI outcomes.

On a national level the introduction of EMI needs to be critically problematized in the context of linguistic imperialism and Norwegian domain loss. Studies (Troudi, 2009b; Troudi & Jendli, 2011) support a concern over the benefits of access to a globalised world job market compared to the losses of local language and a monolingual culture (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). The

---

2 Teacher refers to all teaching academics, e.g. lecturer
critical dimension can question assumptions behind EMI and not accept them as they are, but have the possibility to change them through practice and theory (Benesch, 2001; Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 2001). By challenging the effect of policies of EMI in HEIs in Norway it is possible to see that there is not just one way of doing things and there are possibilities of freedom of action and change in larger contexts (Canagarajah, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

1.3 Significance of the study

The importance of this research stems from its contribution to the generation of knowledge on the impact of the implementation of a policy of EMI on Norwegian university lecturers as part of the institutions’ internationalisation programmes. It is hoped that the results of this study will:

1. Provide Norwegian policy makers with an insight into the problems and perceptions of lecturers using EMI, thus allowing them to identify enablers and obstacles for success and to prepare the lecturers for this new situation based on informed judgements.

2. Give insight into lecturers’ views on probable/preferable future utilisation of EMI and the professional development training and support that they might need.

3. Open the way for more research on the future role of EMI in a Norwegian context.

Wilkinson (2013) states that there is a great need for research into local contexts for EMI implementation, practices, challenges and benefits, thus I can supply insight and practical solutions for my contexts. However, more valuable with this research is that I have asked the right questions at the right time; in fact, the issue of EMI was one of the headlines on the Norwegian broadcasting corporation’s national morning radio news on 29 August 2013, raising it up the agenda of topical concerns for the general public. In addition, although this research is based in a small, peripheral country it can give insight into lecturers’ perceptions and attitudes on the topic which might help in preparing teachers for this big step in other Scandinavian countries and perhaps further afield.

This research fills a gap for looking at lecturers’ perspectives in EMI as research seems to focus on students’ perceptions in Scandinavia (Hellekjær, 2010b; Shaw & McMillion, 2008) and in different contexts (Mack, 2012; Pacek,
2005; Troudi & Jendli, 2011). Many studies investigate NNS/NS teachers’ situation in regards to marginalisation, lack of self-efficacy and disempowerment (Davies, 2003; Hornberger, 2006), but not into subject teachers’ using EMI. Thus it is hoped that my study addressing questions of power in EMI can shed light on the role of teacher self-construction at a local level, and at the same time problematize the socio-cultural and linguistic effects of EMI at HEIs in Norway.

1.4 Research Aims
The study seeks to fulfil the following aims:

- To critically investigate the current use of EMI in Norwegian tertiary education
- To identify the motivators and incentives for using EMI for policy makers and academic staff
- To explore the relationship between international education policy in Norway and the teachers’ feelings about the implementation of EMI
- To investigate how this policy is affecting Norwegian university teachers’ sense of themselves, their teaching and their relationship with their students
- To investigate the academic teaching staff’s preparation for the change to EMI and their response to it
- To identify difficulties and ways of coping with EMI.

I hope the study contributes to the on-going debate about EMI, and with its wide remit can bring in different dimensions for consideration. At a local level I want to provide insights into the EMI situation with these Norwegian teachers that will give them confidence, awareness and a more holistic understanding of themselves when teaching in EMI.

1.5 Research questions
In order to address the research aims and objectives the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How do Norwegian university lecturers react to the implementation of a policy of EMI for their programmes?
   1.1 How are they currently using EMI in their teaching and English in other academic situations?
1.2 What is their attitude to the usage of EMI?

2. How have these lecturers been prepared for the implementation of this policy and how do they cope?
   2.1 How do the lecturers judge their EAP language competence?
   2.2 How do they feel about their preparation for using EMI?
   2.3 What are their perceptions of their own experience of EMI?

1.6 Organisation of thesis

To answer the above research questions and meet the objectives of the research the thesis is organized as follows; after this introduction in chapter one, chapter two provides a description of the research context in which this study is situated. The literature review in chapter three explores four areas relevant to the research; critical applied linguistics, power and language, English as a Medium of Instruction and the teachers’ sense of self in the EMI context. Chapter four explains the philosophical stance and methodological basis for how the research question is answered. It goes on to describe the research design, methods of data collection and analysis, as well as covering the dependability and credibility of the study, limitations and ethical considerations. Chapter five presents the findings from the data mainly following the order of the research questions. However, in chapter six the emerging themes from the findings are combined into three main themes; power and language, democracy and quality of teaching, and together with the literature critically explore these issues to answer the research questions. Finally, chapter seven draws the thesis to an end, with the conclusion, theoretical and pedagogical contributions, implications for practice, then the recommendations and finally my reflections.
CHAPTER TWO – CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

This chapter provides pertinent background from Norway in general (2.1) and Norwegian tertiary education (2.2) in particular to enable the reader to understand the position of English and EMI in this environment. It situates the study in a Norwegian socio-cultural and socio-economic context and profiles the environment in which the study is carried out by explaining the factors that have created the conditions for the role and status of EMI in tertiary education in Norway (2.3).

2.1 English in Norway

As a small remote country in the north of Europe, Norway has traditionally looked to international trade in shipping and export of raw products, and has needed to be receptive to foreign languages for trade. Since the 1970s, with the start of the oil and gas industry and the initial dependency on American expertise, English has become the working language in the oil industry. More recently English is accepted as being the language of the workplace in many Norwegian and international industries, particularly in high-tech and oil related fields. The Norwegian state realizes that, despite initiatives from the government for using Norwegian and much work by the Norwegian Language Council (Språkråd) on Norwegian terminology, English is increasingly the lingua franca of business and industry.

Norwegians have the second highest income per capita in the world (OECD Report, 2010) because of the vast wealth from oil and gas, a small population (4.5 M) and being rich in many raw materials. In 2012 Norway was again voted as the best country in which to live (UNDP). The economy is very open, but can be challenged by Norway being a high cost country with very high taxes to support the Scandinavian style welfare state. To make Norway attractive on the world market much effort is being put into making Norway a knowledge economy. Consequently, higher levels and more specialist English is thought to be required by Norwegians living and working in Norway.

2.1.1 National language policy

The Norwegian State has the resources and the will to invest in language; both Norwegian and foreign languages. There are two types of official Norwegian (Nynorsk and Bokmål), as well as four recognized regional languages (Northern
Sami, Lule Sami, Kven and Southern Sami) in Norway. The Norwegian White Paper nr. 35 (2007-8) Aims and Intentions - A comprehensive Norwegian Language Policy (Stortingsmelding nr. 35 (2007-8) Mål og meining Ein heilskapleg norsk språkpolitikk) summarizes the dichotomy of a peripheral nation wanting the benefits of internationalization, but realizing the tension and stresses involved for their own language and culture. It strongly endorses the support and maintenance of using Norwegian in all areas of society in §5.7.9 (p. 83) “Norwegian when you can, English when you have to” (“Norsk, når du kan engelsk når du må”) and maintains that the richest communication comes when using one’s mother tongue, but pragmatically appreciates that for international communication English is vital.

For this context the White Paper covers three main factors concerning the use of English; firstly, Norwegians’ attitude to Norwegian and English, secondly, the influence of English on Norwegian generally, and thirdly, the loss of domain in business and now in academia (Ibid. §7.1.4.). Firstly, powerful and prestigious people and areas in society are using English, even when not strictly necessary, but for reasons of power (Ibid. §5.6.3) and young people want to use English to appear modern and trendy. At the same time, attitudes to Norwegian are that it is inferior, useful for traditional, cultural activities and is less richly equipped for modern life compared to English (Ibid. §7.1.5.3). Secondly, linguistically the increase in the use of loan words (Ibid. § 7.1.4.4) and code-switching between English and Norwegian (Ibid. §7.1.4.5), especially in everyday conversation amongst young people is causing changes and language losses in Norwegian.

Thirdly, developing from the above and more importantly is the far-reaching influence of domain loss (Ibid. §7.1.4.6). English usage in business and now in academia has started a vicious circle resulting in limitations in the use of Norwegian. As a consequence concepts and terms will no longer be created in Norwegian resulting in an inability to imagine or talk about an activity area in one’s own mother tongue. If Norwegian is not used in central and prestige areas, but only in limited and private fields, cultural and linguistic impoverishment can occur (Ibid. §7.1.5.7). This loss of meaning, nuance and richness leads to greater differences between those who master English well and those who do not, thus causing social inequality with the increasing use of English.
However, Norway is not accepting that Norwegian be a second class language, stating that “[n]o cultural nation with respect for their mother tongue can sit with their hands in their lap in such a situation” (“Ingen kulturnasjon med respekt for morsmålet sitt kan sitja med hendene i fanget i ein slik situasjon”) (Ibid. §7.1.5.1). It recognizes that as academia is state controlled, it can do something here and does not accept the loss of Norwegian competence in such a central field as education. The 2005, updated in 2007, strategy study by the Norwegian Language Council, “Norwegian at Full Throttle!” (Norsk i hundre! Ibid. §3.2) suggested that domain loss can be stopped and stabilized with the two languages sharing domain as parallel languages in academia.

Increased use of English is threatening the important value in Norway of equality (Ibid. §7.1.5.6). Marginalization and a democratic problem are occurring as a large group of people cannot get by in English, whilst the elite from business, industry and research are increasingly using English. Knowledge is not being transmitted from specialists out to members of the community as terminology has not been developed in Norwegian (Ibid. § 7.1.5). This could lead to school textbooks beginning to be written in English as specialist Norwegian words do not exist. It also reduces transparency and democratic control if subjects can only be described in English.

2.2 English in Norwegian tertiary education

The background of the study centres on the effects of globalization, internationalisation and English as a lingua-franca on tertiary education (Wilkinson, 2013). The HEI neo-liberal market (Giroux, 2004; Molesworth et al., 2011) started in Norway in 1995 when Norway implemented the “General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in Services”, which changed education from a service for the benefit for society to a tradable commodity. The above mentioned 2007-8 White Paper on Norwegian language policy did not stipulate that Norwegian should be the language of instruction in HEIs as had previously been the case. It was considered that HEIs would be competitive and attract foreign students with EMI (Ljosland, 2008) and consequently, Norwegian is not legally protected in HEIs.
2.2.1 The Bologna Process

Norway was one of the initial signatories of the Bologna Declaration (1999) and enthusiastically welcomed harmonization, internationalisation and standardization of the European higher education (HE) systems. Bologna has no specific language policy remit and no requirement for proficiency in the host country’s language, so students’ and academics’ mobility is achieved through EMI and English usage. The resulting adoption of English as the lingua franca spills over to English textbooks, examinations and academic culture.

The implementation of the Anglo-American system of Bachelor and Master degrees radically changed the Norwegian academic culture from a European tradition of generally longer and wider degrees, to a “time is money” cultural attitude. Pedagogy has also changed to a more American style where the emphasis is on the lecturers activating the students, and continuous and varied types of assessments and examinations. Bologna has started not only linguistic and cultural transformations at HEIs, but following on from GATT (1995), has led to commodification of HE as institutions compete against each other for academic prestige and financial benefits.

2.2.2 National educational policies

Norway supported the aims in Bologna with White Paper nr. 27 (2000-2001) Do your duty – demand your rights, Quality Reform of Higher Education (Stortingsmelding nr. 27 Gjør din plikt - Krev din rett Kvalitetsreform av høyere utdanning) (Referred to as Quality Reform). The White paper did not specifically mention EMI, but endorsed mobility by committing to build up subject areas in English (Ibid. §7.3.2) for recruiting foreign students and harmonized degrees to the Anglo/American system. Previously, internationalization had meant sending Norwegian students abroad when the subjects were not available in Norway, or students coming from developing countries and spending two years learning Norwegian before taking their courses in Norwegian (Brock-Utne, 2007). EMI means all students engaging in English during their degree, and if they do not go abroad then international courses should be available for them in Norway. Quality Reform also recognized education as a commodity that is exposed to competition. Although decrying the wide-spread policies of HE as an export industry, Norway still
wants to be in the forefront for academic cooperation. Since 2002 HEIs have been encouraged through rankings to offer more courses in English.

2.3 English at the faculties
Ten years ago few courses were taught in English; now it is widespread especially for Master and PhD programmes (Brock-Utne, 2009). English seems to be increasing in HEI administration (Brock-Utne, 2007). The lecturers who are to teach subjects in English often do not have any choice in the matter (Shaw & Dahl, 2008). Thus, institutions are taking democracy away from the workplace and are reproducing and legitimatizing their power over the lecturers. The teachers are at the forefront of their disciplines, but are now consigned to the role of NNS in Norway. English textbooks and course material are often used for courses taught in Norwegian, as well as naturally on EMI programmes. Pressure for EMI also comes from students (Ljosland, 2008) and EMI results in an additional work load for teachers (Hellekjær, 2010a).

The preparation teachers receive for EMI is short, piecemeal and ad hoc. It has been left up to individual EAP teachers, often on short-term contracts, to decide the purpose and teaching of the courses. The courses I taught at a Norwegian HEI were typical in teaching the traditional EAP skills of lexical items and rhetorical features in lecturer’s disciplines and using methods to speed up the transmission of suitable English for the auditorium (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001) (Appendix 1). Thus, the aim was communicative competence that emphasised appropriacy of perceived linguistic and social norms for the EMI environment (Ellis, 2008; Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001), without consideration of the sociocultural environment (Benesch, 2001). Crystal’s (1997) pragmatic approach to global English is generally accepted and the Norwegian EAP environment appears to be a positivist sociological model. Thus, EMI teachers are learning a type of language used by prestigious groups in their field and are unquestioningly socialised into accepting a set of beliefs and rules that are inherent in globalisation (Benesch, 2001; Phillipson, 2001).

2.4 Conclusion
In Norway the balance between the perceived political and economic benefits of EMI are being juxtaposed with the challenges and threats faced by HEIs, local languages, quality of teaching and academics’ agency and voice. English is
now not just for international trade, but by entering academia as EMI, is going even deeper into a country’s culture and language.
CHAPTER THREE – THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Section one in the literature review begins by explaining the critical approach with Critical Applied Linguistics (CALx) (3.1.1) and critical pedagogy (3.1.2) relevant to the context. Section two continues by providing an overview of the pertinent theories on power and language (3.2), looks at the power of global English (3.2.2), with sub-sections on linguistic imperialism (3.2.2.1) and English as a Lingua-Franca (ELF) (3.2.2.2), then continues by explaining domain loss (3.2.3) and ends by linking language to power through Bourdieu’s theory on cultural and linguistic capital (3.2.4). Section three examines the reasons for EMI programmes (3.3), reviews EMI policies (3.3.1), with sub-sections on the strength of English (3.3.1.1) and the commodification of education (3.3.1.2), before looking at teachers’ possibilities for agency in EMI (3.3.2) and exploring EMI implementation (3.3.3). Section four explores how the above influences teachers’ sense of self (3.4.1), then the manner in which teachers’ values, beliefs and reflection affect their practice in EMI (3.4.2) and goes on to investigate Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory of teaching to form a theoretical pedagogical basis for judging teacher engagement with students (3.4.3) and finally, international academics’ position in their disciplines’ Community of Practice (CoP) will be explored (3.4.4).

3.1 A critical philosophical framework

The research is political in wanting to challenge hegemony, change situations, and emancipate and empower, so consequently is grounded in critical theory from the Frankfurt School (Atkinson, 2002; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Crotty, 2003) (4.1.2). My research rejects the power values associated with traditional TESOL and wants a more inclusive, ethical and democratic environment linked to socio-cultural and political awareness to challenge Eurocentric and NS/NNS attitudes (Pennycook, 2001; Tone Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009). Power and inequality are reproduced by and through dominant groups and Harbermas’s desire for emancipation in a democratic society is inextricably linked to Freire’s aspiration for social transformation (Ibid.). I believe that research is worthless if it does not result in action for change (Gur-Ze’ev, 2005; Troudi, 2009a).
3.1.1 Critical applied linguistics

CALx is employed as the means of questioning assumptions of language and power connected with social inequality, e.g. in agency, class, identity, voice and inclusion, and in not accepting, but wanting to change the present situation through practice and theory (Benesch, 2001; Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 2001). CALx focuses on questions of access, disparity, appropriation and performativity and is “far more than the addition of a critical dimension to applied linguistics” (Pennycook 1999: 9). The attraction of such a viewpoint is that, although CALx has its own theoretical and epistemological framework, it is not an independent discipline, but links to other disciplines relevant to language use in this context such as psychology and sociology as well as critical language awareness (Pennycook 2001).

CALx theorizes human agency within structures of power in social, cultural and economic frameworks (Pennycook, 2001). It believes in the connection between micro and macro social relations as illustrated by the struggles in society, e.g. global capitalism, and those in the classroom, e.g. by texts and pedagogy, as being historically constructed and problematic. By challenging the nature of educational institutions as agents of social reproduction, it acknowledges the possibility of freedom of action and socio-cultural change (Canagarajah, 1999). Through a constant cycle by self-reflexivity, being critical of itself and aware of limitations of knowing, CALx can build bridges between theory and practice to produce efficient teaching methodologies (Pennycook, 2001).

By problematising givens (Pennycook, 1999), CALx questions the fact that for many people around the world, including European countries such as Norway, English language proficiency is used as a gatekeeper for teaching and learning in tertiary education (Ljosland 2008; Pennycook 1999; Phillipson 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). CALx sees L1, both language and culture, as a resource, where language learning is connected to broader political concerns of power and equality and if the L1 can be appreciated, used and developed, equality and cultural diversity will be furthered (Pennycook, 1999). Instead of accepting the standard version of normative knowledge for language use and teaching methods, CALx addresses ethical demands in, for example, language education, EMI and the global spread of English in a manner that allows for heterosis (Pennycook, 2001).
CALx aids understanding by taking into account the students’ own cultures and traditions, and by questioning the consequences of the role of English and EMI in their lives (Pennycook, 1999). Just as Kumaravadivelu (2003) advocates teaching strategies beyond standard Western models to those taking local situations into consideration, so too could compassionate and less competitive Scandinavian teaching practices be employed rather than Anglo-Saxon methodologies. The centre-periphery debate is highlighted by Canagarajah (1999) in appreciating local cultures, questioning who is making curriculum and textbook choices and about value laden testing (Pennycook, 1999). Teaching is a moral responsibility and the attitudes of teachers using EMI influences students’ cultures and shapes their identities and agency (Johnston, 2003).

Nevertheless, despite the critical approach, this thesis is grounded within the realities of the necessity for English usage for global communication (Graddol, 2006), e.g. in commerce, the Internet and academia (Crystal 1997). English usage is intensifying, changing linguistically and breaking cultural borders, and is no longer just the domain of the NS (Mauranen, Hynninen, & Ranta, 2010; Troudi, 2005). However, there is a tension between balancing standard and regional varieties of English coupled with the need for local identity with local varieties of English (Crystal, 2001). A CALx approach questions the local cost of the benefits of international communication; it can be detrimental to native languages, and thus to societal and cultural values if arising challenges are not faced (Pennycook 2001, 1999; Phillipson, 1992; Skuttnab Kangas, 2000). Inequalities and disempowerment can be perpetuated without questioning and taking action for change. CALx is concerned with creating possibilities for change by transforming teachers (Giroux, 1988) and humanizing social issues (Pennycook, 1999).

3.1.2 Critical Pedagogy
Critical pedagogy brings social and ideological relations of power from the outside world directly into teaching and the classroom (Pennycook, 2001). It questions language and power that are relevant to access, disparity and difference in education and is a teaching approach that aids teachers and students to question and challenge dominant beliefs and values, and challenges the status quo in order to change the situation (Pennycook, 2001). Teaching is never considered just a neutral act (Benesch, 2001), but all teaching is a
political activity (Johnston, 1999). Critical pedagogy uses dialogic pedagogy in the classroom to achieve a preferred version of society and the future (Johnston, 2003). Freire (1972) advocates employing our hope and action to intervene to improve situations; not on our terms, but on those of our students.

Critical pedagogy criticizes my EAP traditional context as accommodationalist and indifferent to social change (Benesch, 2001). Traditional mainstream EAP ideology considers society as static, deterministic and materialistic (Pennycook, 2001), where students are unquestioningly socialized into accepting a set of beliefs and rules as fundamental to the functioning of the larger society (Giroux, 1988). It also seems to accept and celebrate the global spread of English (Benesch, 2001; Jordan, 2004; Pennycook, 1999; Troudi, 2009a). The pedagogy of EAP as described in my own courses in section 2.3, uses a cognitive approach to learn communicative competence in ‘appropriate’ English for individual learning with little regard to the wider social context (Benesch, 2001; Ellis, 2008; Jordan, 2004). The inherent relationship between language and society means that the power and inequality in the mainstream classroom is thus reproduced in the wider social, cultural and political world (Pennycook, 2001).

In contrast, I advocate a critical pedagogy where schools should be more than places of social and cultural reproduction, but be places of struggle and possibility – teachers can use critical knowledge to alter the course of events if they become transformative intellectuals (Giroux 2006). Critical pedagogy takes into account the students’ own cultures and traditions and questions the consequences of their subjugation by linguistic imperialism. It democratizes institutions by engaging staff and students in decisions that affect their lives in and out of college and to understand teachers’ and students’ multiple identities (Benesch, 2001). By endorsing greater equality, encouraging students to assess their options, and challenge institutional goals, critical pedagogy raises awareness of historic and cultural inequality (Ibid.). Critical EAP acknowledges learners’ rights as they are seen as belonging to a community of practice and in a position to explore possibilities for change, instead of having to wait for entry until they have the appropriate discourse (Ibid.).
My belief is that teachers can be transformative educators (Giroux, 1988) concerned with an ethics of compassion, conscientisation and problematizing practice to produce change (Freire, 1972) in the EMI environment. When teachers are transformative educators, marginalization, developing voice and agency are part of a pedagogy which results in a more inclusive society (Giroux, 1988). Mainstream pedagogy transfers knowledge, almost as a form of banking, whereas critical pedagogy engages with the students, allowing them to question the conditions they live in and to develop language skills through a process of exploration which empowers them to connect the classroom and the outside world (Frye, 1999; Rivera, 1999). Giroux (2006) illuminates the relationship among knowledge, authority, and power, and thus, just as power is socio-constructed in education, so it can be dismantled and critically remade.

Critical pedagogy should be a critical reflection on practice, relating it to theory to form teachers’ on-going education to form praxis (Benesch, 2001; Freire, 1972). Teachers can raise their awareness by reflecting on beliefs and values and challenging in/consistency with their classroom practices to achieve a critical consciousness of their practice (Borg, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2003) (3.4.2). Dialogic critical thinking can lead to student and teacher empowerment (Benesch, 1999). If the EMI teachers develop a critical approach, question assumptions and make tacit knowledge explicit through reflection, they can bring about awareness of the socio-political factors that shape and reshape a teacher’s practice (Schön, 1996). It is not enough to be a passive practitioner (Freire, 1972). The role of teachers is to improve our world, even by a miniscule amount, and to question an education system where pedagogy could be understood to be embedded in power and dominance and thus sustaining social inequalities (Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

Critiques of critical pedagogy are sceptical of awareness leading to emancipation (Johnston, 2003; Pennycook, 2001). Luke (1996, cited in Pennycook, 2001) questions if anything really changes, as it does not enlighten on how power relates to language and literacy, as it fails to explain why and how some discourses and knowledges count more than others; instead he thinks we should look at how power is produced, maintained and resisted. Johnston (1999) criticises the emotional level of the language of struggle and revolution involved which alienate many teachers. Both of them fail to recognize
the seriousness of the inequality or to suggest alternative ways of changing the situation. Canagarajah (1999) also questions whose versions of reality gain legitimacy and whose representation of the world gains sway on others. The classroom is a site of cultural struggle with different agendas for teachers and students, who operate within different cultural possibilities which reflect their outside world. Often there is a pragmatic adaption of complex global and local concerns of power and equality by teachers and students (Canagarajah, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Although Norway is a European country, it is a small, distant country and thus seems to experience the centre-periphery debate and the lack of appreciation for local cultures highlighted by Canagarajah (1999) and Kumaravadivelu (2003). Critical pedagogy can bring a critical perspective into the classroom to question the vested interests and hidden agendas of the spread of English (Phillipson, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

3.2 Power and language

Critical theories of language and society go beyond viewing language as reflecting society, but recognize its productive role in forming society and in the construction and maintenance of power relations (Pennycook, 2001). Language does not reflect identity, but is only one of the things that constitute it; who you are depends on how you act, not your use of language (Ibid.). The cyclic relation between language and society is complex as Mey (1985, cited in Pennycook, 2001 p.39) states, “it is not linguistic oppression as such, but societal oppression that manifests itself linguistically”. The micro and macro discourse used have far reaching effects for initiating and driving change in society in general (Ibid.). Awareness of critical theories can help teachers look at the style of language learning in their classes in a wider context.

By recognizing the social context of language use, Giroux (1988) understands the unequal distribution of power in accessing knowledge and resources that prevent individuals leading self-determined existences. In responding to the profundity of human difference through an ethical engagement to another, a better kind of relation between self and other can be achieved (Kearney 1988, seen in Pennycook 2001). Through engagement teachers can understand that there are not static categories of ethnicity and belonging, but they can appreciate hybridity and reuse language and culture in multiple ways, just as they can comprehend how students resist and appropriate forms of language
Insight into the problem of power and language can be gained by working contextually in creatively adapting English to suit local and individual situations through postcolonial performativity (Canagarajah, 1999). For me, Kramsch (1998) best illustrates the diversity with her explanation of cultural encounters producing a third space, not just for example homogeneity or imperialism.

The concept of all languages and dialects being equal in that they serve the needs of the speakers equally discounts the complexities of social and cultural factors on social difference, inequality, and conflict (Pennycook, 2001). The idea of a hierarchical view of primitive languages, cultures and societies on the bottom and developed languages and cultures on the top cannot be sanctioned and must be challenged. Honey’s *Language is Power* (1997) supports this idea, even going as far as maintaining that some languages are less equipped for certain kinds of intellectual activity (Ibid.). His promotion of access to Standard English to empower all denies the critical opinions expressed above that both linguistic and social change are essential. Different language forms have evolved to take on different roles as power operates ideologically through language use and status. Individual empowerment is useless as it reproduces the same broader inequalities, which ultimately lie outside language. In fact, EAP, and consequently EMI, often follow this strategy and in offering powerful forms of language to some fails to deal with those inequalities, but also reproduces them (Benesch, 2001).

Foucault maintains that power is not just one group’s domination over another, but power is exercised from innumerable points in all individual relations and interactions (Benesch 2001; Pennycook 2001). Language is a site of struggle and those who exercise power through language are continually involved in defending their positions (Fairclough, 1989). The relation of power and knowledge entwined at a state level, e.g. in the justice system, is just the same as at an individual level in the classroom, e.g. when disaffected students show resistance to power (Benesch, 2001). However, Foucault’s concept of power is not merely repressive, but also productive as can be exemplified in the latter example. It is not a question of a given standpoint, but being able to imagine and bring into being new schemas of dealing with questions of power, e.g. bringing in code-switching in EMI (Pennycook, 2001). By constantly questioning
our assumptions, open-ended, contested, multi-sited answers can be presented (Gordon, 1980). Therefore, mechanisms of power in institutional arrangements are not seen as inevitable, but viewed as historical or economic decisions (Ibid.). By placing the power focus on the individual as a site of control in time and space, Foucault gives us a tool to look at how individuals respond to that control (Benesch, 2001). They are actively engaged in that power, rather than being objects of its control (Gordon, 1980). Although Habermas criticizes Foucault’s work as dangerous and going against emancipatory possibilities (Pennycook, 2001), for this context, Foucault’s theory can help to explain power in classroom dynamics, particularly as power must be explained and the analysis of power does not exist prior to the analysis of the language used (Gordon, 1980).

3.2.1 The power of Global English

Traditionally English has been accepted as the lingua franca of globalization due to historical, cultural and economic reasons (Crystal, 1997). Crystal (1997), Kachru (1990) and others are neutral or enthusiastic about English usage as they perceive the advantages for trade, technology and culture, and the resulting transnational and multi-cultural dialogues. However, frequently NS language and cultural norms, especially from the UK and US, are powerful forces in this environment which lead to disempowerment of NNSs (Crystal, 1997; Jenkins, 2009; Melchers & Shaw, 2003; Phillipson, 2009b). A more critical view (Benesch, 2001; Pennycook, 2001; Phillipson, 1992) sees a colonial celebratory position in the influence of British and American government and multi-national company post-colonialist positioning to create global neo-colonialism through “the continuing relationship between English and the discourse of colonialism” (Pennycook, 1998, p.193) in English Language Teaching around the world. Even in countries which have not been colonized by the British, colonial cultural constructions and discourses still promote the superiority of English and the construct of “the other” when referring to indigenous languages (Phillipson, 2009). I agree with Phillipson (Ibid. p. 338) that English is not “neutral, free of culture and serves all equally well”. Economically and culturally, there has been an uncritical endorsement of capitalism and all its accompanying science, technology and ideology as the norm in local societies (Phillipson, 1992, 2009). EMI can be self-imposed by local policy makers, so that the pressure is not just one way; many countries,
even those not suppressed by colonization like Norway, enthusiastically embrace English at all levels and spheres almost to the degree of self-imposed linguistic imperialism (Troudi, 2009a).

A useful conceptualization of the geopolitics of English is illustrated by Kachru’s (1985) three concentric circles; Inner, Outer and Expanding. The Inner Circle is the traditional base for English, e.g. UK, Canada; the Outer Circle is where English is not the native language, but often due to colonialism is used in the countries’ institutions, e.g. Pakistan, Kenya; and the Expanding Circle where English is used as a foreign language, e.g. Russia, Norway. The NSs in the Inner Circle have traditionally provided the language and cultural norms and thus suppressed the disadvantaged majority by a privileged minority, e.g. in technical or commercial environments where English is used (Jenkins, 2009). However, recent developments seem to have diluted the power of Inner Circle NS English, as Englishes from the Outer Circle are being recognized as languages in their own right with their own vocabularies, grammars and literature making it their English and not the language of ‘others’ (Jenkins, 2009) (3.2.2.2). Canagarajah (1999) documents acts of resistance in classrooms in Sri Lanka in the Outer Circle, and he proposes a pluricentric approach to English usage. Jenkins (2007) reports that the economic power and number of English speakers in the Expanding Circle has resulted in resisting pressure for NS accents (Jenkins, 2007); however in my practice the desire for a NS accent seems very strong. I think Jenkins (2007, 2009) is too optimistic in the empowerment of the Outer and Expanding Circles’ Englishes, because linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 2009b) is evident in the power, not only of the Inner Circle government policies and businesses, but also TESOL examination boards.

3.2.1.1 Linguistic imperialism

English linguistic imperialism is the dominance and increasing use of English by hegemonic groups, e.g. businesses, that sustains the pre-eminence of English and causes linguistic and cultural inequalities around the world as English usage spreads into more countries and domains (Phillipson, 1992). Phillipson maintains that organizations, such as the British Council and TESOL publishing houses, have a vested economic and cultural interest in the spread of English, and the arguments promoting English, e.g. economic utility and as a symbol for
modernity, are in fact harming countries’ indigenous languages and, at an individual level, act as a gatekeeper (Phillipson, 2009b; Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). I think that Phillipson’s five fallacy tenets, viz. the monolingual, native-speaker, early-start, maximum-exposure, and subtractive fallacies, are all occurring in Norway today.

Around the world governments and corporations seem to be embracing not only the English language, but the accompanying cultural and economic models at the cost of indigenous ones (Canagarajah, 1999; Phillipson, 1992). Indigenous languages and cultures can be marginalized, inequalities can be caused by strong English language policies, multiculturalism and bilingualism are often abandoned and learning English predominates (Phillipson, 1992, 2009a). According to Phillipson (2009), the spread of English for economic and social purposes results in education systems and workplaces that reproduce and legitimatize the power and knowledge of English, which poses a threat to other languages and cultures (Ibid., 2003).

The real danger for disempowerment comes when global English becomes the default language intranationally, thus legitimating Anglo-U.S. linguistic norms in political, scholarly, and educational traditions; this linguistic capital dispossesses and takes over space previously occupied by national languages or the mother tongue (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). A subtractive monolingual education leads eventually to extinction of indigenous languages, thus contributing to the disappearance of the world’s linguistic diversity (Phillipson, 2009a; Tone Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009). English is a site of struggle and resistance for learners, but individual students feel that access to greater job opportunities outweighs any linguistic harm done (Benesch, 2001). Users of English accumulate “linguistic capital and others are dispossessed of their language, their territory and their functions” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 338).

A critical approach sees the L1, both language and culture, as a resource and a holistic education promoting bilingualism should be the norm (Garcia, 2009). Studies in Europe (Wilkinson, 2013) and in Norway (Ljosland, 2008) show that EMI in tertiary education is increasingly a monolingual English experience ignoring a bilingualism approach (Silver, 2009). Multilingual competence results in less marginalisation occurring (Cummins, 2009) and ameliorates issues of
identity and otherness (Wink, 2009). When learning content in English-medium classes agency is lost (Cummins 2009), although empowerment can be enhanced by endorsing mother tongue education and a commitment to language rights (Tone Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998). Language learning is connected to broader political concerns of power and equality and if the L1 can be appreciated, equality and cultural diversity will be furthered (Pennycook, 1999).

Phillipson’s theory of linguistic imperialism has been criticized for not linking social aspects to linguistic when understanding human agency. Individuals, institutions and governments are making their own rational decisions to use English, thus counteracting the deterministic nature of linguistic imperialism (Brock-Utne, 2007; Pennycook, 2001). Rajagopalan (1999) does not regard the use of English as endangering regional languages and cultures, but as a reflection of cultural intermixing and multilingualism throughout the world that is naturally leading to changing identities and conceptual frameworks. Furthermore, he sees linguistic imperialism as a misguided guilt complex, particularly amongst EFL teachers, as it is patronizing to think that individuals are incapable of independent decision making regarding English usage, whereas it could be a conscious choice. It could be argued that, while those who follow Phillipson (1992; 2009) see choices about language as externally imposed, and the other camp sees them as decisions made by individuals.

Phillipson is also criticized as seeing language as static, and for not explaining if the promotion of English creates forms of imperialism or just reflects them (Pennycook, 2001). Widdowson (2003) maintains that language itself cannot be imperialistic, and questions if the promotion of English necessarily means downgrading of local languages. However, Ljosland’s (2007) study certainly shows prestige for English usage and diglossia concerning Norwegian usage. The dilemma remains of needing a lingua franca for academics to communicate their ideas and theories internationally, but domestically care has to be taken. I agree with Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) that linguistic diversity is as important as bio-diversity for our planet and all the individual choices of English usage will result in a poorer linguistic landscape.
3.2.1.2 **English as a lingua-franca**

In mainstream TESOL and EMI power has generally been ignored (Benesch, 2001; Johnston, 2003; Pennycook, 2001). However, as my research progressed I found that English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) could inform in my EMI context and counteract some linguistic imperialism concepts. ELF is best defined as "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7), with an underpinning philosophy that English is no longer owned by NSs who think they have the authority and power to decide how it is used (Widdowson, 2003). Mauranen et al. (2010) argue that as English is used mainly among L2 speakers of English, often with no L1 speakers present there is no reason for Anglo/American norms to dominate. They maintain that ELF would broaden ownership of the language of international communication, and have the advantage of forming a new and less inequitable global English, where L1 speakers also learn to modify their English for international communication. Jenkins (Ibid.) believes that as English is the international language of communication, no-one should have custody over it. It is the language of science and business and will develop genres with standards of communicative effectiveness that are not dictated by NS norms.

The prescriptive attitude of traditional TESOL towards mastering the NS language norms of Standard English marginalises NNSs as it sees grammar representing symbolic possessions required to belong to a particular community rather than for communication (Widdowson, 1994, 2003). Core lexicogrammatical features that Jenkins (2009) identifies such as subject/verb concord, omission/insertion of articles, confusing the relative pronouns ‘which’ and ‘who’, as well as counting uncountable nouns e.g. “informations”, are all influenced by Norwegian, and seen as mistakes in English language education in Norway. ELF allows NNS the right to innovate and outcomes are considered legitimate forms of English rather than errors (Jenkins, 2009). ELF involves flexible communicative strategies, particularly accommodation and code-mixing and switching, to adapt to specific communication contexts (Ibid.). NNSs spend much time perfecting grammar points that are not considered relevant to ELF so in my context with few NSs it might be more useful for academics to become familiar with other ways of using English than the NSs’ (Jenkins, 2007).
Pronunciation features in ELF, e.g. consonant sounds such as /ð/ and /θ/, vowel length contrasts, and the placing of stress, that are influenced by the L1 are acceptable deviances in ELF (Jenkins, 2009). Mutual intelligibility between speakers is the criterion for success, thus the influence of L1 in NNS accents should not be seen as errors, but regarded on a par with regional accents from speakers from the Inner and Outer Circles. Jenkins’s study (2007) reveals that NNS accents reportedly receive negative associations such as having low education level, intelligence and status, even among NNS themselves (Jenkins, 2007). In these days of globalisation when most people are bilingual, it seems prejudicial that the monolingual NS is viewed as knowledgeable and efficient from their accents, whilst negative perceptions of NNSs seem widespread (Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011). ELF ideology is to create a more democratic and equal speech community where speakers can use their L1 as part of their identity (Seidlhofer, 2004). It promotes the flexibility and accommodation skills that bilingualism brings in the sociocultural context of international communication (Jenkins, 2007, 2009).

ELT gatekeeping linguistic norms of Standard English, e.g. TESOL examination board criteria, tend to spread to the classroom, thus perpetuating NS norms to which NNSs seem to comply (Ibid.). Even in regions of the world which were never colonized, NS norms continue to ‘colonize the minds’ of NNSs leading to NS linguistic superiority and often feelings of linguistic insecurity for NNS (Jenkins, 2007). Idealized NS proficiency indicates that on sociocultural grounds NNSs are seen as being unable to transform their world nor conform to it (Jenkins, 2009), and are regarded as failed NSs rather than as users in their own right (Lantolf, 2000). These attitudes place the NNS users at a disadvantage (Jenkins, 2009), which in an EMI context means the unequal distribution of power in accessing knowledge and resources, thus preventing individuals leading self-determined existences (Giroux 1988), e.g. at an individual level, exclusion from decision making at HEIs or being denied access to grant funds (Brock-Utne, 2007).

The value placed on NNSs’ language and society in teaching situations has huge influences on power dynamics in communication (Phillipson 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). I appreciate many of the aspirations of ELF in attending to the psychological issues of being a NNS in a hegemonic TESOL
environment and maybe ELF can contribute to a fairer, more just milieu when English is used. However, ELF is not without its critics, as Seidlhofer (2004) admits, as ELF seems to be defined by deficiencies from NS language and is seen as inferior, oversimplified English and its core features have yet to be defined. Mollin (2006, p. 1) identifies ELF as a “[Y]eti in English varieties; everyone has heard of it, but no one has ever seen it” and, according to Sowden (2012), apart from the small VOICE and the ELFA corpuses little evidence exists of frequency and systematic linguistic features in ELF. Therefore, currently teaching ELF seems impossible, but some of the philosophical aspects would be ideal to bring into the pedagogy of EAP and EMI preparation e.g. becoming more familiar with a range of L2 accents and developing accommodating skills when teaching NNS students (Jenkins, 2007).

Critics of ELF such as Quirk (Melchers & Shaw, 2003) and Trudgill (Trudgill, 2002) maintain that NNSs from the Expanding Circle will be best served by a single variety of English for lexico-grammar and pronunciation to enable clear communication and not, as they see it, use broken deficient forms. For historic reasons these norms should be NS from the Inner Circle, and by learning this powerful group’s language practices, NNS will gain respect and credibility in the group. Even in Jenkins’s (2007) research she found that NNS themselves wanted to achieve the perceived correctness, prestige, and authenticity of the RP accent to gain entry into the speech community by learning NS norms. This cannot be morally right, but as an RP speaker I do not want to be patronizing to NNSs. However, Canagarajah (2006, p.236) recognizes the effects on NNS self-worth and identity conflict caused by the emphasis on NS norms in pedagogic material and methods in the Outer Circle, and these are then reflected in international English communication.

I want to embrace the democratic ideals behind ELF of a fairer international English milieu, but I question if ELF has more of a role than awareness raising at the moment (Ammon, 2000). With the general public and majority of English language teachers and students supporting the idealized NS, much work needs to be done on the gatekeepers and NS attitudes (Jenkins, 2007). Nevertheless, circumstances are changing and established ideas should be questioned, and a small sign is the books published on the subject e.g. Melchers & Shaw’s (2003) and journals such as *World Englishes*. There are limitations to ELF as illustrated
in the next section on domain loss, but English used in universities today between NNSs is departing from the Anglo-American standard and people are competently communicating in an international situation with, or despite, the above mentioned core language deviations (Jenkins, 2009).

3.2.2 Domain loss

Language domains are areas of language usage that are dictated by socio-economic contexts and expectations, e.g. one language used for family, another in business (Fishman, 1972). Originally research centred on varieties of a particular language, but now often concentrates on language usage in multilingual settings, particularly concerning prestige (Ammon, 2001). Phillipson (1992, 2009) regards domain loss as a symptom of linguistic imperialism as domains are not being developed in the native tongue. Brock-Utne (2007) maintains that this is the case in HE, especially in smaller European countries.

Societal power influences language choices (Ljosland, 2008), but the effect of an individual's language choices also influences society's domain usage as individuals make linguistically advantageous choices for themselves (Fishman 1972; Ammon 2001). Keller (1994) maintains Phillipson's contention that English usage at the individual level occurs not through a conscious decision not to develop Norwegian, but the power of English has unintentionally led to a decline in Norwegian domains. Thus, when individuals use types of language in sufficient numbers for reasons of career and/or prestige the sheer numbers lead to sociolinguistic changes. However, the ecological factors influencing an individual's choices are political initiatives and decisions (Ljosland, 2008). Thus, the external and individual factors combine in intentional actions as individuals fulfil the international requirements of their institutions. The accumulation of these actions acts like an "invisible hand" (as in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776)) with causal consequences of domain loss (Ibid. p. 407). Thus, English usage is increasing in academia in Scandinavia as a result of choices made by individuals as they want to increase their career chances (Phillipson, 2009) with the unintentional consequence of Norwegian not being developed in academia (Ljosland, 2008).

A further distinction in domain loss is between situations when a language is not used and when it cannot be used (Christensen, 2006). Ljosland (2008)
maintains the former is the situation in Norway. However, she writes that with the increase in the use of EMI courses and the pressure to publish in English there are fewer situations to use Norwegian in academic contexts. In Norway HEI students are often only learning their discipline in English, thus are becoming monolingual in this domain and Norwegian academic register is being lost. Her research showed that PhD students felt that writing their theses in English was the natural choice as English was a more suitable language for academia and had more prestige. English therefore is not purely about communication, but covers other functions of positioning and identity (Ibid.).

The strength of the English language and globalization at universities makes it challenging for an individual with a minor language, such as Norwegian, to maintain academic domain usage without financial help from their institution and the state (Ibid.). Already there is a tendency of subtractive language use, e.g. in terminology, so that code-switching to English is increasingly evident (Ljosland, 2008; Phillipson 1992, 2010). In the near future a new generation of experts who are not maintaining and developing Norwegian will be in positions of responsibility, and will be unable to communicate their discipline to students and the general public in Norwegian (Phillipson, 2009). Thus English usage could lead to social inequality with students with insufficient English being unable to study subjects and sections of the general population may be linguistically excluded from the dissemination of research from universities. The Norwegian publishing system (Tellekant) for academic publication favours high ranking English language journals, and most participants do not have Scandinavian journals in their fields that give credit for professional advancement, thus also increasing the use of English (Brock-Utne, 2007).

3.2.3 Bourdieu’s contextualisation of power

Bourdieu’s contextualisation of power is linked to language in that

“[l]anguage is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also an instrument of power. A person speaks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 646)

For Bourdieu capital embodies the differential value given to different cultures and linguistic forms in economic, social and cultural contexts (Phillipson, 2009).
Capital is then internalized through society and education to become embodied capital (habitus). However, this capital is only considered as valuable to individuals if it becomes symbolic, which means that the capital must be valued by others, and thus can then lead to group membership and an ability to participate and enter domains (Ibid.). Language is part of cultural capital and the choice of language used gives credibility in particular environments, and can be converted to economic capital, through jobs and publications (Kjeldstadli, 2010).

This situation can be clearly seen in the EAP context where NNSs unjustly feel that they have the academic, but not the linguistic, capital and consequently feel marginalized and disempowered (Davies, 2003; Hornberger, 2006). Ljosland’s (2008) PhD thesis shows university teachers using EMI in Norway are being pushed from above (international, national and institutional policies) and from below (students). They report that they prefer giving lectures in Norwegian, and although English is unproblematic there are frustrations over communication difficulties (Ibid.). It seems that the teachers’ habitus is changed when their linguistic capital diminishes. The perceived cultural capital in this environment embodies the linguistic cultural capital of the NS and the power of Anglo/American symbolic capital, which disempowers speakers of other languages (Pennycook, 2001).

The values of the dominant group can be taken up by individuals who feel they will gain by so doing (Bourdieu 2009). They perceive the power of the dominant group and feel it is natural to join them, but by joining and making the group seem the natural place to be, the dominant group gains hegemony (Ibid.). Thus Norwegian academics teaching in English try to learn the terminology and register to fit into their international academic milieu, thus gain linguistic capital, habitus and often economic capital, but at the cost of a Norwegian academic milieu (Ljosland 2008).

A disadvantage of Bourdieu’s theory is that it is deterministic and just explains, rather than gives answers to questions of emancipation. Butler (1997, seen in Pennycook 2001) maintains that Bourdieu needs more understanding of performativity in using language and how agency emerges from the margins of power. However, it helps to explain how norms and values are perceived within an EMI context. Teachers may feel that they have little habitus if they do not
3.3 English as a Medium of Instruction

The main reasons for the implementation of EMI policies are to fulfil the criteria set for universities brought about by globalization, internationalisation and commodification of education (Giroux, 2004; Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari, 2003; Phillipson, 2003). EMI is considered “a must for universities if they want to take an active role in the global academic and scientific markets” (Cots, 2013, p. xx) and essential for the creation of economically viable citizens (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013). In 1996 Maastricht University was one of the first in Europe to be granted bilingual status; they wanted to strengthen their international profile, be accessible for foreign students, create programmes with an international focus and create an international academic atmosphere for student and academic mobility (Nieuwenhuijzen Kruseman, 2003). There was nothing about finance and status, but Nieuwenhuijzen Kruseman (Ibid., p. 10) stated that “we are beginning to see the product to which we strive: the student as world citizen” (my italics).

“[T]he expansion of EMI has been driven by economic, social and political forces, and sometimes educational” (Wilkinson, 2013, p. 3), but not for foreign language learning (Coleman, 2006). The role of the market and the power of English emanate from the international and national policies mentioned in section 2. HEIs are imitating the top-ranking universities, particularly with English as the language for teaching and research, to achieve a competitive position, which seems to be leading to a lack of diversity in the university system (Wilkinson, 2013).

Exchange programmes are particularly important for small countries such as Norway to facilitate study places abroad for domestic students (Coleman, 2006; Shohamy, 2013). The common language of mobile students and academics is English, which results in the proliferation of EMI programmes. Some HEIs start EMI courses in the belief that local students’ level of professional English will be improved, e.g. in Israel (Inbar-Lourie & Donitsa-Schmidt, 2013), and other HEIs think EMI will increase recruitment of domestic students (Hellekjær & Westergaard, 2003). Pressure for English also comes from students for their
perceived increased employability (Ljosland, 2008). Financial incentives for recruiting international students have taken over from the idealism of helping the developing world (Kjeldstadli, 2010).

The language of official discourse at universities is increasingly English, and whether students are domestic or international, English is seen as essential for their preparation for the job market (Doiz et al., 2013). Much teaching and research material is in English, and often heavily promoted by the Anglo/American publishing industry. In addition, the prestigious academic journals publish in English, which places pressure on HEI teaching to be EMI.

3.3.1 Medium of Instruction policies

Language policies are not created in a vacuum, but are produced by a multiple of social and political ideologies (Shohamy 2006; Tollefson & Tsui 2004). A common language is deemed necessary for globalisation (Crystal, 1997), and the capitalist values embedded in the language strengthen its position (Phillipson, 1992). Policy makers have great power in putting forward educational ideologies that appear as universal common sense, whilst at the same time controlling economic resources for implementation (Shohamy, 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004).

Menken & Garcia (2010) maintain that interest is moving towards a more multidimensional implementation of language policies and departing from top-down policies from governments which overlook the role of the practitioner. Ostensibly other stakeholders, e.g. teachers, principals, textbook writers, researchers, and students, are viewed as policy makers as they engage in interpreting and negotiating the language policies (Ibid). Consequently it is not a single policy that emerges, but numerous competing versions of a policy. A complex relationship emerges with a move beyond top-down, bottom-up or side-by-side divisions (Shohamy 2006; Tollefson & Tsui 2004) to create a mixture of explicit or implicit, de facto or planned policies as they are appropriated by various actors to serve a variety of intentions and purposes (Zakharia 2010). However, I think that the strength of English in education and the commodification of education have radically changed the power relations between policy makers and educators stated by Menken & Garcia (2010) and
now teachers have little say in policy apart from implementation in the classroom.

### 3.3.1.1 Strength of English usage in tertiary education

Educators are not in a position to influence EMI because it is invisible in policy documents. In Saarinen and Nikula’s (2013) Finnish study on policy and practice for international degree programmes, they found that language was not mentioned as English was considered self-evident and taken for granted in HEI policy documents. International and multi-cultural environments were mentioned on EMI courses, but language learning was not discussed; students and teachers were expected to have sufficient English for teaching and learning (Ibid.). Multi-lingualism was down-played as a teaching and learning resource, and English was unquestionably seen as the foreign language, whilst other languages are ignored (Ibid.).

Policies, such as Bologna (1999), do not have concrete policies for the use of EMI so English usage forms “tacit institutionalized practices in academia” (Tietze & Dick, 2009, p. 119) and knowledge is generated almost entirely through English (Ibid., Ammon & MacConnel, 2002). In addition, Tietze’s (2008) empirical study of NNS management academics working in non-English working environments found that the driving force to accept English usage policies weakened local and national influence. The complete dominance of English in academia (Curry & Lillis, 2010), combined with laissez-faire language policies which strengthen English, have resulted in accommodation strategies rather than resistance to English in academia (Brock-Utne, 2007).

Consequently, the invisibility, lack of concrete linguistic details and the almost ubiquitous English usage disempower institutions and academics as there are no consultations and dialogues as the concept is taken for granted. Previously, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) used a metaphor of peeling an onion to get to the heart of the onion where the practitioners are to illustrate how ELT professionals can oppose historical and institutional power to engage in a social process for deciding and promoting language policies. However in the present situation the policies are in place, as Brock-Utne (2007) and other prominent academics in Norway experienced when politicians and policy makers ignored their public protests on the amount of English usage in academia. Formerly,
when language policy was a concrete proposal, often for nation building and to make language norms universal to prevent elitism, interaction occurred on policies (Haugen, 1983, seen in Menken and Garcia, 2010). The present situation with EMI is very different and when Ricento and Hornberger (1996) criticise linguistic imperialism’s deterministic attitude on language choice, I think they underestimate the power of English and how the implication of EMI policies perpetuate social inequities (Phillipson, 1992, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998).

These top-down language policies endorse hegemonic ideas “embodied in arguments used to justify the use of English or the learning of English in given contexts” (Phillipson, 1992 p. 73). The practical qualities of EMI are endorsed and unchallenged at the national level (Phillipson, 2009) as policy makers do not problematize language, e.g. neither competency of an individual teacher nor the effect on national language and culture (Saarinen & Nikula, 2013). Tertiary education is where the sociolinguistic norms of academic disciplines are established, which result in dominant groups establishing hegemony in a particular language usage, thereby creating inequality among learners and in society in general (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). In EMI a principle of ‘the rich get richer’ occurs and policies suit those who manage in English, thus increasing the desire for EMI by the powerful (Wilkinson, 2013). The consequences for loss of local culture and languages are dramatic if English continues to replace native languages in education and communication (Troudi, 2009).

3.3.1.2 Commodification of Higher Education

Competition in the HE market resulting from GATT (1995), Bologna (1999) and supporting national policies has led to education being a global commodity with a turnover of billions of dollars (Coleman, 2006). The role of universities has changed from institutions for free enquiry and safeguarding national culture and values, into consumer-oriented corporations viewing education as a commodity and traded according to traditional market forces (Kjeldstadli, 2010; Ljosland, 2008). Economic criteria are used to judge success in university mission statements (Sauntson & Morrish, 2011), and “the ready acceptance of the sector to take a subservient position within a consumer culture has reduced the space for emancipatory narratives” (Scullion, Molesworth, & Nixon, 2011, p. 231) (their italics). Market orientation closes spaces for reflection and does not allow the relationship between research and good teaching and learning
practices to develop (Ibid.). HEIs seem to have no choice in considering alternative ways of doing things or suggesting different radical structures, because their choices are “always contained and constrained by the market” (Ibid., p 233). Universities seem resigned to react as well as they can to marketization, as governments assume that this is the only way to achieve global competitiveness (Molesworth et al., 2011).

Zhang & Hu (2010) criticize globalization implemented from above, saying it disregards contextual influences and disempowers teachers, but there is also bottom-up pressure from students. They are now treated like customers or even consumers, yielding power over institution rankings in their satisfaction ratings (Molesworth et al., 2011). Consequently, short term demands for specific jobs are prioritized by HEIs compared to offering a critical education for life (Giroux, 2004; Kjeldstadli, 2010). Students are shopping around for courses and research projects are increasingly problem solving exercises commissioned by industry, where instant practical solutions are required (Gibbons 1991; Kjeldstadli, 2010). English proficiency is considered a must for domestic and international employment (Ammon 2001). Thus, EMI is pivotal for HEIs being international, multicultural and in the global competition of rankings (Saarinen & Nikula, 2013), when an important efficiency indicator is the number of EMI courses offered. The ideological change causes increased use of English in teaching and research, as it seems to be the passport to join in global competition (van Leeuwen & Wilkinson, 2003).

An Australian study by Fredman & Doughney (2012) on the effects of neo-liberal policies on academics work situation in HEIs, but not on EMI, is helpful in showing other challenges. They found that job satisfaction was low among academics, because of the neo-liberal managerial culture, increased workloads and reduced work status. However the academic staff felt they could work harder if they had control over their work and could develop their jobs. They “contrasted a marketised present to a collegial past” (p. 41) and felt disempowered. However, I hope there can be a middle path between the past and present, as HEIs have previously been elitist, authoritarian and excluding. I welcome the changes for women, multi-culturalism and diversity at HEIs today, and believe it is important for students to have a say in the type of education they receive. According to Molesworth (2011), the marketization of HEIs is
going through a period of change and uncertainty, and nothing is fixed, so perhaps the teachers have everything to play for in their influence.

3.3.2 Teachers’ role in policy
The educators’ chances of innovating and finding solutions to policy largely depend on the amount of freedom and encouragement provided at institutional level (Sutton and Levenson, 2001). Major tensions are occurring in the discursive space for negotiation on usage and status of English. Even though teachers might have influence in the classroom (Hult, 2012), I think Menken and Garcia (2010) are too positive when they maintain that educators can be the principle agents of policy implementation. The power of English and the commodification of education give them little room for manoeuvre even at the grassroots level. During times of change institutions can facilitate teacher agency by creating a supportive, congenial work environment encouraging different perceptions and practices and allowing teachers and institutions to develop and initiate policies that are appropriate to their context (Zhang & Hu, 2010). Professional development can nurture collegial collaboration, with courses or opportunities for peer support (Ibid.). Institutions have an important role in cultivating initiatives, and giving training and knowledge on language policies. They can allow and encourage new ideas, new creations and new policies that are not always in line with national ideologies (Ibid.).

Individuals’ values, beliefs and attitudes influence the level of contestation, resistance, reconstruction, appropriation, adaption and implementation of the policies (Canagarajah, 1999; Menken & Garcia, 2010). Personal identity and prior education and pedagogic experience help shape policy interpretations (Canagarajah, 1999; Zhang & Hu, 2010). An educators’ agency for interpretation, negotiating and enactment is dependent on their ability for self-reflection, knowledge of the language and culture in question and its status and uses, and the teachers’ knowledge of their students and their society (Menken & Garcia, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999). Pennycook’s (2001) notion of post-colonial performativity allowing local people not just to appropriate English, but penetrate it with their intentions, gives voice to educators, rather than just to governments. The discourse, practice, and choice of language at the micro level should feed into the understanding of language use in education policies (Ibid.)
Practice can be seen as unstated policy engaged in the existing structure which allows personal agency in emerging situations (Zhang & Hu, 2010). Good educators do not blindly follow a prescribed policy, but draw on their own knowledge of realities on the ground to suit their context (Menken & Garcia, 2010). Zhang and Hu (2010) show how teachers reconstruct language policy through a critical and participatory community centred learning process in order to create safe spaces for language policy development and engagement in contemporary issues. In Sri Lanka teachers translate official and external practices to suit their existing beliefs, objectives and recognize the needs of the students in policy creation (Canagarajah, 1999). In the classroom teachers can sometimes negotiate if and when a language is used, in translanguaging situations and code switching (Garcia, 2009). Zakharia (2010) shows the influence of employing critical pedagogy for the implementation of Lebanese in a multi-lingual school. Reconstructing policies from pre-existing elements and new elements with students can lead to ways of inclusive or exclusive of linguistic and cultural variation. However, Shomany (2006) maintains policy is mostly imported by political entities in top-down manner as institutions and teachers comply. In the EMI context Molesworth (2011) blames academics for not taking more initiative, but claims they feel weak and passive through being neglected and do not cooperate well, although, of course, some academics see EMI as desirable. However, according to Elton (2011), academics are not interested in the discipline of learning and do not understand the impact of the market on pedagogy so are powerless to respond.

3.3.3 Local implementation of English as a Medium of Instruction in Higher Education Institutions

Wilkinson (2013) identifies five chronological phases of motivation for EMI implementation at Maastricht University in 1987 from practical, idealist, educational, survival to financial, which seem to reflect partially, or wholly the experiences from other HEs. His experience reveals that, when EMI courses were first introduced, English language staff provided language support separate from content, which was then replaced by collaboration with content staff, until the language element was phased out except for English writing courses (Wilkinson, 2013). Although some HEIs have introduced courses in communicative skills in English as generic competence in degree courses (Cots,
2013), most HEIs take it for granted students and teachers have sufficient English for successful education in EMI courses so there is little input from EAP English teachers (Hellekjær, 2010a).

At the teaching level three scenarios occur for implementation of EMI programmes in Norway. Firstly, an informal arrangement for a course to use EMI occurs because of personal connections (Brandt & Schwach, 2005). Secondly, EMI can be formally offered on courses for both Norwegians and foreign students; these EMI courses should be additional to courses using Norwegian, but in fact replace them (Ljosland, 2008). Thirdly, whole subjects or a whole study programme are conducted in English; often for Masters courses specifically to attract international students. The quality of the EMI teaching on these courses has been described as poor; Norway has embraced EMI at all levels as if there was no alternative (Ibid.). Despite the number of EMI programmes increasing, little research has been carried out on the role of the practitioner in accepting, adapting or changing language policy at the institutional level.

In Europe financial incentives and status have encouraged a universal increase in EMI courses at universities (Coleman, 2006; Doiz et al., 2013). Small language countries in north and west Europe have embraced internationalisation fully with subject courses in English not only for exchange students, but also home students, e.g. The Netherlands (Doiz et al., 2013; Wilkinson, 2013). The German system has many courses in English at the beginning of a Bachelor degree and expects students to follow lectures in German later in their studies, whereas in other countries, e.g. Finland, Switzerland, more EMI is used higher up in the system (Ljosland, 2008). In southern Europe, the commitment to internationalisation, particularly through Erasmus programmes has led to accelerated Englishization (Doiz et al., 2013). Even in France with the protection for French in education and research by the Toubon Law of 1994, the desire to attract exchange students has meant an increase in the amount of EMI courses (Ljosland, 2008).

3.4 Teachers’ sense of self
So far this research has investigated external factors effecting teaching academics, but I now want to look at EMI from the individual’s perspective and
their opportunity for action in a CALx context of creating a “preferred future” (Freie, 1972) and being transformative teachers (Giroux, 1988).

3.4.1 Sense of self and identity

Much research has been conducted into how NNS and NS teachers in TESOL see themselves (Llurda, 2006), which can be useful in this context of using EMI. Hall (1996) maintains there is a close connection between language, identity and culture and these play significant roles in shaping personal and professional identity. Identities are unstable, unpredictable and constantly changing and transforming through a construction of external and internal elements (Ibid.), as every person actively incorporates mediated experiences from their surroundings into self-identity (Giddens, 1991). However in this context, a post-modern approach with its emphasis on power relations and politics shows professional identity and self-awareness emerging by continually deconstructed and reconstructed sub-identities in an environment of struggle and conflicting identities (Tsui, 2007).

Giddens (1991) maintains that teachers actively construct themselves through reflection and action; responding to society and culture in a variety of ways which empowers them to form the global institutions that have shaped them. However, NNS teachers often lack confidence and agency because of their perceptions of their English language skills from their environment; even being defined by what you are not, i.e. a NS, rather than positively as a bi/multi-speaker who speaks English. NNS’s perception of deficits in their accents seems to cause feelings of inferiority and inequality, but really it is not the accent it is a mind frame of otherness that is disempowering (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999). However, Ball and Lindsay’s (2013) study from the Basque country found that NNS teachers’ language is competent, confirming Björkman’s (2010a) findings from Sweden.

The tensions involved between identity formed on the basis of language competency and agency can result in marginalization, disengagement and non-participation (Tsui, 2007). Tsui’s findings show that legitimacy of access to practice means that active participation is central to agency. Through discourse and social interaction, agency, reification and a climate of hope can be achieved (Giroux 1997), but in reality the teachers can be oppressed in one situation and
not another (Pennycook, 1999). Often the theorising about empowering does not take sufficient account of the real world and multiple identities (Johnston, 1999).

### 3.4.2 Beliefs, values and reflection

EMI involves a change in teachers’ professional lives and how they cope can be dependent on opportunities for individual and institutionally led reflection on their values, beliefs and practice as advocated by Borg (2006) and Kumaravadivelu (2003). Ideally, teachers should be able to challenge beliefs, raise awareness of in/consistency in beliefs and institutional practice when EMI is implemented (Cots, 2013). An important role of reflection is to enable teachers to turn tacit knowledge into articulated knowledge about their own teaching context (Crandall, 2000) and for teachers to “become authors of their own worlds” (Kumaravadivelu 2003, p. 142). However, Borg (2006) warns that behavioural change does not imply cognitive change; the latter does not guarantee the former, so teachers have to be given the time and encouragement to try out new practices. Change in beliefs follows, rather than proceeds, change in behaviour (Pajares, 1992).

During their professional lives teachers are constantly learning in a cyclic manner, developing over time with new ideas, practices, and introducing pedagogic changes and adapting to challenges in a thoughtful manner (Roberts, 1998). Kumaravadivelu (2003, p. 17) maintains that teachers need and want “a continual process of self-reflection and self-renewal”. Professional development plays a vital role in enabling teachers to develop critical thinking about ideas, beliefs and pedagogic knowledge and understanding the implications of these in their teaching (Wright & Bolitho, 2007). Teachers should be given the time and encouragement to be empowered through reflective practice and work on understanding the idea of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988) and of thinking about aspects such as post-method pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

### 3.4.3 Socio-cultural teaching and learning

Lectures have a decisive role in HEIs in conveying content to students, and delivery is critical to success of EMI (Klaassen, 2001; Wilkinson, 2013). The monologic, formal, prepared and structured nature of lectures can be
challenging as lecturers also need to engage with the students to convey content. Studies have shown that students’ language competence can be problematic (Airey & Linder, 2006; Hellekjær, 2010a) and although the teachers’ English may be better than they realise, Ball and Lindsay’s (2013) study found that teachers were neglecting methodological implications for good teaching; again confirming Björkman’s (2010a) findings in Sweden.

I have taken socio-cultural theory (SCT) based on Vygotsky and Leont’ev’s work to concentrate on the engagement involved in learning as a social, rather than a cognitive, process. The co-constructed nature of learning makes understanding the language between the teacher and student essential for success. The learners’ engagement with their dynamic, reflexive and constantly changing social and linguistic environments takes place firstly overtly in social dialogue and secondly privately within themselves. The teachers are trying to get their learners to actively construct their new understandings, and the social process dictates the direction and form the learning takes (Lantolf & Poehner, 2008; Mitchell & Myles, 2004). It is the learners’ participation in culturally organized activity that augments the quality of their higher-order mental functions, including voluntary memory, logic thought, learning and attention (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). Ideally, learning activities in SCT take place in cultural contexts and historical formed settings, e.g. college, and are mediated by language and other symbol systems (Lantolf & Poehner, 2008; Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Although in a different context, learning French in the USA, Donato & MacCormick’s (1994) case study endorses socio-cultural learning with dialogue between teacher and learner and encompasses reflection leading to successful acquisition of learning strategies. Many of their observed techniques can be useful in my context, e.g. emphasis on the social life of the classroom and making a reflective portfolio.

The concept of Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (ZPD) is important for the teachers to find out where the students are in their learning. It is not the immediate task but the development of critical thinking and reflection that empowers learners to solve future problems and develop personal values that are especially important in tertiary education. For my context the ideal teacher views the learner as Freire’s – learner as partner, with inclusive language, mutual trust and respect and also realising that teaching and learning in a new
language is a lifelong process with broad social, cultural and educational implications (Williams & Burden, 1997).

Kumaravadivelu (2005) maintains that for Vygotsky meaning is constructed through social interaction by active participation from which individuals can make their own meaning. The students take responsibility for their own learning to become autonomous learners (Glasersfeld, 2007). The teachers are using their and the learners’ L2 to obtain competency and self-efficacy in the learning process which results in continual changing of identities and growth of the learner as a whole person (Ibid.).

In learning, language not only conveys meaning, but classroom discourse also creates meaning (Mitchell & Myles 2004). Learning is a process of developing certain ways of seeing and acting, which language use influences (Ammon 2001). Socio-cultural theory also involves teaching the social norms of the community of practice that the learner is trying to enter (Duff & Uchida, 1997). In the EMI environment with the universal employment of Anglo/American style lectures (Godefroy & Barrat, 1998; Lynch & Anderson, 2003; Wood, 2009), the learner is becoming a certain kind of person for participation in a particular community (Wenger, 1998). The disadvantage is that the style and dynamics of the lecture reflect imported pedagogies with a “one size” fits all approach for material, methods and approaches and leads to a uniformity as language influences the educational culture.

### 3.4.4 Communities of Practice

Communities of practice (CoP) are made of groups of individuals who share areas of expertise and knowledge and want to inspire members to participate and learn by interacting and sharing ideas, whilst giving meaning to their actions and allowing a community to develop (Wenger 1998). The social participation means that individuals are in turn re/constructing their own identity within and through the group identity (Ibid.). In the international world of research and publishing these communities can offer encouragement and support, and give social culture, but the EMI lecturers can also feel that they do not possess the social or linguistic capital to position and create themselves within the power allowed in the group (Ibid.). The identity positions are either interactive, in that they are allowed and can be negotiated with others, or reflective when
individuals think or imagine who they might be (Harre, 1998). These positions are in a constant flux as they inform each other and depend on agency to develop what is brought into the group (Ibid.). They are also dependent on different communities inside and outside the institution, and the agency allowed in each to construct the self (Ibid.). Individuals’ agency to create their own identity in the group, and feel comfortable with their habitus depends on the generosity of the CoP.

One of the reasons for implementation of EMI is for the Norwegian teachers to enter their disciplines’ CoP. English allows them socialization through linguistic and social interaction to become part of the particular culture of their community and to adopt the communities’ norms and practices. Simultaneously, they are educating their students for this international CoP through EMI. It will be interesting to find out if these teachers feel that they are accepted in the community as the experts they are in their own field, or if they feel peripheral members who are trying to join (Wenger, 1998). In addition, to see if their English language competency is viewed by themselves and others detrimentally so that they find it difficult to be persons valued by the community (Ibid.) In CoPs issues of power, unequal access and control, as well as the distinction between the periphery and the centre influence how individuals perceive themselves in their social world (Ibid.).

3.5 Conclusion
The varied literature review linking critical perspectives to power in the EMI context and to the teachers’ situation creates a stimulating conceptualisation for the study. It shows the cyclic connection between international education, which is a result of, and in turn contributes to globalisation and shows teachers’ possibility for resistance, acceptance and accommodation. The critical exploration of EMI teachers’ attitudes and practices in their socio-cultural linguistic environment naturally leads to socio-cultural theory for the theoretical framework in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY

The focus of this thesis is on the effect of access and power/disempowerment in the EMI context on individual academic teaching staff’s identity, beliefs and professional practice. It investigates the opportunities, or lack of them, for joining an international CoP. In addition, it links the social, cultural and linguistic effects of EMI on the Norwegian language and equality in Norwegian society. The agenda is critical in wanting to challenge the consequences of EMI, but also intends to give insight into these teachers’ professional situation from their own perspective, thus an interpretive paradigm combined with critical perspectives is used to execute the study. By exploring and criticising the teachers’ perspective it is possible to make a fresh contribution to educational research in this field.

In this chapter I will explain my philosophical and methodological choices (4.1) that underpin the type of findings and conclusions I can demonstrate in this research. After explaining the methodological assumptions (4.2), research design (4.3) and stating the research questions (4.4), I go on to describe the data collection methods (4.5), the research procedures (4.6) and data analysis (4.7). I then look at dependability and credibility (4.8) to demonstrate the rigour of the research, before explaining the ethical considerations (4.9), and conclude the chapter by describing the limitation of the study (4.10).

4.1 Theoretical perspectives

The theoretical perspective is the philosophical approach that underpins the study, and leads to the choice of methodology and subsequently the selected methods (Cohen et al., 2007; Crotty, 2007; Ernest, 1994). The claims I can make from my research and its credibility depend on my chosen perspective of reality (ontology) and on how that reality can be known (epistemology). The selected methodology of a small-scale qualitative study logically follows on from these decisions to show the research results in a trustworthy, dependable and consistent manner. This choice again guides the methods; i.e. the fundamental, practical means in which the data are collected, treated and analysed. The choices in this thesis intersect two of the paradigms, because whilst on the one hand the research is trying to understand a situation for academics teaching
their subjects in English in Norway, on the other, there is a critical agenda to challenge EMI norms and promote a more just environment at HEIs.

4.1.1 The interpretive paradigm
The theoretical perspective used is interpretivism as this research’s ontology is relative as knowledge is dependent on the knower and the context, and there is no one reality; rather multiple realities. A relativist ontological stance is used as different individuals construct and interpret their reality differently (Cohen et al., 2007). The epistemology is dependent on human experience that is continually constructed through interaction between individuals and their worlds, and through their observations of it (Cohen et al., 2007; Crotty, 2007; Pring, 2007); we do not discover a real objective world, but construct a personal model (Ernest, 1994). Thus, the knowledge generated does not regard reality as something that can be known with certainty, but a human generated knowledge that constantly needs qualification and justification in a state of flux as no knowledge is considered eternal or absolute (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). The epistemological position behind the research is subjectivism as it follows the belief that our reality occurs when “meaning-making beings make sense of it” (Crotty, 2007, p. 10). Thus, the epistemology takes a constructivism approach as individuals are creating their reality through their interaction with society and culture, as truth “comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world” (Crotty, 2007, p. 8).

Research using interpretivism informs on understandings of phenomena (Troudi 2008), thus is suitable for exploring research questions like mine, which start with “what” and “how” and use qualitative data. I want to uncover Norwegian academics interpretations of their worlds in their own words to reveal meanings and perceptions, and for them to create their own multiple, constructed realities by imposing their meaning on their teaching situation. The participants’ understanding of the multiple social constructions of meaning and knowledge allow them to help shape the direction of the study and to recognise that the research process and the researchers are not neutral (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). The onus is consequently on the researcher to be rigorous and honest, but also to use the advantages of this paradigm in constructing meaning, rather than discovering it, of being part of the research process and understanding that the investigation is the creation of the inquiry process (Ibid).
The relative ontology and subjectivist, constructionism epistemology in the theoretical perspective of interpretivism leads to the use of symbolic interactionism in this research. It is relevant here as it is understood that there is no one reality, but many realities, meanings and truths and an understanding that reality is socially constructed and encompasses a cultural and historical dimension for interpretation of the social world (Crotty, 2007). It understands perceptions and values of a community where researchers are “taking the place of the other” (Ibid., p. 84) and the researcher’s involvement forms a sound approach to obtaining “a thick description” (Denzin, 1994, p. 505, cited in Troudi, 2008) of the context, intentions, meanings and experience. Symbolic interaction is highly appropriate for “language, communication, interrelationships and community topics” (Crotty, 2007, p. 8), and suits my research in “describing rather than predicting and being inductive rather than deductive” (Cohen et. al 2007, p.169).

However, neutrally exploring the participants’ co-constructed reality through discourse with their world is insufficient in this research as hegemony, power relations, inclusion and the desire for change are also relevant (Schostak & Schostak, 2008). Where I depart from interpretivism is that it considers relativism does not mean equality of everyone’s opinion (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), whereas I believe in the ideals of equality from the Enlightenment and not that some people are better than others. I want to encourage a “viewpoint that engages with otherness as its equal in the formation of communities” (Schostak & Schostak, 2008, p. 272). Everyone’s opinion has some validity in their point of view; it is the job of researcher to pick it out, analyse and interpret what they find in the data. Equality of voice and agency is paramount for my teachers in the current climate of financial and linguistic change, thus I want to include the critical paradigm.

4.1.2 The critical paradigm

The critical agenda is embedded in the interpretive paradigm with the perceptions of the participants, but the research recognises the influence of others (e.g. government, administration, other teachers and students) and the social situation which shape the participants’ behaviour and possibilities to challenge the system (Pennycook, 2001). Pennycook’s (1999) model for CALx is linked to critical theory in examining political and ideological contexts and
giving individuals the opportunities for “social and institutional change and, possibly social justice, with participant engagement and validation” (Ernest, 1994, p. 28). Consequently, I am not only concerned with understanding the perceptions and behaviour of the academic staff, but in developing a social critique and instituting social and institutional transformation in keeping with the critical tradition.

Marx (1818-83) laid the foundations for critical inquiry by looking at social reality entwined in philosophy, history and economics and treating the realities of individuals as never being in isolation (Crotty, 2007). “[E]conomic forces determine how we think” (Ibid., p.120) and outside social influences determine consciousness, thus economic hegemony forms perceptions and viewpoints that shape belief and value systems (Ibid.). In my context the evolving of Marxist ideas into a “Western Marxism”, or post-Marxism are relevant. Influences of Max Weber’s (1864-1920) emphasis on society and culture, György Lukács’s (1885-1971) work on class consciousness and Karl Korsch’s (1886-1961) emphasis on praxis on social relations inform the study. Their different traditions and theories contribution to the dynamic Frankfurt School’s critical approach and desire to change society.

From the Frankfurt School two names particularly influence my thinking for this research. Firstly, Theodor Adorno (1903-69) highlights how much of the research situation is lost by restrictive conceptualisation of data and, in linking to post-modernism (4.1.3), data can be regarded in different ways and awareness of what is being missed out by analysis, e.g. in coding, has a bearing on the research. Secondly, Habermas’s post-Marxist critical theory requires the interpretive approach to be combined with a critical interest of wanting to change society for the better (Ernest, 1994). Habermas’s desire for equality through the need for ideal speech situations and communicative competency (Rosenau, 1992) fits well into the teaching context of NNSs in the EMI environment.

Critical theory views existence as full of inequality, injustice, oppression and human suffering and therefore full of conflict, struggle and resistance (Cohen et al., 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). It does not regard the researcher as neutral or disinterested, but through reliable research questions and methodology, criteria
can be set to achieve reliable evidence from which to work for a fairer, more egalitarian society and give agency to oppressed or exploited voices (Ibid.).

The radical research based on Schostak and Schostak (2008, p. 269) that I am advocating is a “search for alternative views and the continual creation anew of a beginning”, of driving democracy further down to enrich individuals in communities and create a space for inclusion of difference to include all people, e.g. NNS academics, in communities of practice (Ibid.). In exposing how power is operating and “problematizing the given” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 24), critical theory allows individuals the insight into power structures enabling them to transform their social context by giving EMI teachers empowerment and a voice that is often ignored or suppressed in the name of modernisation, internationalisation and economic interests (Schostak & Schostak, 2008). The teachers’ perceptions of EMI are used as a basis to improve their situation, e.g. self-determination of language use (Freire, 1972).

Using the critical paradigm in a Norwegian context may appear contradictory with its egalitarian and wealthy society. However, in my practice I have seen experienced Norwegian academics disempowered when using English and the standard response is to learn more English, but I want to investigate alternatives in connection with the EAP socio-cultural context. I want to deconstruct their realities in order to re-build and challenge them and put them in a form that the teaching academics can challenge their situation (Freire, 1972).

4.1.3 Post-modernism

Having just described the logical approach of his research, it might seem inconsistent to embrace post-modernism which disputes underlying “epistemological assumptions, refutes methodological conventions, resists knowledge claims, obscures all versions of truth, and dismisses policy recommendations” (Rosenau, 1992, p. 3). However, there are many interpretations of post-modernism and my choice is a moderate post-modernism useful for the redesigning and innovation needed to re-conceptualize individual experience and explain the world around the participants (Ibid.). Its value is in the deconstruction of issues; to look at them anew, reveal contradictions and assumptions, and to give alternative meanings to what is taken for granted. In
post-modernism, the agenda of research emphasizes individuals rather than the collective: those often ignored, marginalized and those deprived of power. It questions if this “progress” of internationalization is meaningful or desirable, how it is sought, and by and for whom (Ibid.).

In post-modernism it is not the case that anything goes; instead it is critical and challenges boundaries by deconstructing them, only to then recreate other spaces and another way of looking at a situation (Cilliers, 2008). I am influenced by Holliday & Aboshiha’s (2009) post-modern approach of engagement with subjectivity, justifying the steps of the research and problematizing deeply held opinions with insight. The tight overlap with post-structuralism allows inclusion of cultural influences and a pluralization of strategies and ways of thinking (Rosenau, 1992), which suit investigation into English linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 2009a).

It is post-modernism’s “indeterminacy rather than determinism, diversity rather than unity, difference rather than synthesis, complexity rather than simplification” (Rosenau, 1992, p. 3) and its attention to the unique rather than general that is attractive. Post-modernism naturally follows on from my paradigm built up by emphasizing emotion rather than impartial observation, relativism rather than objectivity (Ibid.). The radical constructivism of knowledge being constructed by the thinking individual in post-modernism develops from previous explanations of these participants constructing their own understandings (Ernest, 1994).

I agree with Featherstone (1988, cited in Roseau, 1992, p. 207) that there are “as many forms of post-modernism as there are post-modernists”. I have chosen a more affirmative variety than many of the negative and pessimistic ones, one more in keeping with the Anglo-American perspective and, which links into the political aims of CALx of changing unjust situations into ones of equality, empowerment and agency. My study’s conceptual perspective is grounded in CALx in questioning assumptions and by linking language and power to social inequality (Benesch, 2001; Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 2001).

4.2 Methodological assumptions

The researcher understands EMI in Norwegian universities as
“both a product and an agent of culture, social, political, educational and ideological agendas that shape the lives of individual participants, teachers and learners” (Shohamy, 1998, p. 332)

requiring a critical approach. However, at the same time it recognizes the practicalities of English as the lingua franca in international academic settings and, hence, requires the more pragmatic critical theory described above and advocated by Gur-Ze’ev (2005) in its ability to develop “a more democratic culture and active citizenry” (Peters, 2005, p. 35). Habermas’s belief that it is impossible to do away with market and state administrations also supports this stance, but we must “learn to tame them” (Peters, 2005, p. 40). This research design incorporates multiple views and challenges prevailing norms which have been defined by the powerful, e.g. policy makers. The research design is consequently influenced by radical research in “constructing the cooperation necessary to engage with change, to keep up with the productions of difference and, thus, to be creative about developing ever-inclusive communities” (Schostak & Schostak, 2008, p. 9).

Ontologically this is possible as the multiple realities of interpretivism marry well with the social, economic and political agenda of the critical paradigm (Mertens, 1998). Epistemologically the interpretative paradigm is developed into a social and radical constructivism approach compatible with the critical paradigm. The approach is critical, as the research aims to not only understand the perceptions and behaviour of the academic staff, but to develop a social critique and to institute social and institutional transformation.

Radical research suits post-modernism by questioning the rules of the game and “how the real is constructed” (Schostak & Schostak, 2008, p. 10). In addition, my agenda of questioning who has access to what, who can do what and where, is not considered to be “fixed but open to reconfiguration and, thus, alternative ways of seeing” (Ibid. p. 10). Therefore, different implications can be seen in and extrapolated from the data depending on which data are made visible. The interdisciplinary nature of radical research leaves education and enters disciplines of psychology, sociology and politics. It wants a radical openness to difference whilst “seeking to build communities of support for difference” (Ibid. p. 8).
Embedded in the background for his research from the literature is the desire to employ the critical mind engagement advocated by Giroux (1988), where ideological theory and principles inform on practice connected to social issues. The “reflective turn” in critical philosophy links to the reflectivity of critical pedagogy, so that my participants are being asked to reflect upon their practice, values, and beliefs and through an understanding of their situation they can acquire and question knowledge (Peters, 2005). Only through this type of research activity of understanding and interpreting situations can we employ emancipatory practice ourselves and to our research (Giroux, 1988). Power differentials are perpetuated by using supposedly value-free, neutral research, so my research has the aim of change through mutually interdependent shared meanings to give rich insight whilst acknowledging awareness of my own selectivity and perceptual biases.

This approach has not only developed through my reflexivity-in-reflection (Cohen et al., 2007), but also requires participants to engage in reflection-on-action (Schön, 1983) seeing it as an opportunity to step back to reflect, monitor and record actions in order to make sense of themselves as teachers in an EMI environment (McNiff & Whitehead, 2006). The aim of this process is to change routine, unthinking action, e.g. obedience to authority, into reflective action that is prompted by consciousness of the consequences of any belief or practice (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). The self-reflective spiral for the researcher and the participants of planning, observing and reflecting brings about a holistic approach emphasising creativity and context sensitivity (McNiff & Whitehead, 2006). I want to embrace this situation with my own reflection and practice and in the long run after completing this thesis, bring my pedagogic contribution into my practice for reassessment.

4.3 Research design
The research design is a small-scale qualitative study to critically explore lecturers’ attitudes and experience of EMI. As Radnor (2002 p. 48) states “[a] combination of data collected through watching, listening, asking and recording – that is, observing and interviews – enables us to engage in the act of interpretation”. Through these two methods of data collection, I can gather meanings and patterns of behaviour from the participants as active agents in the structural changes that are being made in their working lives with the
implementation of EMI (Ibid.). Observations and interviews offer the flexibility and subjectivity to be innovative in the discovering of the relationship between practice and attitudes in a context of deep understanding (Silverman, 2001). Through their words and observing their actions participants’ meanings and perceptions of EMI are uncovered within the concept that there is no one reality, but many realities, meanings and truths (Silverman, 2001). Although typically used for exploring and describing phenomena this type of qualitative research is also suitable for critical research (Spada, 2005). The research questions are answered using the following instruments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQs</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Research questions

The research questions have been generated based on my experience of preparing academics to lecture in English in a Norwegian university over the past ten years. They address concerns about the positive and negative effects of EMI and the consequences at an individual, institutional and national level. The teachers seem to have been forgotten in this linguistic change, and although a few studies have been carried out in Norway, e.g. quantitative work by Hellekjær (2007 & 2010) and qualitative work in a general case study by Ljosland (2008), no critical work has been carried out.

In order to address the research aims and objectives the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How do Norwegian university lecturers react to the implementation of a policy of EMI for their programmes?
   1.1 How are they currently using EMI in their teaching and English in other academic situations?
   1.2 What is their attitude to the usage of EMI?
2. How have these lecturers been prepared for the implementation of this policy and how do they cope?
2.1 How do the lecturers judge their EAP language competence?

2.2 How do they feel about their preparation for using EMI?

2.3 What are their perceptions of their own experience of EMI?

4.5 Data collection methods
Data collection is through in-depth, focused, semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions and unstructured, filmed observations of teaching situations which are triangulated against the literature (Holliday, 2002). Integrating these two complimentary methods produces a sound interpretive rendering for enhanced consistency and credibility (Radnor, 2002). The combination gives an understanding of how behaviour occurs as well as the participants' perspectives of their occurrence (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Arising phenomena from the observations can be investigated and made explicit through interviews to systematically produce new information and perspectives on EMI.

4.5.1 Justification of data collection methods
To ensure trustworthiness of both the process and the evidence a detailed account of the data collection methods is given (Lewis & Ritchie 2003).

4.5.1.1 Interviews
Interviews were chosen in keeping with the theoretical framework of co-constructed knowledge through the interaction between the interviewer and interviewee (Kvale, 2007; Wellington, 2000). The interview is a powerful method of producing knowledge of the human condition as it explores ways in which subjects experience and understand their world from which the researcher can interpret their experience (Kvale, 2007).

Co-constructed research sees the interviewer as the main research instrument as only the complexities of the human mind can understand another human's existence (Kvale, 2007). It is my craftsmanship and competence that will produce credible data. By using my own previous knowledge of working 30 years in the EAP/EMI field, my interview experience as a personnel selection officer in the Royal Navy, along with my understanding and familiarity with the local language, routines and power structures of my Norwegian context, I hope
to be sufficiently sensitive and skilful to gain sound, solid, rich data. Interviewing is subjective, but through giving good descriptions of the whole interview process it is possible for other researchers to understand the interpretation of the findings. In keeping with postmodernism I see the interviewer as a traveller freely gaining an already existing socio-constructed knowledge by asking pertinent questions, encouraging responses and listening and open to multiplicity of meaning (Ibid.).

By addressing the local, understanding knowledge as interwoven in networks and validated through practice, interviews supply relevant insightful data (Ibid.). Following the critical pedagogical principles encompassed in this thesis, these interviews allow for change of the interviewees’ meanings as they enter a process of reflection where meanings and themes can be transformed. The interviewee is the teacher helping the interviewer to understand their perspective from their point of view and the way they understand it.

4.5.1.2 Observations
Spada (2005) promotes using observations in interpretive-postmodern frameworks for studies in the classroom involving complex, linguistic cultural and social factors. Her work endorses studies such as this one involving co-constructed learning and focusing on the teacher’s sense of self and linguistic growth. Although her research was in ESL learning, the classroom is always a complex place for observation, but real teachers in real classrooms have great potential to inform on classroom practice (Spada, 2005).

Observations endorse the theoretical philosophy of the study as symbols, i.e. language, appearance, gesture, and interaction, compose data to be read as symbolic interactionism (Wragg, 1991). A strong sense of self results from studying the interaction of these symbols in actions and the perception of these actions by others (Ibid.). In addition, observations show the wider context where subjective meanings of events are inseparable from the social structure, particularly with reference to power (Ibid.). It is the opportunity to explore individual behaviour within the classroom context which has led to the choice of filming the teachers’ behaviour in their natural teaching setting (Dörnyei, 2007), so they were most valuable in the quality of teaching aspects of this thesis. Thus, “the ‘culture’ of the social setting, the norms, values and habits that make
up the way of behaving in this setting” give an opportunity to experience the learning environment and understand the teachers’ behaviour (Radnor, 2002, p. 50).

The importance of the filmed observations reflects the power in Western society of ocularcentrism, thus actions observed in the classroom can produce powerful data that are inaccessible by other means (Banks, 2007). Observations are particularly useful when investigating behaviour and interaction, understanding non-verbal communication, as well as verbal, and investigating behaviour that has escaped the consciousness of the participant, thus supplying valid knowledge to answer the research question (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).

My role in the observations was to come to an understanding of the world of the research participant (Radnor, 2002). I was aware of a personal bias as I have been their EMI teacher, but I kept an open mind to the social reality of their classroom. I made a professional judgment to just observe having been forewarned by Radnor (2000) of the effect of being lulled into making assumptions from one’s own past experience in the context. Whilst observing I kept a mental distance in wanting to be able to see the strange in the familiar by seeing things that are taken for granted, yet be in the position to know the significance of details that might elude strangers (Holliday, 2002). By being open about bias, the research gains in trustworthiness.

The lessons were filmed to enhance the strength of the data by combining the analyst’s “eyes” and the camera “eyes” to give as full picture as possible (Dörnyei, 2007) and to provide time to fully analyse the situation (Wragg, 1991). Filming has the advantages of being an unambiguous, objective account of events and giving invaluable information about the setting and context (Radnor, 2002). The films were vital in giving time for exploring pronunciation, grammar, rhetoric features and dialogue-lecturing, as well as the body language.

The data from the films provided information on seen behaviour and the interviews complemented in investigating the teachers’ actions (Mertens, 2010). Two methods of data collection offer a more complex and holistic view of the situation for analysis (Cresswell, 2009). I have perceptions and attitudes from the interviews that can be verified, contrasted and complemented by a glimpse into the teachers’ everyday EMI environment for me to build up thick data on
what is happening in their EMI environment and to critically analyse the situation (Radnor, 2002).

4.5.2 Selection of Participants
20 teaching academics with various experience of EMI from four Norwegian HEIs were interviewed, and for logistical reasons of those, five were observed in the auditorium after they had attended one of my EAP courses (Appendix 2). My interview sample size was iterative for as I approached the twentieth interview I noticed a lack of new themes occurring (Dörnyei, 2007). Classroom observations require trust between the researcher and participant which takes time to build, therefore I used previous students who also recognized the relevance of my research to them (Spada, 2005). I offered to share my findings and work with all the participants when it was completed.

By having 20 participants from thousands of potential candidates, my selection has been purposeful (Perry, 2005). However, I enhanced the opportunity for exploring differences and similarities, and finding patterns across disciplines and age groups by selecting my teachers from different fields and of various ages (Dörnyei, 2007). Purposeful selecting has also been employed by choosing four very different types of institution; culturally, historically and in their philosophy of learning and the academic curricula offered, which strengthens ideas of commonality within EMI (Ibid.). I also selected participants with various levels of English, as I found that those confident in the EMI world were enthusiastically coming forward to tell their story, whilst naturally enough those encountering challenges were harder to find. Thus, the size and diversity of the sample is sufficient to generalize in Norway, but small enough for the penetrating analysis required in critical exploration (Kvale, 2007).

Selection was by contacting my previous students and snowballing through contact with other EAP teachers (Wellington, 2000), which resulted in ten previous students, of whom five were filmed, from my institution and ten recruited from the other three Norwegian institutions. Although I knew my previous students beforehand, there was a great diversity of experience and perceptions from all the participants, all of whom I believe spoke frankly and provided rich data. The Hawthorne and Pygmalion effects are irrelevant as I am
not involved in the different institutions so I had neither influence on, nor expectations of particular participants (Perry, 2005).

4.6 Procedures
For practical reasons the interview data were collected between July and September 2012, and the observations had been filmed and feedback given to participants at the end of a course I held the previous year, but I anticipated using them for this research. During data collection a research log was written on factual details, first impressions, reflections on both data sets and provided invaluable field notes for the cyclic process of data collection and ideas for the analysis and theory building (Radnor, 2002).

4.6.1 Interviews
There are few standard procedures for interviewing. However, by following Radnor’s (2000) suggestions of advanced preparation for all aspects including performing post interview work during the interview, e.g. clarifying meanings of statements, counter questioning, challenging responses and asking control questions, then transcription, analysis, verification and reporting the findings are made easier.

Two pilot interviews, one in English and one in Norwegian, were carried out with colleagues familiar with the EMI environment in Norway to discover weaknesses (Wellington, 2000). Feedback I received was that I was too encouraging, so that it was not just co-construction of meaning, but I could be misinterpreted as influencing meaning with my enthusiasm. In the interaction I lacked a tolerance to silence whilst the participants were thinking about the answer and generally I spoke too fast. I needed to refine the questions to be more specific to make it easier for them to answer. I learnt from these comments and acquired a manner of keeping the conversation flowing with pertinent questions and follow-ups to search for the interviewees’ meanings and practices, combined with active listening to gain rich data to build a picture of what is happening from interviewee’s perspective.

From the pilot experience I refined an interview sheet with 12 main open-ended questions and prompts for each of the questions (Appendix 3). I did not follow the order rigidly, but was flexible depending on different individual situations in the way I covered all of the topics. An in-depth, semi-structured interview was
used to gain relevant and reliable material in thematic and dynamic dimensions, as well as being sufficiently open to allow spontaneous, lively, unexpected answers (Kvale, 2007).

Information on the purpose of the research, the research questions and the consent form were e-mailed to each participant before the interviews (Appendix 4). Fourteen interviews were carried out in the participants’ offices and for logistical reasons six were Skype interviews also from their offices. The interviews lasted between 12 and 38 minutes (Appendix 5 - example transcription). In both types of interview I ensured the respondent was comfortable and relaxed and rapport was achieved by active listening, showing interest and respect, and being clear about what I wanted to know. Norwegian was used to discuss the purpose, check the consent forms, ask for permission to record on a digital voice-recorder, and participants were asked whether they wanted to be interviewed in Norwegian or English; five chose the former and 15 the latter, and an opportunity was given to debrief at the end in Norwegian. After each interview I wrote a reflective log on immediate impressions of the context, setting, and mood of the interview (Appendix 6).

4.6.2 Observations

The observations of five participants had been carried out at my institution after they had attended one of my EAP courses and before the interviews. The purpose of the lecture at the time was to give the course participants the opportunity to put into practice the English they had learnt on their course, look at their film with feedback to improve EMI lecturing skills. The lecturing took place with small groups in small auditoriums so also involved some dialogue-lecturing. There was no direct pilot filming as all my EAP lecturing courses had ended in this manner so I had been filming these situations and giving feedback over many years.

The videos are distinct and robust, and can show latent meanings that are unavailable to those performing the social action (Banks, 2007) and are invaluable for gathering ‘live’ data to give an understanding of classroom culture (Cohen et al., 2007; Silverman, 2001). The strength of these observations is that I made notes for the participants whilst filming occurred, I gave the
participants feedback as part of their course, and then I noted relevant behaviours whilst I looked at the films as externals on Nvivo (Appendix 7).

I was aware that having taught these participants I might assume a shared knowledge, but tried not to have pre-judgements and concentrated on understanding their teaching and their actions from their perspectives (Radnor, 2002). In addition, I was mindful that there is no one single way to be a good teacher and there is a wide range of teaching styles between disciplines and contexts. In the observations I was as nonparticipant as possible, dressing casually to minimise intrusion and wanting the filming to be seen as natural part of the lectures’ professional development. The camera was static to avoid distraction, but using the zoom feature to focus on points. The aim was to produce as authentic a situation as possible, but I realise that observations cannot tell the whole story of classroom life and that observations invariably change what is being observed (Dörnyei, 2007).

The class was informed that the purpose of filming was for the teacher’s in-service training, and all agreed to the filming. These teachers are all experienced and are also used to being videoed, e.g. for distance learning, thus reducing the effect and bias on the participants’ behaviour. Also on the EAP course they had been filmed in micro-teaching activities and received feedback. As university lecturers, they are experts in their disciplines so subject knowledge was not taken into account.

During the observations I was also a practitioner so used unstructured observation protocols with three topics; language, interaction/delivery and general impression, to give useful feedback to the participants (Appendix 7). I distributed my attention widely and evenly and captured as many aspects as possible to see what emerged in the context. I recorded events for low-inference categories e.g. language problems and high-inference ones e.g. involving techniques in the classroom, as they occurred in keeping with the qualitative methods employed (Dörnyei, 2007). The employment of the three conceptual groups had the advantage of being an informal record of situations that emerged and provided feedback on the participant’s performance from which to explore the lesson and make and draw inferences (Radnor, 2002).
Using one of the many published lesson observation sheets would have been too constraining to items on a checklist.

The length of the films was 25 - 30 minutes and in my capacity as practitioner I wanted to give feedback from the filming and my observations as soon as possible after the filming. Some participants watched their film straight after their lecture, and others were a couple of days later depending on individual timetables. In both cases the participant and I sat down together and watched the video, starting and stopping it as necessary. (Unfortunately, these interviews have not been recorded as they happened as part of my teaching, but the feedback forms have been used with permission and those observed are five of the 20 participants with whom I later had in-depth interviews).

The advantage of filming is that since the initial pedagogic use of the films I have reviewed them several times on Nvivo making further observations. Thus, the complex activity in the classroom could be analysed to provide invaluable, in-depth data for investigating the teaching situation. My changes in approach during the doctorate have allowed me to look more at the pedagogy and question the previously taken for granted superior value of correct language usage for successful teaching.

4.7 Data analysis

Thematic analysis described by Braun & Clarke (2006, p. 9) readily fits the co-constructive nature of this work, as well as in recognizing “the ways individuals make meaning of their experience, and, in turn, the ways the broader social context impinges on those meanings”. They highlight the importance of making the data analysis process transparent by allowing a rich, detailed and complex account of the analysis. Their flexible method of identifying, analysing and recording themes gave rigour to an insightful, inductive analysis of themes, and at the same time maintained focus on the research questions.

This section provides details of the analysis of the two data sources. They were analysed simultaneously as inferences, comparisons and contrasts within and between them could be considered and noted in the research log (Ibid.). Thick data was achieved by forming a network of interconnected data and being systematic thorough argument and discussion of the whole process of data collection and analysis. In qualitative research clear, consistent, thoughtful
ordering of data stimulates careful analysis and shows rigor and a clear account of the process of analysis gives credibility to the work (Holliday, 2002; Radnor, 2002). Here is an outline of the data management and analysis (also see Appendixes 5 to 9):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** | From tapes to transcriptions and summaries  
Summaries verified by e-mail  
Make notes on observations |
| **2** | Manual coding – initial analysis - inductive  
60+ themes from interviews  
Focus on language/pedagogy in films and comments in interviews |
| **3** | Nvivo coding of interviews and observations  
Nvivo nodes – in-depth inductive analysis - 120+ nodes, merged to 80  
Check data from observations confirming/contradicting interview data  
Refining categories and classifying data |
| **4** | Detecting patterns to link to the research question  
Building hierarchies of nodes to answer the research question for the findings chapter |
| **5** | Developing explanations and themes for the discussion chapter |
| **6** | Theory building for the discussion and conclusion |

### 4.7.1 Data management

The recordings of the interviews were listened to once without transcribing after the interviews, and impressions and reflections noted in the research log. The interview was then transcribed verbatim as representing oral language with e.g. run-ons and sentence fragments, and including hesitations and pauses to preserve the original nature of the encounter (Braun & Clarke, 2006) (Appendix 5). The level of transcription was to represent my participants’ views as faithfully and accurately as possible and to give richness to the written word that would be helpful in analysis (Gibbs, 2007). Anonymity was ensured by giving participants pseudonyms.

Knowing the subject matter and context, transcribing was an interactive process involving opportunities to connect and develop understandings with the data through deep listening analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Ibid.). The Norwegian transcriptions were then translated into English. To increase credibility, a summary (of between 200 and 400 words) of my impression of each
participants’ interview (Appendix 5) was sent to them for participant verification. Some participants replied with minor corrections, others agreed with my version of their interview and many did not reply at all. I felt I had a rich corpus from the 20 interview transcription, 20 summaries and the field notes which together comprised over 45,000 words.

As the interview structure was not to form a priori categories but to be used inductively, I followed Kvale’s (2007) suggested method of reading through each interview. I was conscious of my role as an active researcher and found that themes did not just emerge, but I identified patterns and themes and did not passively give voice to my participants (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The films, with the feedback sheet, had been gone through with the participants after their lesson. I transferred the films to my laptop as VLC media documents and explored them as externals on Nvivo10. My initial comments, my field notes from my research log and the points arising from the exploration on Nvivo10 were all categorised into the Nvivo nodes which had arisen from the interviews (Appendix 7).

Looking at the two sources together provided sharp insight to understand the raw natural data of the films compared to the data of opinions in the interviews, and it focussed on how they complemented each other and contextualized the study (Dörnyei, 2007; Holliday, 2002). The data from the films strongly complimented the interviews particularly concerning the type and standard of language used, the pedagogy and the general learning environment.

4.7.2 Describing, classifying and interpreting

The data has to be organized into categories and themes, explained and meaningfully interpreted (Cresswell, 2007). I followed Braun & Clarke’s (2006) six phases of thematic analysis; after familiarising myself with the data, I generated initial codes, then searched, reviewed and defined themes before embarking on a final analysis and selection of extracts to link with the research question. I will now explain each phase in detail.

Staying as close as possible to the data, I familiarised myself first with paper versions of the transcripts (Appendix 8) and observation data (Appendix 7) making notes as to possible codes at the same time keeping ideas from the
literature and on how I would answer my research question in the back of my mind (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Radnor, 2002). As I became more familiar with the contents, I then uploaded all the data into Nvivo10, and I looked for categories, i.e. nodes in Nvivo, more systematically and found many new ones. Nvivo was vital for the on-going reflexive dialogue with the data, and storing, analysing and retrieving information. I continually cross checked with the manual notes on the paper copies to strengthen dependability. I was glad I had started with the paper coding as it helped the process of discovery of possible relationships and meanings.

During this process I was looking for patterns across the whole data set. The open-coding method seeks recurrent patterns and themes to produce analytic conclusions, and allow alternative interpretations from the observations (Cresswell, 2007). I looked for similarity and difference in the data (Ibid.) and used my judgement for choosing categories to answer the research question and provide interesting research. Although the study is qualitative and ideographic, prevalence of issues mentioned by particular participants, or mentioned by many of them, also influenced my decisions in order to reflect the participants’ concerns, but I also included items just mentioned by individuals (Braun & Clarke, 2006, Gibbs, 2007). I showed this in the text by saying the amount, e.g. “most participants”, or using the pseudonym of the relevant participant.

I coded inductively as I wanted data driven research that could develop the empirical theoretical aspects of the study and be in keeping with the critical approach of the research. The themes were identified at the latent/interpretive level from the transcripts in keeping with the constructionist paradigm. However, I found that my initial coding was too descriptive, although it proved a useful step for gaining control of my data, and from which to identify and develop themes (Appendix 8). The initial categorising was then made into hierarchies to answer the concepts from the research questions with sufficiently large categories to enable extensive qualitative interpretations (Kvale 2008). Thus, I moved from the first Nvivo categorising below to the next one showing the formation of categories for each research question (see Appendix 8 for details).
Thus, for each research question, or part of it, I followed a process of thinking about which themes would be relevant, e.g. below for the first part of RQ 2, and for more comprehensive details of the process see Appendix 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e.g. Areas required to answer part 1 of RQ 2 - How have these lecturers been prepared for the implementation of this policy and …?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To move from the codes to the themes I continuously made thematic maps and charts (Appendix 8) to up-grade the descriptive codes to rich, interpretive themes. Considerable time was employed reviewing and defining the themes. Gradually the codes on the participants’ values and beliefs, and their practice and perceptions of it, were generated into themes based on the recurrence of patterns and relationships between the different phenomena from the initial analysis (Kvale, 2007). As the themes were from different aspects of the research questions, the findings section stays close to the research questions in analysing the data and the discussion section explores the underlying ideas, assumptions and conceptualisations in three main themes; i.e. power, equality and teaching quality, with their relevant sub-themes. It was at this stage that I had to increase my literature review as I saw the power relations between NNS/NSs were relevant, some principles behind ELF could inform my study and commodification of education played a central role in my research.

In writing the discussion I wanted to provide “a sense of scope and diversity of each theme, using a combination of analyst narrative and illustrative data extracts” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 24). I was careful to have an open flow between the data and analytical claims and have rich and interesting themes;
some idiosyncratic, but never anecdotal. Thematic analysis (Ibid.) provides a rigorosous theoretical method of analysis to apply to my data and suits my approach. It offers assessable results through thick description of the data, highlights similarities and differences across the data, to provide unanticipated interpretations of data.

4.8 Dependability and credibility

In qualitative research the terms reliability (consistency in the instruments for the measurable results) and validity (that the research instruments measure what they are intended to measure) of quantitative work are described as dependability and credibility respectfully (Silverman, 2001). From external validity generalisability can be achieved in quantitative work, however in qualitative work as the context and setting are paramount to the study this is not applicable, although transferability to other similar contexts can be justified through sound reasoning (Cohen et al., 2007). Transferability is aided through methodological or theoretical triangulation as it offers “rigor, breadth, and depth” (Denzin & Lincoln 1998, p. 4) My triangulation of analysing the multiple data sources at several levels, each focusing on a certain dimension of the phenomenon being observed (Denzin, 1989), as well as with the literature addresses construct credibility (Yin, 1994).

However, I prefer Ritchie and Lewis’s (2003, p. 263) categorisation of generalisation being “relevan[t] beyond the sample and context of the research itself” when the epistemology and ontology allow. By careful selection representational generalisation is extended to the parent population from which the choice was made (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003), so with opportunist selection of four HEIs and participants from different disciplines, there is some transferability to other Scandinavian institutions. In keeping with the epistemology of this research, inferential generalisation is possible “based on the researcher's own experience and feelings, rather than one that is rationalistic and law-like” (Ritchie and Lewis 2003, p. 268). Theoretical generalisation means that principles and positions involved can be made more general through a universality of the human condition (Ibid.). This research, in keeping with its postmodernism slant wants to achieve “a transferability of knowledge from one situation to another, taking into account the contextuality and heterogeneity of social knowledge” (Kvale, 2007, p. 87)
In this type of research “‘credibility’, ‘neutrality’, ‘confirmability’, … ‘trustworthiness’” (Cohen, 2007, p. 148) are key criteria (Perry, 2005). In my study, credibility is shown by neutrally displaying evidence supporting and challenging my ideas (Yin, 1994). I can inspire trust by treating evidence thoughtfully, fairly, and admitting my possible bias and showing a chain of evidence and writing in an engaging manner with a strong story line (Perry, 2005; Wellington, 2000). Having collected multiple sources of data from interviews and observations, this corroborates evidence and logically links from data to proposition with clear criteria for interpreting findings thus ensuring this works’ dependability (Ibid.). The conclusions and implications can be seen to tie back to the data (Wellington, 2008).

Consistency can be enhanced particularly against the criticism of “anecdotalism” (Silverman, 2001) by placing a transcription of an interview in the appendix (Appendix 5). Thus, different observers can gain insight into the process of the data analysis and consider if they would interpret and categorize transcripts in the same manner. The texts let situations and events speak for themselves and credibility is increased by footnotes giving post-interview informant feedback (Cohen et al., 2008). Credibility is strengthened as the study design and method of data collection are clearly explained (Alwan, 2007, Wellington 2008) and are “context-related, context-dependent and context rich” (Cohen, 2007, p. 167).

Bias could be shown by the researcher as I could have been too close to the situation and have my own agenda, so there could be questions about neutrality. However, here it is known and is part of the research methodology, so it is acceptable and thus unnecessary to eliminate the researcher’s identity as it is made evident and understood (Cohen et al., 2007). Robust reporting and precise descriptions throughout the project produce good quality knowledge that other researchers can use to follow the logical and systematic process of data analysis and interpretation of findings (Kvale, 2008). The participants are asked for their honest attitudes and feelings so member checking offers means of avoiding bias (Appendix 6) and notes had been made at the time of the observations and afterwards as the films provided opportunities for thorough analysis (Appendix 7).
4.9 Ethical considerations

Ethics in research needs to balance the requirement to gain the truth by the researcher and protect the subject’s rights and values (Cohen, 2007). Wellington’s (2000, p. 57) Table 4.2: Watch your ethics: eight rules to follow has been followed. It includes informing the participants about the purpose of the research and ensuring that they do not suffer any negative consequences. They should give their informed consent, and know they are free to refrain from participation or to withdraw (Cohen et al., 2007). Lastly, pseudonyms should be used for all people and places.

Researchers’ responsibilities to ethical considerations include their awareness of what is involved in their project, that correct procedures are followed at all stages (including storage of the data) and that their integrity and trustworthiness are always upheld (Cohen et al. 2007). Ethical considerations are for the protection of all parties involved and research communities must have an ethics committee from whom to apply for permission and to follow an ethical code of conduct during their research. Ethical research approval has been granted by Exeter University (Appendix 10). All aspects of the consent form (Appendix 4) were explained to my participants before they signed the form (Cohen, 2007). Pseudonyms have been given to the participants to ensure anonymity and the data has been securely stored.

4.10 Limitations of the study

The factors placing restrictions on the conclusions in the study and their application to other situations are geographical, temporal, the honesty or not of participants’ disclosures and the neutrality or lack of it of the researcher. It might be construed as constricting that my participants were from academic institutions where I had connections, could easily get to and/or enjoyed logistical support. However, the choice of universities encompassed the four main types in Norway: established and newly established universities, and a technical university and a vocational university college, all of which were in different regions. The honesty or dishonesty of participants’ disclosures is juxtaposed with the observations of some of the participants and having semi-structured interviews allowed them freedom to develop topics, whilst still keeping to the research’s agenda. Using English for gathering and analysing the data could be portrayed as detrimental for investigating attitude, but these are teachers who
were all teaching in English, and as mentioned previously they were invited to be interviewed in Norwegian if they wanted. All the administration of their interviews was conducted in Norwegian.

The researcher is supposed to be subjective and involved in meaning making in the research paradigms, but intentionality, deconstruction and reconstruction are important for continuously calling into question my attitudes as a researcher. Although I have a monopoly of interpretation, I have carefully explained the data analysis and included items critical of my stance to compensate this. I have justified knowledge claims about what is known and how through my choice of paradigms.
CHAPTER FIVE - THE FINDINGS

Thematic analysis of the interview and observation data forms the framework in answering the research questions (RQs) posed in section 4.4. The first RQ concerning reaction to implementation will be investigated using data from the interviews (5.1). Section 5.2 focuses on RQs 1.1 and 1.2 as they pertain to the usage and attitude to EMI. In order to answer this and the following RQs observation and interview data are combined to provide a richer picture. Before answering the main second RQ, I will address RQ 2.1 in section 5.3 as it relates to the teachers’ view on their language competence, which naturally runs on from the previous points and provides useful insight, before dealing with RQ 2 on participants’ preparation and ability to cope with EMI. Section 5.4 examines preparation and includes RQ 2.2 on feelings about the preparation and section 5.5 investigates coping and coping strategies. Finally as issues of power and the individual form the conceptual and theoretical framework, section 5.6 answering RQ 2.3 concerns the participants’ perceptions of EMI experiences and will focus on their responses relating to power, status, identity and domain loss and uses only interview data.

5.1 The lecturers’ reaction to implementation of EMI – “it’s natural”

The reaction of the participants to the policy of implementation of EMI in tertiary education was positive in theory and ambiguous in practice; ranging from welcoming to fearful. In theory the participants recognized the importance of the policy of academic harmonization and mobility expressed in Bologna (1999) and in Norwegian education policies. In practice the degree of reticence or enthusiasm to implementation depended on the discipline, the decision making concerning EMI and personal ideology and fears.

The participants wanted Norway to be engaged in global research and realized that “English as lingua franca is a necessity in research” (Lars) (names given in brackets refer to pseudonyms of participants), and felt that EMI was the price to be paid as reflected in Ljosland’s (2010) research. Many of the engineers and economists were positive about the implementation of EMI as “English is the international language of science, and it is natural to use it on Master courses,” (Eilif), especially as it prepares students for English in the workplace. In contrast, those from professional subjects were more reluctant to embark on EMI.
Although their students will probably have Norwegian as their working language, they appreciated the intercultural benefits of providing “at least one international course in each education programme in English” (Signe).

The hesitancy on EMI implementation by some of the participants concerned the top-down policy decisions resulting in little consideration given to the aims of the learning outcomes (Ljosland, 2011). Freya echoed opinions from others in humanities and teacher education in her following interview excerpt:

“those who decide, the Ministry of Education thinks there is no difference between using English or Norwegian, in teacher education; if there are two (students) from abroad, then they say that the course must be in English, but we say, what about those [our students] who must teach this, they have to learn their language, maybe they think it means nothing.”

Signe saw a dilemma when using EMI for “courses on Norwegian conditions, lifestyle and what it meant to be a teacher in Norway” as she recounted in the following interview extract:

“I think probably you would lose something if you forced teachers to teach in poor English, it would have to be a teacher who Masters English very well if they can bring out the nuances of the subject to be taught.”

The HEIs decision making process on courses and choice of teachers for EMI was vague as Silje expresses in her interview:

“I am not sure at what level in the organization we were reminded, it was pointed out that it would be good if we could offer some courses in English; as part of the internationalisation of our institution and our work.”

When Vegar’s course was designated as EMI, he replied to the following question in this way:

*Interviewer: “Have you had any choice about teaching it in English?”
“No, so when we first have this subject, then it has to be taught in English”*

Some teachers have felt pressurized into teaching EMI and those over 55 years old often try to avoid EMI, but most participants just accept the change to EMI as shown in Jensen & Thøgersen’s (2011) Danish study. The staff often decided between themselves within their departments who would teach the designated EMI courses. Knut felt that most academics self-select as he said
“I’ve never felt the pressure, because I’ve always said yes, I have my education from the US, so it’s never been a problem.” Research endorses my findings that gradual implementation and involving staff in the processes of change results in more positive attitudes compared to when whole programmes are assigned as EMI by the management (Hellekjær, 2005; 2008).

On the practical level the introduction of EMI has meant great changes in participants’ working lives with no extra time nor money to cope with a much increased workload. The lecturers accommodated this change by showing great flexibility and ingenuity to make EMI work by organizing teaching to make best use of resources, e.g. by combining some classes. Some participants were pleased to have EMI programmes to attract international students because of the falling number of Norwegian students, though the present discussion on introducing tuition fees in Norway is making some teachers wary of relying too much on international students. When Sweden introduced fees the consequential falling of international student numbers resulted in rural university colleges closing down.

Several of the participants had ideological reasons for taking a personal initiative to start EMI courses. Emma’s story shows how her initiative has grown from using personal international contacts at her Norwegian institution to build up expertise in EMI to realise her dream of starting a ITC Master course “directed towards the South, … because technology in the South is a big issue.” Sverre is driven by the belief in Norwegian outdoor activities being something special which need promoting internationally through EMI programmes. The administrations have positively followed up these types of initiative and funding has increased with project money. Others have been proud to be part of EMI as illustrated in Nils’s interview excerpt:

“… the thing is we have some unique education here when it comes to x and the xx, and it’s important for Norway also to show the rest of the world that they actually have some teaching in that genre.”

Silje thinks of moral obligations as “if you don’t give any courses in English then you can’t receive exchange students” and “we send students abroad all the time … so if we are going to use this opportunity, it’s only fair that we should give something back.” The strongest advocates for EMI were those who felt they had gained so much from having been exchange students themselves.
5.2 EMI and English in other academic situations - usage and attitude

This section explores firstly the internal usage of English at HEIs (5.2.1) including themes of language (5.2.2), pedagogy (5.2.3), and the learning environment (5.2.4), including information and opinions about the students’ language (5.2.4.1), academic competency (5.2.4.2) and the multicultural classroom (5.2.4.3), before looking at teaching materials (5.2.5). The section ends by examining internal use of English in HEI administration (5.2.6) and external use (5.2.7) at conferences (5.2.7.1) and in publishing (5.2.7.2).

5.2.1 Internally – teaching - “a sense of necessity to be able to teach in English”

The level of programme at which the lecturers are using EMI depends on academic discipline. In vocational university colleges and on humanities and pedagogy programmes, EMI is mainly on individual designated courses on Bachelors programmes which are otherwise taught in Norwegian. These courses are usually part of international exchanges, e.g. Erasmus programmes of 10 to 30 European credits, and are often electives. At the Masters level, particularly in engineering and economics, whole programmes can be in English, as is the case with all PhD programmes. A minority of Master programmes, e.g. in ICT and Sports Science, use EMI for individual Master courses within a mixed language programme. Awareness of the amount of EMI on individual Bachelor programmes was limited with some lecturers expressing surprise that their course had been designated as international. Occasionally, they had been teaching the class in Norwegian, sometimes over many years as no international students had enrolled, and when an international student enrolled on the course the participants have dutifully switched to EMI.

The lecturers’ attitude to EMI and English in general is well summarised in this excerpt from Tina’s interview in the following:

“Well, I see it as a sense of necessity to use English to be able to publish internationally and to be able to cooperate with people internationally, and I also see it as sense of necessity to be able to teach in English to welcome foreign students to Norway; the problem is that we sort of are in danger of losing our own language as an academic language.”

The major tension in the debate is highlighted in Nils’s interview excerpt:
“There isn’t really any mobility between universities in Europe as long as you have Norwegian, Dutch, etc., so if you want mobility, that’s the price, you have to pay. So teach everything in English and that is the official language.”

This section will explore the range of opinions between and around the above quotes. They illustrate that EMI is not in a vacuum, but the context of institutions and CoPs also influences, and is influenced by, EMI.

5.2.2 Language considerations – “In a teaching situation it’s your language”

In Vygotsky’s socio-cultural learning the tool for mediated learning is language, and although the teacher is considered the significant, knowledgeable other, the teachers and students actively co-construct new knowledge (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). Many participants supported Signe’s concerns for L1 in her interview:

“I think generally speaking, unless you develop your mother tongue you cannot be good at other languages, I think purely linguistically and therefore if you are to be good in your discipline too, e.g. in pedagogy, know the terminology both in historical terms, and within your field so that you do not stand there in a staffroom and replace all the terms into English to be understood, it is very important that there is consistency in the academic language in the mother tongue.”

Most of the participants recount feeling more confident and preferring to teach in Norwegian and that most of their students want Norwegian teaching, which is a similar finding, but concerning Swedish, in Bolton & Kuteeva’s empirical work (2012). The participants were worried that their L2 competence would jeopardize student learning. Many participants felt that “[i]t is clear that one is better [at teaching] in Norwegian” (Vegar) as they could “use some humour, use plenty of examples” (Sverre) and they were more relaxed when using their L1 as it “was kind of easier, nicer …” (Nils); elements that the data from the observations seem to support.

Hellekjær (2010b, p. 11) states that it is wrongly assumed that “[Norwegian] lecturers will not have appreciable difficulties teaching in a foreign language”. When lecturing in English the language element with which participants were most concerned was grammar, but the observations show that the participants’ grammar competence did not affect teaching. Their performances revealed relatively few grammar “mistakes”, most of which were influenced by L1 as identified by Jenkins (2007, 2009) and considered acceptable language in the ELF context (3.2.1.2). (Appendix 7 - example of observation feedback sheet).
The observation data show pronunciation variations were also sounds influenced by L1 identified in ELF (Jenkins, 2009), e.g. wide, large vowel sounds and clipped consonant sounds, confusion of ‘w’ and ‘v’ and difficulties with /ð/ and /θ/. In addition, sometimes word stress on important words such as in “analysis/analyse”, and putting stress on the first syllable of words e.g. “content”, and the Norwegian intonation lilt is seen in the data to influenced lecture comprehension. In ELF pronunciation mutual intelligibility between speakers is the criterion for success and in addition, Jenkins’ (2009) research showed the general approval of Scandinavian accents internationally. However, in the interviews the participants expressed concern at not sounding like NSs (Sverre) and felt vulnerable with NS students in the classroom (Bart).

The observations showed contact with the students was influenced by lack of vocabulary, which was supported by comments in the interviews. Searching for the English word, involving many ‘uhms’, and lengthy descriptions of forgotten words interrupted the thought flow and appeared as a lack of confidence. In addition, not varying vocabulary, e.g. using ‘a lot’ (Idun), or ‘made’ (Kristine), poor collocation as in “big changes” instead of ‘major’ (Siv) led to weaker lectures. Leidulf and others also related in their interviews that “the challenge are sometimes that there are words and expressions that you really don’t know how to translate” and Katerine, in common with many others, said “it can be a simpler language than when using Norwegian”.

In keeping with Björkman’s (2010a) study, poor or absent signalling and linking made it difficult for students to follow (Siv’s observation). The lack of non-content words seemed more detrimental than a lack of academic terminology. The features causing the most departure from the EAP norms stated in EAP course books were a lack of rhetorical features and variety of phrasing (Hyland, 2006). The observations showed that recommended linguistic techniques such as employing minimizing/emphasising and summing up along the way led to lecturers not being fully in contact with the students’ comprehension (Björkman, 2008, 2010a, 2010b, 2011).

The observations showed a distance between the students and the lecturers by them using direct language, e.g. “I will tell you …” (Idun) and not employing involving language. Tina felt a distance when teaching as her English “may be more of a written English, than an oral English”. Others found it uncomfortable
to speak in English to Norwegian students as Vegar found that contact was “clearly less with the Norwegian students, perhaps so, when you teach in English.” Silje’s language experience of EMI summed up many participants’ experience when she said:

“I speak slower, have to think more, not so much about the wording maybe, but I have to concentrate on what I actually say… One result is that it is slower, and when I get tired and I do get tired and I speak real slow and of course for those that is not so perfect in English they would like that, because it’s easier to catch, to understand, but for those who are very good English speakers it could be irritating”

and as Audun said in his interview it “take(s) time to get comfortable with it, as you are thinking in Norwegian whilst teaching in English.” Nonetheless, as my comments on Siv’s observation feedback form showed:

“[t]here are some grammar mistakes and slight mispronunciation, but the fluency, meaning, enthusiasm for your subject and presence on the stage override this.”

5.2.3 Pedagogic considerations – “I just throw myself into it”

The practical teaching situation varies considerably for my 20 participants. One course is totally net based with a few students coming into the auditorium; sports science has much practical work; many groups are so small that seminars are usual and there are also the traditional lectures. The practical and pedagogic implications for teaching were downgraded by most of participants; however, Freya thought “[it] would be very difficult for me. I could not be a good pedagogue” and explains in the following interview extract:

“In Norwegian I feel so free I know my subject and I am confident in physics so the challenge would be to teach in a way such that the student can learn from it, then I have to change the approach to them, if they don’t understand me now, then I have to try another way, another example, so if I had been a better English speaker, I could have done the same in English.”

In practice most of the participants have a similar attitude to Sverre’s when he says “I just throw myself into it and see that it goes OK”, but in fact the observations show a more complex picture. This section looks firstly how the participants deliver their lessons, and secondly how they structure their lectures. Presence in the classroom needs to be established for successful teaching. The observations show how the lecturers, who are all experienced in Norwegian, are currently teaching in a timid manner in English, and nervousness and
uncertainty often influence their performances. Nervousness upsets the voice, making it sound breathy and too quiet for good projection (Siv). Freya’s observation feedback (Appendix 7) included a need to “vary your voice more with tempo, pace, volume …” to maintain her students’ attention, whilst Kristine could be seen to use her voice to hold students’ attention, but Idun spoke too fast before settling into the lecture. In participants’ interviews they make no mention of this and emphasise that they cope as best they can in EMI.

The Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (LTHE) course at Exeter University that I took emphasises body language and eye contact for efficient teaching. My observations show insufficient eye contact was made with the students even by experienced lecturers when lecturing; as Tina says “I tend to stick more to the manuscript, so (as) I don’t feel self-confident enough just to speak without sticking to the manuscript”.

Freya started her lecture with very tense body language (tight shoulders, rigid arms by her sides and a straight back), but as she gained confidence she relaxed and became more personable with fluid body language. It was possible to see Idun visibly relax as she moved from the formal lecture into the question section, whereas the opposite happened with Kristine, who started with a confident stance and used her hands in a dynamic manner to communicate to the students, but rambled during the questions as she left the prepared part of teaching.

Analysing the structure of the lecture according to traditional EAP criteria (Benesch, 2001) the observations showed that the introductions were too long (Idun and Signe) and other lectures lacked focus and did not fully explain the lecture’s outline (Kristine). Timing needed more control as some lecturers did not manage to get through all the material they had planned. In contrast Ingvald finds EMI “more efficient, because there aren’t so many interruptions by the students, so you finish what you had planned to do”, and others notice fewer questions in EMI. The lectures contained more description than was necessary and insufficient analysis; consequently the participant’s ‘voice’ did not come through in the lecture. Most participants felt a lack of spontaneity, with an absence of examples and anecdotes; as Vegar says, “[y]ou have to prepare yourself better; it is easier to have spontaneous teaching in Norwegian”, but
once prepared Freya recounts a rigidity in having “to follow the road I had decided on beforehand” for her lectures.

5.2.4 The learning environment – “it’s a positive experience”

In this section and the following three only data from the interviews are used as this research focuses on the teacher’s point of view and situation. Consequently the observations cannot show, for example student competency or textbook usage, but rely on the teachers expressing their views about these topics in the interviews.

The class sizes taught by the lecturers are universally small by international comparisons. The participants’ international Bachelor classes range from six students (with one international student), to 15-20 students (with two-three international students) and only Eilif teaches a Bachelor class in engineering of 100 students. On the Master programmes the diversity increases with a large proportion of international students coming from the Far East, particularly China. Depending on disciplines these cohorts have between 30% and 60% international students, but classes are rarely more than 25 students. Hellekjær & Westergaard’s (2003) questionnaire survey into Scandinavian EMI classes revealed that small-scale programmes were successful, but that language, cultural and methodological problems arose with larger courses.

Many engineering participants expressed concern on the reduced number of Norwegian Master and PhD students. The buoyant Norwegian employment market has meant that Norwegian students are going into the job market after their Bachelor degree. Consequently, the ratio of foreign students is increasing, so at the PhD level almost 100% are international students, mainly coming from the Far East. Traditionally PhD students have been employed as lab and teaching assistants for the Bachelor classes, but as the international PhD students do not speak Norwegian, English is also used in the Bachelor programmes in these situations.

The learning environment depends on the Norwegian and international students’ language and academic competence, along with the cultural implications of the international classroom. Despite challenges, Leidulf’s interview comment reflects many teachers’ opinion in his following interview excerpt:
“it is a positive experience, not necessarily because of the language, but because it is an international setting in the learning environment, that is the interesting part.”

5.2.4.1 The students’ language competency

The participants relate that many “Norwegian students would probably prefer Norwegian instruction” (Nils) as “it’s easier” (Thomas). Freya’s own experience of taking PhD preparatory courses in EMI in Denmark is that “I would have got much more out of it if it had been in Danish” which endorses Troudi’s (2009) research on the extra burden L2 places on learning. Lars maintains that the Norwegian students “tolerate having lectures in English, but feel rather uncomfortable when speaking in groups for debates and discussions”. Many of the participants express “surprise” that although “they generally speak, OK or good English” (Bart), Norwegian students do not have better general and formal English competency. According to Hellekjær’s (2005, p. 11) study Norwegian students seem to have “an unmerited complacency” about their general English proficiency and he maintains that the 5-hour per week course in the first year of upper-secondary school as the university entry requirement is insufficient for the academic rigours of university.

The participants find the students very passive in class, a point endorsed by Airey and Linder (2006) in their study of Swedish physics students. However, although they “are a little bit afraid of going into an English programme” (Thomas) there are a variety of perspectives as shown in Leidulf’s interview excerpt:

“some think it’s totally fine and that is also combined with interest of being together in an international environment, … Some students think it’s a little difficult with listening to the English, some of those will approach me and say that and say can you please say that in Norwegian, some of them stay silent for the whole semester.”

In contrast the international students present other challenges as identified in this excerpt from Bart’s interview:

“The foreign students they talk (right) but also the problem with some of the foreign students is some of them are very bad in English so it is almost impossible to understand what they are saying (Yes) and I also think they have a difficulty in understanding what I’m saying.”

IELTs scores have been raised to 6.0 during the last few years, but still the international students’ language competency varies (Nils).
Most participants were positive that “Norwegian students should also learn to read and write English at this level” (Eilif) and Lars maintained in his interview excerpt:

“… it’s to prepare the students for using English as the working language in different companies, it’s actually a good thing. … They value that when they come through when they are graduated.”

5.2.4.2 The students’ academic competency

The courses build on the Norwegian curriculum from the upper-secondary school, but with global recruitment comes diversity as Thomas points out in an interview excerpt:

“I would say the international students has very wide range of knowledge and skills competence, they are from the very best to quite poor actually (Yes) so it depends very much on which country and also which university they come from in that country, so we have, well, for the Norwegian students it’s about the same, so we have the entire range, but I would say the most clever students are usually, or the ones with the best grades, (Yes) are usually the international students.”

Departments check for the right background, but with relatively few international courses international students are sometimes taking courses for which they do not have the background. In addition, social aspects influence the teaching, as Audun relates in the following interview excerpt:

“The problem is in my course, is that it is a blend of five, six different study programmes, right, (Yes) they don’t know each other before and it’s in fourth year, and also it’s a challenging subject, so then they have some problems of actually interacting, I ask questions all the time to see if they can answer them. I know that some of them know the answer but they don’t want to say,(Yes) because they don’t really know more than one or two in the class, so that’s difficult.”

5.2.4.3 The multi-cultural classroom

The participants are teaching Norwegians (sometimes with Norwegian as their L2), international NNSs and NSs through EMI in a truly global classroom which brings cultural challenges; firstly for the teachers to connect to the students and secondly for the students to form a cohesive group. Knut finds the Far-Eastern students give “the professor an awful lot of authority, which we’re not used to taking” as he explains to his international students in his interview extract:
“we’re not quite equal but we’re almost equal, and you come up here and I can give you advice, but you must take responsibility in your own life.”

Sverre has found EMI “a tremendously positive experience” because of the international students. Other participants find they enhance and enrich the student milieu and “are eager to learn as they are outgoing” (Ingvald). The internationals' diligence and application means that they “show the Norwegian students up with their attitudes to study” (Kristine) and in social settings as illustrated by Sverre’s interview excerpt:

“They say ‘thank you for the interesting lecture and see you tomorrow’, that is something that Norwegians do not say. It is a completely different culture.”

Other students bring with them their cultural academic traditions as related by Knut in his interview:

“In some cultures you are supposed to repeat what the professor is saying (Yeah) that is taken as given knowledge. In other cultures, you are supposed to challenge it, so there are very different values.”

But he finds that having appraised a Chinese student as “just a shy hard working Chinese student who doesn’t quite get it”, she has become a leading business woman in the New York fashion industry and he realises that “how some of these people blossom afterwards is really interesting”. Emma finds that EMI has also brought with it multi-cultural challenges, e.g. with time, structuring and the amount of time spent with students. Emma’s attitude of adopting a pragmatic approach and negotiating openly has ensured cooperation with partnership institutions and individual students.

5.2.5 Teaching materials – “I usually want to have the best textbooks”

The teaching materials also serve as a “tool” in Vygotsky’s socio-cultural learning for co-constructing knowledge (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007). These days market forces dictate the scarcity and expense of Norwegian textbooks: often three times more expensive than Anglo/American textbooks. The participants easily find relevant English textbooks which they consider to be pedagogically outstanding. Bart highlights his usage in the following interview excerpt:

“I usually want to have the best textbooks, but what I see is becoming more and more popular is that the textbooks are having supporting material, that you are having all these pre-made
PowerPoint slides, and pre-made test and everything, because we have a time limit yes ... Most of them do online, the major textbooks have great material (mm). ... I'm quite sure you'll find students that doesn't approve of that, but I think it's OK, (right) but I also think that tends to make my slides, ... well, many textbook come with slides, but I also want to have my slides in English in case there is (mm) a need to switch to English or something.”

The global aspect is important as Eilif points out in the following interview excerpt:

“You can be confident that the book I'm using is a standard, this is an American book, this is used all over the world, we don't get any reduction in tasks, this is what students all over the world at this level are doing, so we are keeping level.”

Bart continues this theme when he says:

“you should use the same textbooks all over the world, if you go and study here or in Cambridge, or Harvard we all use the same main textbook.”

In contrast Knut, also from economics, disagrees as “language represents a culture and especially in all these books" for it is impossible “to divorce language from culture”. Consequently, he believes with the changes in world power the curriculum should move away from the Anglo-American perspective and engage more in Far-Eastern standpoints. Many participants were relieved to use EMI with English language teaching material as they did not have to continually relate to the two languages. However, Katerine maintains that in maths “I don't think that language has so much to say, they must understand it”.

By contrast most humanities' lecturers express dissatisfaction with the increase in English teaching materials on their courses “because of our English speaking colleagues” so “writing in Scandinavian languages have been pushed out. It is a matter of influence, isn't it?” (Kristine) and she continues in the following interview extract:

“I would like to keep up the Norwegian academic language and themes ... I would work for courses in Norwegian using Scandinavian literature.”

Nevertheless, the Norwegian students are finding Swedish and Danish too difficult because English usage has taken over from Scandinavian languages in many spheres, e.g. satellite TV, and the Norwegian upper-secondary school no
longer includes them in the Norwegian syllabus. Participants from teacher education and the humanities find teaching Scandinavian concepts through English a challenge.

In the classroom many teachers from all disciplines found that their students struggle with the English language textbooks. Some students were protesting about English textbooks because the language presented a challenge to engaging with the textbook. Students taking further education and those coming directly from upper secondary school have particularly problems, because of the “special English” (Eilif) which is “more heavy going” than Norwegian (Katerine). Nevertheless, the engineering faculties are a little more positive especially as the engineers have evidence from the assignments that the students are using their book, although Bart adds in his interview comment:

“that [not reading any textbooks] is the general problem, students don’t read, they want to go to the lecture and be fed everything (Yes) they need for their exam.”

Freya adds another dimension in her interview excerpt:

“It [an English textbook] was too hard, and it took too much time, time consuming. So I think if they had textbooks in Norwegian, it would be much easier for them, and I think also that they would have a deeper, a better understanding … we don’t have any [textbooks] in Norwegian in physics then, they say that it is a very great disadvantage, that we teach physics in Norwegian and that we read English textbooks.”

According to Pecorari, et al.’s (2011) empirical Swedish study, English textbooks are presenting problems for learning in EMI environments, and perceptions that they enable students to read and write English at a university level are questionable. Poor reading, exacerbated by poor reading strategies, can be helped in EMI by Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classes (explained in 6.3.2) so that a language dimension can be added to discipline courses (Hellekjær, 2010b).

### 5.2.5 Internally – administration – “they are expected to learn Norwegian”

Academic mobility means increasing recruitment of international staff which is leading to participants using English informally and formally in their HEIs, because as Lars says in his interview:
“We have teachers from abroad speaking English mainly, they are expected to speak Norwegian within an acceptable period, within two or three years or so, but they hardly relate to that, they sort of ignore it and they are not sacked yet, there are no consequences of not learning, formally there should be consequences, but it’s not practiced.”

Therefore, English is becoming the working language for some of my participants, as Emma’s remark in her interview shows:

“They start speaking English and I answer in English, only out of politeness … so when I meet with them, of course, I speak English”

Kristine says on meeting international staff that “I must confess that I switch to English rather quickly”.

The HEIs’ policies of parallel language usage are flexible in practice as Thomas’s interview excerpt shows:

“Typically it would be in Norwegian for meetings, yes, of course. I have colleagues who don’t speak Norwegian and when they are present we probably switch to English”

In Kristine’s situation the meetings are in Norwegian and colleagues translate when relevant and “occasionally we speak in English when we think our themes and matters are literally interesting to them.” Freya has a different experience as she reports in her interview:

“We had a big meeting at X, in the Department of X, and I think maybe there were two or three persons who didn’t speak Norwegian very well, but they had been in Norway for two or three years, but because of them, and maybe there were 150 others, so everything changed to English.”

In addition, in engineering English is used all the time as Eilif says:

“There are many of the staff here that uses English very well of course, so and since the staff is international it is natural to use English, of course.”

However, in the Sports Science and at some vocational university colleges, all their English speakers have learnt Norwegian and the formal and informal language of the departments is Norwegian. However this is rare and even informal language is often in English as Lars says:

“… it happens that colleagues that come from abroad join the others at the table for lunch and everybody else starts speaking English
instead of Norwegian because of this one person, which is quite normal.”

The attitude to the amount of English usage internally varies. Some participants, for example Nils from engineering says “he would be pleased to have English as the official administrative and teaching language at his university”. However, he is in the minority as other participants have a hardening attitude to the increasing amount of administration, particularly meetings, in English. Ingvald, also from engineering reveals his concern in his interview excerpt:

“Yeah, sometimes I think maybe it [English in the workplace] is too much, I think we must preserve our own language and if we can, we should use Norwegian for meetings, when there are only Norwegian people. …”

Katherine, also has a nuanced attitude in the following comment:

“I’m a little ambivalent, in taking account of those who come from outside, we should be international, but we have our own language that we should take care of, (mm) and for some it can be a handicap, those who do not manage English, it depends on the situation, if it is something that you want to express that is of great importance to you, it can be very tortuous to get it into English.”

Some are beginning to fight back and Kristine’s following interview excerpt is typical:

“I think both myself and the majority of my Norwegian native colleagues; we are a bit fed up with people who do not make an effort to learn Norwegian.”

And Ingvald follows this up in his interview stating that:

“international staff could learn Norwegian … I think many people, especially visiting from Europe who are starting to work here, it’s not very hard for them to learn Norwegian actually, … it’s better to have meetings in Norwegian”

However, Eilif says that “the German employees seem to be quicker at learning Norwegian, whereas the English speaking colleagues are more reticent.” He adds that in his department they tease a UK colleague who has worked in Norway for 20 years and does not speak Norwegian, but others are more sympathetic to the English NSs as Sverre states that:

“it can be difficult for native [English] speakers who live in Norway … they think that it is difficult to learn Norwegian as so many people think it is fun to learn English, and practice with them,”
Written English for internal e-mails is common and as Ingvald relates “sometimes people write reports in English, and the reports could have been written in Norwegian”, such that English usage is growing in depth and breadth to threaten the local language as illustrated in Abdel-Jawad & Abu Radwan’s (2012) investigation into their situation in Oman.

5.2.6 Externally - “It’s a must”

The teachers published in English before the implementation of EMI, but with research based teaching these lecturers are being influenced by their own and others research presentations and papers produced in English. Through English usage at conferences and through publishing they enjoy the benefits of international contacts and the inclusion in their discipline’s CoP. All the participants report increased networking, some with international projects with local industry (Thomas, Nils and Ingvald), others on international teaching exchanges (Emma), and another using an international contact as a PhD external examiner (Nils), whilst Lars has been on the board of an international literary organization. International sabbaticals, for example in China and Japan (Ingvald) and the USA (Sverre) gave valuable insight into their discipline. Sverre enthuses about his next project in the following interview excerpt:

“Now we’re going to an international meeting in Romania, and that is a country I have never visited, and I don’t know anything about their sports education, I don’t know how they get a feeling and adapt to their nature. So I will apply for funds and travel, there is a college there with which we will have a network agreement or cooperation agreements with, so I think that there is only positive, very, very”.

5.2.6.1 Conferences

Everyone agrees to a varying extent with Bart’s interview excerpt on conference attendance and networking:

“Well, we have to go to conferences to be on the research front here (yes) so it’s a must. …, I know that from my career I have to go… a conference is a real energy booster (yes) I need it, and usually it’s quite easy to get to know people, … I enjoy it very much.”

Increasingly even Nordic conferences are in English due to pressures from Finland and the Baltic States for a common language and Lars’s German and Scandinavian conference changed language to English to go global. In the former Kristine appreciated the increased diverse input, but in the latter Lars found “the Anglo-American dominance by NSs could be a bit troublesome at
times” and he regretted “a cultural arrogance” with the one way direction of culture, as others translate into English, but not vice versa.

The Norwegian academics feel well received in conferences because of their perceived high level of English as Idun says in her interview:

“… everyone that I have met has been very polite and they kind of oh I’m impressed that you speak so good English, I don't speak Norwegian, I’m so glad you speak English, … people are happy that we are able to communicate as we speak English.”

There was a strong male/female, engineering and economics/humanities and teacher training divide on the amount of confidence in presenting the paper. The male engineers and economists generally had “no problems” (Ingvald), whilst the female participants echoed Tina’s comments in the following interview excerpt:

“Nervous, with the language again it is the same thing, you feel that you have to stick to your manuscript but of course, I’m sort of used to using English as most of the things I’m reading and writing is in English, but I don’t feel, I'm fairly fluent in English, but I feel I’m not speaking perfect English when I’m discussing something in English.”

They generally manage as illustrated by Freya’s comment in the following interview excerpt:

“… it was very difficult for me. I had to learn what I had written, and I learnt the text I wrote and I think the text was, after many weeks of work, a good text, so the text I presented to the audience, I think that was interesting and the response they gave me indicated that.”

But she admits that away from the prepared formal presentation:

“I felt that I was simply too bad at English for questions and conversations, so if I’m a little nervous then the words just disappear, and it is not a situation that I can take things off the cuff.”

5.2.6.2 Publishing

The Tellekant system for publication at Norwegian HEIs favours high ranking English language journals for professional advancement as Bart’s comments in the following interview excerpt:

“All my academic work is in English more or less (Mm) if we write articles in Norwegian (Yeah) they don't count. … Well, if you are going to get promoted to a full professor … you have to publish internationally (Yes) all that matters is published international.”
The participants from engineering and economics, and the younger participants from all disciplines, have written their PhDs in English, so find it easier to write in English in their discipline than in Norwegian. Signe enjoys writing in English as she finds it more straightforward than in Norwegian, and it makes her concentrate and focus more on her work. The participants publish in English from a couple of articles to over 20 per annum when articles are co-written.

There is a feeling that all publishing must be in English as “it is language of the scientist” (Eilif) and the participants feel they “need the international community” (Ingvald) and to belong to a CoP in their discipline (Silje). However, Audun is concerned about the lack of publishing in Norwegian as “one of the drawbacks in doing everything in English, you are distancing yourself from the local community”

Studies by Flowerdew (2001), Belcher (2007) and Curry and Lillis (2004) confirm the participants experience in academic publishing that it is challenging for NNSs. The participants find the review process very rigorous in the Anglo/American journals as Nils’s interview excerpt shows:

> “the last paper I published, … then I got it back from them, it must have been an Oxford English guy, really strict, so then I realised that maybe my English is not that good.”

> Interviewer: How do you feel about him, with his Anglo English, correcting you?

> “It’s fine, it makes the paper better, and improves the reading so it’s good if somebody does that, and I maybe learnt a little bit from it.”

In my study the Anglo/American bias is perceived as being stronger than at conferences; some appreciate it (Eilif) and others do not (Silje). Knut certainly thinks that the Anglo/American cultural bias is acting as a gatekeeper and continues by saying:

> “Arguments and so cultures have values and languages often represent those values, so I think from an ethical viewpoint our texts are said to have a particular bias.”

Silje recounts difficulties in publishing articles from her thesis on X, and she thinks that it is for political reasons as the USA had “a bad conscience” about the country. However when she sent similar articles on the subject to a European English language journal she recounts:
“... then I had a very critical review, but very useful as they pointed out certain things that then I used those things and really seriously went into debate about what was going on here then, finally that was the end of it, and the article became much better, whereas from these men from America it was neither here nor there,”

Lars is more cynical in his interview comments in this excerpt:

“I think it is a corrupt system anyway; you have to have good colleagues, who both give you advice and build up your reputation; small circles and big fights.”

However, the main concern with the Tellekant system is stated by Freya in her following interview excerpt:

“we get no points at all to write textbooks. They don't count at all. My question is who should we get to write textbook for schools and they must have them in Norwegian. It is also important in the first year at university, but we do not get any points for that. It is the Department of Education who has decided that. ... But if I wanted to be professor, I mustn’t bother with that, for it gives me no points to be a professor, then I must just publish in English.”

5.3 Teachers’ views on their EAP language competence “you always like to be better”

The teachers’ view of their competence depends not just on linguistic competency, but on social and psychological factors. Sverre thought that “perhaps many Norwegians have poor self-confidence and that is not well founded, and that it [their English] is good enough” which supports Lehtonen, Lönnfors & Virkkunen-Fullenwider’s (2003) participants’ view in their Finnish case study. My data from the interviews held in English and the observations suggest that confident men have a tendency to rank their English highly, whilst most of the women are more modest about their language skills. However, taking into account their perceived competency, three participants thought their English very good, six good, six OK and five poor.

In addition to the upper-secondary school English exam, some participants had their education, or part of it from an English speaking country, others had had sabbaticals abroad and one had a university English qualification, as well as everyone having increased their language skills through extensive reading. However, the main judgement of the participants’ competence was echoed by Bart as a relative term in “you always like to be better”. Most felt more
comfortable teaching in their L1, but a couple of the male participants said that they were equally good teaching in English or Norwegian.

Many felt that they are competent in general English, but it is a big step up to be competent in EAP. They feel the passive skills of reading and listening are well under control, but as Idun relates in her interview:

“in an informal setting I can speak very good, my problem was and is still speaking in a formal setting, in an academic setting.”

She continues with a general worry about English competence in her interview comment:

“I feel a little bit uncomfortable as I don’t feel as I manage, or can cope with it as good as I want to. I would love to be fluent in English academic language, but I know I ain’t.”

Others were more relaxed as Emma relates:

“I can understand and I can make myself understood, and that’s the most important thing I think and I don’t struggle too much, I think.”

Many teachers from humanities felt challenged by the narratives required. Limited vocabulary causes challenges for all disciplines, as Tina felt her lecturing was marred as she “sometimes stop(s) in the middle of a sentence because I can’t remember the right word” and Sverre found he used “more time to say simple things in English.” Nils feels a lack of freedom in his interview comment:

“Well it’s the quality of the English, of course, I guess, it’s the number of words, so if we want to say something that is not prepared, I’m sometimes looking for words as I am not that good”

However, Bart’s confidence compensates when he says in his interview:

“I am not afraid of speaking English and I don’t care if I say something wrong, or I have to take a break to search for the right words or whatever, umm so I don’t think it’s a problem.”

Signe’s diligence pays off as she explains in her interview:

“I read a great deal of literature in my subject areas, so I think that I have mastered the terminology that I need, I do not say “things like that” as I can replace my Norwegian terms with English terms”

In oral work pronunciation preoccupies many as Nils recounts in his interview extract:
“I’m from a generation that had Norwegian English teachers, and their pronunciation was terrible and we learnt it (Yes) and it’s hard to get rid of that.”

Idun is more pragmatic as she mentions that most of the people using EAP are NNSs and often “the older professors” speak good English, “but the[ir] pronunciation is often very bad” and they manage to be respected. However, Sverre’s pronunciation causes a lack of confidence which he tries to solve as he says in his interview:

“I try all the time, I work to improve both my pronunciation and vocabulary, I really try. I am very conscious of my level of English.”

The stress of performing well in the powerful, yet vulnerable, position of lecturing meant that Kristine feels “I’m confident about the language, but what I’m not so confident about is the personal performance”. Signe does not feel as in control and “there is a sort of barrier” in the lecture situation and she wants to be “freer to create nuances and perhaps synonyms, and vary the rhetoric more”.

The lecturers are generally more satisfied with their English competence at conferences than in the classroom. They are presenting their area of special interest, have more time to prepare and feel they get their points across more easily as they do not have to engage with the audience as they do with the students (Vegar).

Some participants felt the cultural aspects of the Anglo/American environment challenging. Siv was concerned about the acculturation into the EAP world, as she says in her interview excerpt:

“a Norwegian person is very informal and there is a lot more polite things that you have to do in an English setting and … you need to be polite.”

Katherine, despite judging herself competent to teach maths in English, finds the cultural aspects of informal English “can be a bit difficult; it is not the same in Norwegian as in English.” The small talk expected in Anglo/American culture is problematic for Bart, and Sverre finds he envies other NNSs as he relates in his interview:

“they speak fluent English, they understand the jokes, and such like, and so they know how to make small talk, and the English sense of humour is a bit quirky, and you have to understand that, slightly anyway.”
Some participants found it difficult to change from one language to the other as “then it doesn’t come so easy and you feel you have to practice the language to keep it running” (Lars) and Sverre would prefer to teach in English throughout the year to avoid the problem of having to “get back into English” each autumn when he teaches EMI.

The participants found that having read their academic literature in English they understood the Anglo/American academic writing format, so writing “comes quite easy and you feel quite competent” (Lars). Writing was considered a less stressful part of EAP as they could spend time working on texts and ask for language help in comparison to the immediacy of lecturing.

### 5.4 Preparation for EMI and feelings about the preparation

#### 5.4.1 Professional development – “it’s all based on myself”

Implementation of EMI has been top-down, and little or no professional development (PD) training has been given for this change. There is no compulsory accreditation system for EMI so any preparation has been voluntary; no-one had been assessed by the management or involved in peer observation/evaluation for EMI. In Norway lecturing is still considered a private affair and although there is student feedback, personally I have never been evaluated whilst lecturing during 25 years practice in Norway. However, PD is considered to be essential for job satisfaction and success, and institutions must take responsibility to provide “planned, supported and rewarded” PD for teachers (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 11). The teachers are relied upon to perform a good job, but without their HEIs’ backup. Research studies support the importance of additional training to cope with EMI (Klaassen, 2004; Lehtonen et al., 2003).

International offices have been established at HEIs, which are mainly responsible for student recruitment and international agreements, and sometimes for EAP courses for staff. English departments are reluctant to be involved in teaching EAP as it is considered to be of low status, e.g. compared to teaching literature. EAP courses are not given priority (Audun) and on the PhD programmes participants relate that there is no EAP component (Siv). Kumaravadivelu (2003 p. 17) maintains that teachers need and want “a continual process of self-reflection and self-renewal” and Richards and Farrell
(2005) claim that when the individual teacher is enhanced, the whole institution is enriched.

Teaching in EMI has involved additional work without extra resources being given to lecturers. Freya felt that her HEI had let her down with a lack of PD for EMI as her background is in sciences, and her school education did not prepare her for the amount of EAP she is now meeting in working life. Emma did not take an EAP course beforehand, but is taking a useful course afterwards as she says in her interview:

“you have to be very interested and feel that it’s very needed when you go to a course as you don’t have extra time for these courses so it is part of your spare time.”

Signe also took a course after starting EMI as related in her interview excerpt:

“If I think of my first lecture I gave in English many years ago, I would have preferred that no one had heard it, but it went with a little laughter, but I felt what I came out with was not my best, but one has to start somewhere, but I thought it would’ve been good if it was not at such a high threshold just as it was with you on our course”

Participants who perceive themselves competent in English often received no PD training for the switch to EMI, did not want any and felt content with the situation. Most participants feel that it is up to individuals to make their own decisions on their needs and satisfy them as best they can in a pragmatic manner. Freya took a short EAP course at her institution, but found it insufficient for her needs and her solution was a private English teacher with whom she was very pleased. She reflects Kumaravadivelu’s (2003) ideas in realising that she has to take responsibility for her own PD, but it is hard not to have the support of socio-cultural learning from her HEI (Richards and Farrell, 2005).

All but one of the men who considered their English ‘poor’ or ‘OK’ did not take any of the voluntary courses offered (apart from Leidulf who did want a course), whereas the majority women with all levels of English took courses, even Kristine, with an English university qualification took two courses; “the second course I took for personal reasons for performing better.” I think this is due to their confidence in the EMI environment, rather than resistance as these were the participants who were keen, and felt it natural to use English.
5.4.2 EAP courses – “it made you more confident”

Teachers should be given the time and encouragement to be empowered through reflective practice and work on understanding the idea of “teachers as transformative intellectuals” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003 p.13). The EAP preparation courses offered are top-down with no action research component, and being only 15 hours are too short to challenge beliefs, raise awareness of inconsistencies in beliefs and develop reflective practice based on experience (Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

One participant at a technical university, two at a vocational and the five “students” from my university (who provide the data for the observations) attended EAP courses, thus the majority of the participants are teaching without PD preparation. An outline of my course given to my participants is typical of those offered in other institutions. It is perhaps shorter and more practical than some and with only eight participants has fewer participants (Appendix 1).

The eight participants who took courses were unanimously pleased and found them very relevant and useful. The preparation was deemed successful due to small groups so that “it wasn’t that scary to talk and you could just feel free to talk even if your English wasn’t that good” (Siv) and as Idun says in her interview:

“it was easy to get feedback and you got relaxed, and you saw that you have progress and it made you more confident and then even more progress”.

They mentioned a good combination of lecturing, group and individual work with a variety of pedagogy creating a congenial atmosphere for learning. Nevertheless, some participants mentioned wanting more focus on grammar ‘mistakes’, vocabulary and pronunciation, whereas others appreciated the emphasis on communication. Many wanted more help with small talk and practice in informal EAP situations. All the participants wanted longer and more courses, and many wanted the opportunity to take a course in England or have an exchange in an English speaking country as preparation in EMI.

5.4.2.1 Learning outcomes

All the courses the participants attended were traditional EAP language courses and the participants state that they gained confidence in their language fluency
in formal and informal academic situations. Many found help with terminology beneficial and Signe says in her interview:

“I had read many English books, but had not activated my English language, I felt that when I was on your course, but it is not done overnight to get to the standard of lecturing.”

The majority were pleased with help on pronunciation and grammar. Tina wanted more critical feedback, although she was pleased with the help she received on making her oral English less like written English.

Idun, in particular, found acculturation into the social norms of her CoP valuable as she relates in her interview:

“[h]ow to present yourself, I really learnt a lot that I didn’t know prior to this course and the self-awareness and how to approach people, because this was much more than just a course, it was also social and culture, what you do say and what you don’t say as a Norwegian, also in regard to Norwegian that you don’t know … this “høflighet” (politeness), … and it’s so much more to have this knowledge”.

My “students” felt the most valuable part of their course was the filming and individual feedback from a lesson (Appendix 1 and 7).

5.4.2.2 Lack of pedagogy for EMI

None of the participants were interested in the pedagogic implications of EMI and questioned the need for courses as expressed in Audun’s interview extract:

“I don’t know what kind of teaching that would be, like, what would you learn for in such a course. Is teaching different in Norwegian and English? It’s just that you lack some words, that are obvious, so you probably have to work on your English rather than working on your teaching I guess.”

However, when pressed Katerine’s interview excerpt shows her growing awareness:

“Two or three years ago I was at a seminar to teach in English, and then it dawned on me that there was perhaps some issues with it and on the students part as well.”

The LTHE I took at Exeter University clearly shows that successful lecturing is more than language and the observations reveal that delivery plays a vital role in engaging with the students. The participants focused on terminology, rather than the communicative aspects of the language and showed little awareness of techniques to allow the students “note-making rather than note-taking” and
interspersing lectures with open discussion, demonstrations, visual concept-mapping and exercises.

5.4.3 EMI without preparatory courses – “There is no back up from the university”

Twelve participants received no professional development (PD) training for the switch to EMI and most of them felt content with the situation. On the one hand, those educated in the USA such as Katerine felt “with the background I have it is not necessary, especially in maths it is rather specialized” and Knut thought a course “was never relevant “ as he maintains that he can teach equally well in Norwegian or English. Thomas and Ingvald’s wide experience of using English at work meant that both men did not feel the need for any courses. Participants in engineering and economics educated in Norway felt sufficiently confident in English not to consider a course necessary.

On the other hand, Vegar and Silje would have liked a course, but did not have the time, and Bart was resigned about the lack of help illustrated in the following interview excerpt:

“That’s usually the case isn’t it, you get your PhD and you start to teach. (Right) There is no back up from the university whether you teach in Norwegian or English. They offer some classes in how to teach and all that stuff, but when you have been studying as many years as we (yes) you have a quite good feeling (yes) so there is no backup.”

Leidulf felt disappointment that having initiated his EMI course to increase student numbers and finances (and succeeding) he experienced the following:

“We also said to our leaders here, ok, if we are to teach in English, it’s not only English, but it’s academical English (Yeah), we need courses, we need to be trained, and they said ‘yes, yes’, but it actually never happened (Mmm). ... So I have never been taught anything here in X, about teaching in English (right), so it’s all based on myself … but academical English, is something I felt I needed help for.”

5.5 Coping strategies

5.5.1 Language – “we get a little … multi-language”

The teachers cope with their lack of terminology in various ways. Emma, whose class are all Norwegians, admits that if she cannot remember an English word then she “take(s) it in Norwegian” and Bart says he checks his English whilst
teaching. Sverre’s strategy enhances the learning environment as he asks students for help “so they are on my side in the team” and he makes a conscious effort to learn English from them. He also enrolls NS staff to help him prepare lectures, check students’ written exams and help him with oral examinations.

The strategy for oral work is to “just speak” (Siv) and Ingvald uses the Internet for help with pronunciation. The attitude of coping in various EMI situations is typified by Eilif when he says that as “Norwegians are used to swapping languages”, and he goes on to relate the following in his interview:

“Well I have even had classes in the Bachelor level where you have to talk in Norwegian, but where there have been foreigners and I have tried to teach in halfway Norwegian and English”

In the classroom Leidulf shows language flexibility as he says in his interview:

“we get a little, you know, (yes) multi-language here, but it’s basically taught in English because of the international students, then I switch to Norwegian if I need to more on an individual basis.”

5.5.2 Pedagogy – “you have to kind of force them to mingle”

The main challenges with EMI in pedagogy are using the language to deal with the students’ English competence, engaging with the students and creating an inclusive learning environment in which all the students can feel comfortable. To cope with a wide range of language ability with his students, Nils and many others adjust their lectures and exercises according to their perception of the students’ needs. The participants relate that they spend time on ensuring the Norwegian students know the English/Norwegian terms by writing them on the blackboard and on PowerPoint slides. When the Norwegians do not understand the English terms or explanations, Ingvald is not alone in allowing questions in Norwegian, answering in Norwegian and translating into English for the international students and Vegar finds the breaks an ideal time to speak to the Norwegians to clear up points. The teachers take time to give extra explanations to the international students and Bart relates in his interview:

“I had one student from Nepal, and he had a recorder and in the beginning of every hour he came up and turned on that….he was very difficult to understand, but somehow we understand”

The participants used coping strategies to engage with the learners. The teachers have made various efforts to reach out to the students and to create a
learning environment. Sverre handles the situation as he explains in his interview:

“I dare to free myself from the manuscript, so I don’t read and there are many who think it is ok that I can stand and speak.”

Knut was concerned with strategies of inclusion so he says “I try to do what is needed for communication”. Signe consciously engages with her students with dialogue-lecturing, but with the unpredictable nature of teaching she finds that she cannot prepare for all eventualities. Knut is also conscious of meeting the students where they are linguistically as he says in the following interview excerpt:

“one adapts words and the choice of words to the people who speak on the other side, and so when we have students from Pakistan and India, Shri Lanka and South America, it’s important to listen to the words that they use (Yeah) so that I can talk back with their words, rather than choose my own, ... I may lose them, so I must choose words that I hope they’ll understand.”

In order to cope with the student diversity, Leidulf in a rural HEI is more proactive than most in the following interview excerpt:

“Our goal is to have an international atmosphere at the faculty (Yes) and we think the way we organize the classes is one way of doing that, and hopefully they will bring that mix and the mingling out into the social life. And also when we host them, you know, we spread them around in the houses (halls of residence) together with Norwegians, so they have to get up in the morning with a Norwegian, they have to make dinner together with a Norwegian for example.”

Silje works hard to get the students to help each other and in so doing the students “were having a lot of fun in class” and Ingvald provides “reading places” in the department to aid integration. The international students often want more contact with the Norwegians (staff and students) than occurs naturally, so often teachers have spent time on extra curriculum activities to help group formation. Sverre is surprised that he has to “steer things” so much and encourages his students to form their own Facebook groups, etc.

With regard to English texts Signe illustrates her pedagogic strategy in her interview excerpt:

“We have a lot of protests against it [English texts] at first, but what I’ve done in pedagogics is to find articles with good entertaining
approaches, so that they gradually get into it. They think that it is fun to read, for it also depends on how well what is given out is written.”

5.6 General perceptions on the teachers’ experience of using EMI

5.6.1 The power of global English – “the only language where the term ‘I’ is capitalised”

The use of English is not neutral, nor culturally free, but strongly influenced by powerful Anglo/American forces around the world that support the expansion of English in all areas of society (Benesch, 2001; Pennycook, 2001; Phillipson, 1992). At the same time, many countries enthusiastically embrace English at all levels and in many spheres almost to a degree of self-imposed linguistic imperialism (Troudi, 2009a). English is firmly established as the working language in industry and finance in Norway, and it looks as if academia is following suit.

One of the factors used for ranking HEIs is the amount of EMI courses offered and participants have felt a top-down “pressure for more English … because it’s written down in the plan for the whole university” (Leidulf). Signe questions this in her interview excerpt:

“X has a strategic plan that says we must have very many courses in English, but we must be critical to see the balance between that and making students well-educated professionals with their mother tongue, we must not wipe that out just so that we will have lectures in English.”

However, if international students are to study in Norway EMI is essential (Vegar). Nevertheless, in engineering it is considered “completely natural” (Audun) to use EMI as preparation for the international workplace. They do not consider the importance of maintaining Norwegian and a pluralism of information, e.g. in textbooks.

Cultural values linked to language are under threat with the power of English; a point taken up in Knut’s interview excerpt:

“English is the only language where the term ‘I’ is capitalized, (Mmm) and the most individualistic cultures in the world all speak English and so I think there is an emphasis on individualism in perhaps in a language, most notable in the scientific theories we have (Mm) in business economics, sociology, in psychology where I think the group behaviour, and the priority of group may be downgraded.”
The participants are increasingly feeling a bottom-up pressure for English as “Norwegian students want to write their Masters in English” (Bart) and all PhD work is in English.

5.6.2 Status of English – “one is so very cool and international if one uses English”

In the humanities and teacher education Signe’s opinion reflects many others in her interview excerpt:

“It’s a bit of a cross to bear, if I may say so, that one is so very cool and international if one uses English and at the same time one knows that much of the quality of the English does not meet the standard required.”

However, Knut from economics thought that the status of courses in EMI could be counteracted as he says in his interview excerpt:

“I think it is important to do this [Master courses] in Norwegian as well, so that we don’t create an inferior and superior language for expressing ourselves,”

Status is very different in academia in Norway compared to international academia as Knut reports in the following excerpt:

“I think you also show signs of Norwegianism when you say ‘teaching’ (undervisning) [as opposed to ‘lecturing’] and ‘elev’ [‘pupil’ instead of ‘student’]. We would like to call ourselves ‘professors’ and ‘students’, and we seem to be eliminating that language in Norwegian right now (Yes) so we are more like an extended high school than a proper university, that may be a problem.”

Eilif takes this further in his interview comment:

“normally you get a job with a PhD but you don’t get a higher salary necessarily, you don’t get a better career, on the contrary, I think, It has no status in Norway, nobody calls me doctor anywhere, they would think I was a medical doctor, they don’t know the concept in Norway”

In direct contrast, Ingvald is impressed by his reception on international sabbaticals and Idun by the positive manner she is received at conferences. Also in international situations Norwegian speakers’ level of English, compared to other NNSs, makes Signe “feel very superior … I feel that I’m almost a genius at English”, but she admits compared to NSs “I remember the way that the Norwegian R94 [National Curriculum] has been translated into English, for it
was written in an old fashioned English, and English students have asked if the translation was really English”.

The status of using English in Norway is also revealed in Knut’s following excerpt:

“All some people may choose to use English words when they don’t really have to (Mmm) … Some social groups seem to feel that if they use a lot of English words as they seek to express things, they imply that we don’t have those words in Norwegian, which I don’t think is true and it is chic to do these things; so in an egalitarian society we need a few things to differentiate us.”

The level of the lecturers’ course, and thus status, also depends on HEIs’ international ambitions, as illustrated by Freya in the following interview excerpt:

“At university, we must use the same people on research, those that are most talented like at the University of X, the price you must pay is that they are coming from India, and they speak English, and it is extremely good for a good research environment, so you can say that maybe you have to have a scheme which says that they must only teach the highest level courses, and so we must have others who can teach in Norwegian”.

In practice this is already occurring as international staff are not learning Norwegian and refusing to teach courses in Norwegian, so they teach EMI courses to “fill up their timetables” (Kristine). Brock-Utna’s (2001) research confirms my findings of more courses being redefined as EMI to accommodate them, which has also resulted in Norwegian teachers taking the Norwegian Bachelor programmes and the English speaking international staff are taking the more prestigious EMI Master courses.

5.6.3 Identity and EAP – “a person can be two different persons speaking two different languages”

The findings endorse Hall’s (1996) notion of identities constantly changing depending on the interaction between the individual and the external environment. The NS ideal is the type of English against which the participants measure their success in English. Concerning accents Lars observes that in international situations Norwegians have divested themselves of their foreign accents. However, Sverre endorses Jenkins’s (2009) study on the pronunciation when he says in his interview:
“I think maybe Europeans think it is very easy to understand Norwegians talking English ... so I think sometimes it is easier for Europeans to understand a Norwegian speaking English, than it is with dialects from Scotland, or Newcastle, or India.”

Within academia Lars echoes Bourdieu’s (2009) ideas on habitus when speaking English fluently “it gives you a certain prestige”, but academia makes the situation more complicated as he relates in his interview:

“sometimes you feel rather inferior, ... people like to practise an advanced form of language communication, they put a lot of challenges into their language, and you’re not understood and the others may feel humiliated by your language, the impression could be that you are arrogant.”

In e-mails he finds NSs “love to make puns and put a lot of humour into their messages and you have to relate to that, and be creative and that’s quite challenging I feel.” Thus NSs are capitalising on the power of global English, but they are forgetting that as Idun says at her next conference “there will be people from different countries, and probably more people from not native speakers’ countries, so we [NNSs]’re all the same probably”.

It is not only language that influences the participants’ perception of how they manage in an EAP environment. Idun’s changes her personality to acculturize to the EAP environment as she recounts in her interview excerpt:

“Because I think language has a lot to do with personality and I think a person can be two different persons speaking two different languages ... I consider myself being a laidback informal person, I think I would have to kind of change myself, but not in an uncomfortable way, I like the English way of doing, I like the yeah ... I love English, I don’t mind to try to catch some of the culture that surrounds a language.”

She is prepared to incorporate Anglo/American politeness principles into her language.

Limited language competence causes loss of status and can lead to disempowerment, causing Freya to change from her normal professional self as she recalls when an institutional meeting was suddenly changed to English as illustrated in her following interview extract:

“I feel suddenly that I’m stuck, really in that situation I had many ideas about how we could solve some of the problems that we have in the institution, but I was absolutely silent. I felt myself a bit stupid, and that others were so good at English, and I hoped that no one
would ask me anything. … I was silent of course and so were many who did not participate in the discussion because it changed to English, and I think that is a foolish thing, and then it was a competition in a way for the best one speaking English in a way. People had their own power in the situation.”

Individual self-image is also affected by how one is treated in an environment. Signe reports struggling to understand students with a Liverpool accent during teaching as she relates in her interview:

“I thought they could not have been from England, but they were, and, in the end, I usually ask “Any questions?” But then I didn't feel like asking, as I could not understand what they said. But they probably were not specifically informed about it, as they made no attempt to normalize their speech, but it was very funny really. I think that was somewhat inward looking.”

The opposite also occurs as Sverre notices in his interview:

“the English, the British, they’re talking to me in a simpler manner than they usually speak ... and then, [they think] I'm now speaking to a Norwegian, and so they moderate their accents so that I can understand them.”

This attitude can be taken further as Knut finds in the following extract:

“I don’t know if you know Garrison Keillor? (Yes) When he went to Denmark he said when you try to get by in a foreign language, you loss 20 IQ points (Yes) and I think that is true ... So initially I think one losses a few points.”

5.6.4 Domain loss – “for we have pretty good words”

The findings indicate that EMI usage is pragmatic for engineers and economists, but in the humanities and teacher education English is used as an additional language to Norwegian at Bachelor level, but increasingly Masters are in English (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012). In addition the internal and external use of English (5.2) means the risk of domain loss is real (Ljosland, 2011).

The dilemma between internationalization and protecting Norwegian preoccupies many of the participants as illustrated by Emma’s comment from her interview:

“Well I have a bit mixed feelings, I’ve thought about it the other day, because when we do the teaching in English we are participating in this, but I think it’s important both for us and our students to learn Norwegian, have to practice it or else we just forget it.”

Kristine’s position is stronger in the following interview excerpt:
“I would like to teach in Norwegian, you could probably say for nationalistic reasons. I don’t want to contribute to the English language taking over at Norwegian academic institutions, on the other hand I enjoy speaking English and I read a lot of English, so I would say it’s a mixed attitude.”

However, in engineering Audun “has no particular feeling about it, because everything we do is in English” and as Nils reflects in his interview excerpt:

“it doesn’t really matter [about Norwegian domain loss]” … it would be nice if it was official English, I think it would be nice if we just converted it to English. ”

He feels that internationalization outweighs any advantages of academic Norwegian and as specialist terminology in his discipline is not used in Norwegian, “it’s better just to have one word, so why should we have an extra word just to translate it into Norwegian”

The New Norwegian (Nynorsk) speakers were generally more positive to only using English as Nils says when having to set his exams in three languages:

“It’s impossible to translate really, Nynorsk is terrible, it’s really not possible because it’s a very concrete language, so there really are a number of words that really does not exist.”

In contrast, Thomas is apprehensive about the increasing use of English as “we tend to switch to English in most situations”, and Signe worries that “Norwegian academic terminology won’t be sufficiently developed, because many in our field are using English between colleagues”. She continues in her interview by saying:

“It is important to have well educated professionals in Norwegian who can speak precisely and fluently about their discipline, that they have consistency in language and not just intersperse Norwegian with English terms”

Using English terms in Norwegian also annoys Knut as it is “not very difficult really, if you think of it for a little while for we have pretty good words”. However, many felt as Tina that she could not translate the English concepts into Norwegian “so we have to explain the English concepts when you talk about it in Norwegian” and for others it was problematic finding suitable English words for Norwegian. Freya is also concerned for the next generation of teachers learning their subject in English, as she says in her interview:
“They [the Department] don’t understand that each discipline has its language, and you have to understand the meaning of that language, and if you are going to teach in that language, then you must learn the language you will teach in.”

Nils says in his interview that writing articles in Norwegian for the general public would be difficult:

“… because that requires high skill in Norwegian writing, and I think that is one of the things that is lagging behind when it comes to science and especially in this kind of environment.”

The policy of Norwegian at the Bachelor level was frequently cited as the means of protecting Norwegian and Invald thinks “that it will survive at his institution, but is not optimistic about Norwegian in commercial enterprises”, as Bart explains in the following:

“the Norwegian students will get the Norwegian terminology (yeah) I don’t see that as an argument [for domain loss] as you will speak Norwegian in these classes and then you will learn both the English and the Norwegian terminology (mmm) so I don’t care”

The participants from humanities were not so certain and felt more money was needed to encourage Norwegian in teaching and publishing for “it costs to save a language” (Freya). They eagerly await information from the recently formed Norwegian Academic Terminology Forum by the Norwegian Language Council. Brock-Utne (2001) endorses the above and highlights my points mentioned above as leading to domain loss, i.e. the increase in academic literature in English (5.2.4), international academics not learning Norwegian (5.2.5), growth in amount of courses in English and the financial rewards for publication (5.2.7.2); all of which are taken up in the discussion.

5.7 Conclusion
The findings show that the mixed, but generally positive, reaction to implementation is complicated by participants’ concerns about more general aspects of EMI, i.e. their own English competence (RQ 2.1), preparation for (RQ 2.2) and coping with EMI (RQ 2.3), their Norwegian and international students’ level of English (RQ 1.1), the use of English textbooks (RQ 1.1), at which stage in education EMI is introduced (RQ 1.), the high status of English generally in academia and the effect on Norwegian (RQ 1.2), as well as competition relating to market forces and financing for their programmes (RQ 2.1). To conclude, the
participants unanimously say how pleased they are in using English to enter their discipline's Community of Practice, but many are concerned for the efficiency and effectiveness of the learning process in their international classroom (RQ 2, 2.1 and 2.).
CHAPTER SIX – DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the findings in the light of the literature in the context of this study. I have identified three main themes emerging from the findings and each contains three sub-themes; firstly, power and language (6.1) covering the power of global English (6.1.1), linguistic imperialism (6.1.2) and domain loss (6.1.3), secondly, equality (6.2) comprising democracy (6.2.1), language competencies and NS ideals (6.2.2) and lecturers’ sense of self (6.2.3), and thirdly the quality of teaching (6.3) divided into language (6.3.1), pedagogy (6.3.2) and learning environment (6.3.3). See Appendix 9 for a table of the categories from the Findings developed into themes for the Discussion. In focusing on power, justice and equality, I question whose agenda EMI is following, who is benefiting from the policy and practice, and at what cost to the quality of education and to national cultural and socio-linguistic aspects.

6.1 Power and language

My participants have not been coerced through any physical power into EMI, but “the exercise of power through the manufacture of consent to or at least acquiescence towards it” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 4) seems to come from the participants’ recognition of the value of English usage (Phillipson, 2009b). Language use and unequal relations of power relate to the ideological workings of the language and do not always seem immediately visible to the participants, or at least for them appear universal and rational, and have become naturalised (Bourdieu, 2009; Phillipson, 2009b). As the previous chapter suggests the participants are generally accommodational in largely accepting Crystal’s (1997) traditional view of English as a neutral and natural lingua franca for communication. They are pragmatic in accepting that economic globalisation encourages the spread of English, which in turn stimulates globalisation and internationalisation and they want to play a part in this world (Graddol, 2006).

6.1.1 The power of global English

Phillipson (2009a) maintains learning English is not a choice the world’s poor have, but my participants from a rich nation seem to have little agency in making a choice about EMI and English usage. Choices are based in historical, socio-political, and cultural conditions linked to economic and power relations and the participants’ choices are driven by the practicalities of their situation. I
want to suggest several theories as to the agency, or lack of it, on the implementation of EMI when most of the participants recount feeling more confident teaching in Norwegian and, if the Norwegian students are similar to the Swedish from Bolton & Kuteeva’s empirical work (2012) concerning learning in Swedish, then they might also prefer Norwegian instruction.

The position of English as the most powerful language in the world is unchallenged and its pervasion into academic life is well documented (Coleman, 2006; Phillipson, 2003, 2009a), so it seems an anomaly with Foucault’s notion that “[p]ower is always linked to resistance: Where there is power, there is resistance” (Seen in Pennycook, 2001, p. 91) when most of my participants seem to be in an environment that is evolving from external factors, e.g. globalization, government policies. Some have the power and being in agreement with EMI do not use it; others might have power and decide not to use it, but a proportion of the participants seem to be frustrated by limited agency for resistance and are resigned to the inevitable acceptance of English (Findlow, 2006, Ibid.).

In the humanities some participants are uncomfortable about EMI, but find it difficult to go against institutional practices and they act in accordance with the norms of their culture. They follow a Neo-Marxist structuralism deterministic path and in this socio-economically driven change have little freedom to act (Findlow, 2006). The external power has coerced them into an accommodationalist stance and their moral responsibility is mitigated by lack of agency. They see that the solution to EMI is to improve their and their students’ EAP. However, in my research it is the outliers who are interesting: in her day Mary Wollstonecraft was considered an outlier; now her views on women are almost universally accepted in the West. In the same manner, my outliers, Lars, Kristine, Freya and Signe are resisting by questioning EMI and want a different future regarding English usage in Norwegian academia.

Another scenario for dealing with English usage at HEIs follows Bourdieu’s theory that the participants have acted judiciously in the situation (Bourdieu, 2009). The participants have a stake in the academic field, but have less weight of capital than the administrators. Their cultural and social capital is insufficiently powerful compared to the economic capital of the administrators.
and the external pressure of rankings. The field is flexible in that all the agents can alter the relative weight of forms of capital, but in this context the external pressure of English is so strong that it reduces the habitus of the lecturers and constrains their possibility of action. Some of my participants lacked knowledge of the amount and range of EMI courses at their institutions, in some cases even if their own course had been designated as international, which reduces their power, indicating that they have not fully worked out how to operate in the field of education administration. Indirect mechanisms affecting them include the status of English, the type of administrative language used and the grand offices the administration have compared to their offices. The control is through indirect mechanisms, called ‘symbolic violence’, which constrain the actions of the participants, but do not completely determine them. Findlow’s (2006, p. 34) findings in the UAE show the limits of habitus in matters of language change and the role of language as “a reflexive tool—reproducing changing cultures that then feed back into and change language and its use”. However, in their academic faculty field my participants generally know how to operate as they are able to modify their situation by deciding through democratic means how they will implement and who will teach EMI, thus suggesting their agency in this field with their recognised species of capital and habitus.

Some participants, mostly from engineering and economics, accept EMI as uncontroversial and not requiring any particular examination; it is an economic and social necessity. It endorses Foucault’s principle that “[p]ower is not merely repressive but is also productive” (Cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 91) as these participants use the power of the English language for their careers and thus create normative conformity for EAP and prevent critical reflection. These participants seem to distance their choice of language from the socio-political situation around them in what Pennycook (2001) calls a liberal ostrichism approach, which denies the relationship of language to social and cultural factors that can lead to equality or inequality as language shapes identity, mindset and academic narrative (Phillipson, 2009b). Another group of participants who accept EMI and English usage are the idealists who feel by using the language of power they can help reach the Third World. These participants want to take technology to the Third World or reduce the inequality caused by globalisation and instead of gatekeeping, allow English to open up Norwegian
(Anglo-American) tertiary education to Third World students. EMI is a means to an end, but fails to take into consideration the harms of globalisation and Anglo-American world domination (Phillipson, 2009a). Suggesting lack of agency or selfish choices concerning English usage, or being victims, can be patronising to intelligent academics. Another scenario that helps me understand the situation for my participants is based on Keller's (1994) concept of ‘an invisible hand’ discussed in section 3.2.3. Individuals' language choices accumulate into a macro-level linguistic change, even though there has been no collective intention of achieving linguistic change, hence the “invisible hand” (Ljosland, 2007, p. 407).

The participants seem to be between Scylla and Charybdis as they need English internationally, but it seems as if we are all sleepwalking into an acceptance of the situation, unable to struggle against commodification of education, linguistic imperialism, Anglo-American culture, and domain loss. However, if EAP is socially constructed, then there must be a possibility of it being socially deconstructed by individuals’ actions.

In contrast to Menken & Garcia’s (2010) ideas of teachers reshaping and reconstructing policy through negotiation with the management and external parties, some of my participants are experiencing a top-down (from policy and management) and bottom-up (from students) desire for EMI that has left teachers caught in a gulf between policy and practice without the space for discussion on pedagogic implementations. These teachers’ opinions seem to be disregarded in this area (Troudi, 2007). The management do not look at the political and moral practice of the educator, but rather take an instrumentalisation approach, regarding the teachers as technicians (Giroux, 1997). Therefore, I agree with Shohamy (2006) that when policy is imported by political entities in top-down manner often little resistance is shown by teachers.

### 6.1.1.1 Commodification of education

Capitalism, globalization, EU policies and Norwegian educational policies have led to a grassroots situation for the lecturers of compliance to consumerist education. The market oriented structure of Bologna, has turned students into both customers and products in an international market where HEIs are competing to supply the best products to the market with special courses and
making products that the market requires, e.g. engineers. (Kjeldstadli, 2010). Success is measured by rankings of the buying and selling of competences for which EMI courses are not only a necessity, but also a contributor. However, the quantitative measurements of the rankings used by management, e.g. the number of EMI courses, volume of English publishing, do not measure the quality of learning or general well-being on EMI courses.

Commodification’s emphasis on useful, applicable research for the market has changed the role of the university away from a democratic public sphere creating critical citizens where education is a moral, ethical and political practice towards a market place where students are consumers and education is increasingly limited to technical learning skills (Giroux, 2004). The change from education to training for specific jobs has particularly affected humanities and teacher education (Ibid., Macedo et al., 2003). These disciplines have been fundamental in constructing culture and education for a national state by traditionally using their L1 narrative for critical thinking and reflection, but now globalisation and market forces are undermining their role (Kjeldstadli, 2010). My participants from these areas are finding EMI more problematic than the scientists, nevertheless they are adapting to internationalisation. Their need for autonomy in education, e.g. to question and challenge problems, requires academic space, as well as a multi-lingual environment in which local languages are not lost, whilst English is being strengthened by the neo-liberal EU agenda for HEs (Giroux, 2004; Phillipson, 2003).

6.1.2 Linguistic imperialism
The environment of power and globalisation leads logically to themes connected to Phillipson’s linguistic imperialism (1992, 2001, 2003, 2009b, 2000). Most of my participants’ experiences endorse Phillipson’s (Ibid.) and Skutnabb-Kangas’s (2000) contentions of the unchallenged hierarchy of languages which strengthens English at the expense of other languages and privileges native speakers. Bolton (2008, p. 270) also acknowledges domain loss in the Nordic region, and he illustrates my participants’ situation in the “discursive schizophrenia” at HEIs, with “leaders” wanting internationalisation and “some staff hav[ing] grave concerns about the consequences such ‘internationalization’ may entail”. My study indicates that language is deeply embedded in socio-political aspects and that the EU and Bologna have
contributed to the existence of linguistic imperialism with which my participants are having to deal (Phillipson, 2003).

Research studies in Norway (Ljosland, 2007, 2008) and in Europe (Wilkinson & Zegers, 2008) support the contention of most of my participants that English in academia has higher prestige than Norwegian, particularly in the sciences. In addition, in my context English is becoming the default language not just for international work but locally, as English is expanding into internal areas of communication, e.g. internal e-mails and meetings, thus normalizing and legitimatizing English usage in HEIs (Phillipson, 2009a). In her Outer Circle context Bhatia (2008, p. 268) suggests that English as a lingua-franca causes languages to adapt to their own community and mesh Anglo-American culture “into their own individual cultures” and Esseili (2008, p. 274) supports the “adopt and adapt English” stance, but this does not seem to be occurring in my context; instead my research suggests linguistic imperialism with an increasing English monolingualism rather than linguistic diversity, idealising NSs and domain loss as seen in Ljosland’s (2008) PhD case study.

My participants experience EMI as a subtractive language policy (Phillipson, 2009b) as when their course is designated international and there are foreign students enrolled, they teach it in English; there are no additional courses in EMI which is contrary to the original intention of “English-medium courses to be a supplement to, and not a replacement for, Norwegian medium courses” (Ljosland, 2007, p. 398). The increased use of English in Bachelor course lab and group work due to international PhD candidates also means that English is taking over the space previously occupied by the L1; it is only desirable for society and the individual when it is additive (Phillipson, 2009b, 2000; Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

I reject Rajagopalan’s (1999) criticism of linguistic imperialism as a guilt complex among ELT professionals. Having been at a Catholic convent for 10 years I think guilt is a destructive emotional word and in globalisation we are all connected and involved in linguistic hegemony, just as we are in economic hegemony, e.g. we are accountable for safety standards in Bangladeshi clothing factories wherever we are in the retail chain. So too must we look at the
bigger picture of thinking about ecological value; we are all connected and have moral responsibilities to each other.

\section*{6.1.2.1 Anglo-American culture}

My research also suggests the economic power behind Phillipson’s (2003) ‘diffusion of the English paradigm’ concerning the spread of English leading to Americanization and homogenization of world culture particularly at conferences and with teaching material. The engineering and economic faculties wanting “the best textbooks” means not only standard English language textbooks, but all the accompanying material from the powerful Anglo-American publishing industry. They also want to use them to save time, as participants are complaining that EMI is time consuming. Nevertheless, I believe market forces of the powerful Anglo-American publishing houses are causing educational imperialism with their standard teaching materials and Norway is generally not spending money on Norwegian teaching materials (See 6.3.3.2).

Some participants in humanities and teacher education are noticing that Swedish and Danish literature is being replaced by Anglo-American in the increasingly English language teaching environment. Internationalization is bringing with it a standardisation of topics and streamlining of syllabuses which in turn is leading to an increased bureaucratizing and less local flexibility for learning outcomes. In Bologna, harmonisation seems to mean standardisation and my research suggests that this is to Anglo-American norms.

A monoculture of standardized materials and courses involved in EMI could be cramping a diversity of academic critical opinions and not allowing heterosis in this environment (Pennycook, 2001). In our late-capitalistic society, the bank crises need a diversity of solutions and a flexibility of thinking, and for preventing an ecological catastrophe radical solutions are also required, but if different types of anti-capitalist thought are to be effective, intellectuals must be able to construct rivals to capitalism in academia (Kjeldstadli, 2010).

\section*{6.1.3 Domain loss}

My participants’ experience of domain loss confirms studies in Sweden (Björkman, 2010a) and Norway (Ljosland, 2007, 2008) as L1 is being replaced by English through EMI and HEI publishing policies. Academic domain loss is a global phenomenon (Ammon, 2000); for example, similar situations have been
experienced in Qatar (Pessoa & Rajakumar, 2012), Indonesia (Ibrahim, 2001), and UAE (Troudi, 2007). My research goes further than Ljosland’s (2007) study on Norwegian domain loss in academia. Not only is English seen as the prestige language of academia, and in some disciplines it has become unacceptable to use Norwegian, but by sending internal e-mails in English, writing Masters and PhDs in English and holding meetings in English, domains that were until recently Norwegian are being replaced with English.

The importance of having good L1 competency to aid L2 (Ellis, 2008) means that most Bachelor courses, at least the first and second year, are taught in Norwegian (Brock-Utne, 2001), but often with an English textbook. Although this helps with vocabulary, some participants are criticising the situation of teacher education students learning a subject in English and having to find the register and meta-language to teach their subject in Norwegian schools. I agree with Ljosland (2008)’s prediction in her PhD thesis that the next generation of teachers, who have not learnt their subject in Norwegian, might have difficulties teaching in their L1. A situation seems to be arising of some academics being unable to speak and write about their subject in Norwegian.

Many participants experienced a conflict between internationalisation and protecting Norwegian, similar to the results in Jensen & Thøgersen’s (2011) quantitative survey in Copenhagen University. The groups with status in the university and whose working language outside the university is often English, e.g. engineers and economists, are unconcerned about domain loss and want English as the working and teaching language at HEIs (Björkman, 2010a). They are denying the cultural and identity aspects of language and see it merely as a ‘vehicle’ of communication. Other participants were concerned in their participation and lack of agency to prevent L1 domain loss (Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011; Phillipson, 2009a).

The domain loss is complicated in that some participants’ inability to translate their academic terminology from English to Norwegian and vice versa has led to subtractive language use and code-switching in both languages. The latter is through lack of vocabulary as participants search for words and put a Norwegian one into English or vice versa, so a “multi-language” is being used. I
think this is a direct consequence of insufficient resources invested to develop academic terminology for advanced communication in the participants’ fields.

Another point in my research is the invasion of English into informal areas of academia, e.g. at the lunch table (6.2.1) so Norwegians are being denied their own language in their own domestic context where personal topics would normally be in Norwegian. The spill-over makes the whole working language at HEIs English, contrasting sharply with the situation that Block-Utne (2007, p. 368) experienced at an EMI university in Dar es Salaam where colleagues learnt Kiswahili “in order not to force colleagues and friends into switching to English when they wanted to relax”. Thus, the working language is increasingly English, which seems to be reinforcing the idea of HEIs as multi-national businesses.

6.1.3.1 Publishing reward system
The financial rewards and prestige for publishing in English led to the participants in social sciences and humanities feeling they were losing status and influence in their universities. Some have no top level journals to contribute to in their field as the Tellekant system neglects topics anchored in the local language and culture e.g. Nordic pedagogy. This down-grading of domestic language and giving status to Anglo-American publications can be seen as an element of linguistic imperialism. Naturally research in English is vital for specialist, international work, but to create a system that penalises writing in Norwegian leads to domain loss and loss of status of those who do. The same lecturers are the very ones who are needed to write textbooks for schools, for which they receive no professional or financial credit. Academics have protested with letters to newspapers and debates on TV, but the powerful administrators in HEIs and the Ministry are not listening, as Brock-Utne (2007) states in her research.

6.1.3.2 Parallel language policy
The policy of parallel languages had hardly been heard of by most of my participants, and few had looked at their HEI’s language policy. Here again policy has not reached or helped the grassroots situation; my participants generally want international staff to learn and be able to teach in Norwegian, and to be able to use Norwegian at work. However, HEIs fear that leading
international academics will not work in Norway if Norwegian competency is enforced. A recent report from a university college in Oslo (Gulden, 2011) recommends EAP courses and Norwegian courses for staff and students to improve overall academic language communicative competency. The understanding of confronting the problem with both languages, and giving resources for such programmes, seems to have more chance of success than policies from the EU stating that “[t]he Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity” (Phillipson, 2009b, p. 87) which result erroneously in the language of the EU being increasingly solely English.

The term parallel languages is an unfortunate expression as it means two, and not a multi-lingualism as advocated by Phillipson (2003) and hinders fostering awareness of the need to provide conditions for other languages other than English. My participants verify increased use of English at the cost of the dispossessions of Norwegian in academia. Parallel language initiatives might help if publicised and resourced, but without state support, small languages like Norwegian will experience problems of domain loss (Ljosland, 2008; 2012).

6.2 Equality

Equality is fundamental in CALx and critical theory; so after a short introduction I will argue that democracy is diminishing in HEIs due to EMI implementation (6.2.1), and then I problematize the lecturers’ language competency and NS ideals (6.2.2), before looking at the lecturers’ sense of self in the general EAP environment (6.2.3).

My research supports Ljosland’s (2008) work and her use of Østerud et al.’s 2003 official report on power and democracy concluding that greater social differences result from Norwegian domains being lost to English. The academic publishing system and a lack of contact with the Norwegian public is distancing the community from the academics, thus knowledge is not percolating from universities to society. I agree with Giroux (1997) on the duty of the academic to enter the public sphere, otherwise the general public is being disaffected. Unfortunately in a system of linguistic inequality, some of the participants are concerned whether their Norwegian is good enough to promulgate their work in Norwegian, and I think that this fear will only increase as new generations write their Masters and PhDs in English.
Another aspect of inequality comes from the status participants report that the English language is receiving generally. In a different context, the English-only movement in the US highlights this status in believing in a “pedagogy of exclusion which views the learning of English as education in itself” and in so doing devalues other languages (Macedo et al., 2003, p. 63). They understand ideological elements generating and sustaining linguistic and cultural discrimination as being like a vestige of a colonial legacy, as the language itself represents the ideas and power of formerly colonialist, now Western capitalist, values. My research shows a shimmering towards this; not only in being excluding, but in giving status to courses in English and to teachers who teach them. Ljosland’s (2007) research in Norway and Findlow’s (2006) in the UAE show English as being used for exciting, international science and business and Norwegian is seen as a language for home, and perhaps rural and old-fashioned topics.

Status is further sharpened by some participants feeling that Norwegian is a very egalitarian language, e.g. often using the same type of vocabulary at university and at school and in not using titles, e.g. doctor. This down-grading is in direct contrast to the perceived status of academia abroad and the recognition these academics receive internationally, thus enhancing the message that if you want status, or even to be recognised in your field, use English. The neo-liberal English academic vocabulary, e.g. “outcomes”, attempts to give HEIs the status of international businesses through the commodification of language (Macedo et al., 2003). Thus, the power of English’s influence at the linguistic, socio-cultural and individual level gives prestige in comparison to other languages.

6.2.1 Democracy

“We live in a time when democracy is in retreat” (Giroux, 1997, p. 95), which is reflected in the external and internal top-down decision making on the implementation of EMI. The traditional HEI authority of the management is missing

“a democratic conception of collective life, one that is embodied in an ethic of solidarity, social transformation, and an imaginative vision of citizenship” (Ibid., p. 95).
Tietze’s (2008) European and Fredman & Doughney’s (2012) Australian empirical work in HEIs support my findings of the lack of an enabling climate of democratic participation in HEIs in general. The management’s use of authority is not a good example if teaching is to be transformatory, rather than traditional and standardised. It is difficult for teachers to have the opportunity to develop critical thinking about ideas, beliefs and pedagogic knowledge and put them into practice (Wright & Bolitho, 2007), if the management are engaged in a conservative discourse of authority (Giroux, 1997) and in ‘ticking the boxes’ for rankings.

6.2.1.1 Professional development

The management’s preparation for EMI has been piecemeal and left up to the individual to access traditional EAP courses if they feel they need them, and no pre- or post-appraisals or mentoring have been given. Many of the lecturers seem not to have had a say in the proposal, development, and creation of their PD. Consequently, conditions have been created that do not enable free and equal practice for self-determination. Teachers “have been treated as technicians or public servants, whose role is primarily to implement [the policy] rather than conceptualize pedagogical practice” (Giroux, 1997, p. 103). The silence and non-participation of the lecturers in their PD seems to be continued into the classroom with silent students (Ibid.).

Norwegian teachers need to be qualified to teach in Norwegian, but no accreditation system exists for EMI. Most participants maintain that they are not as proficient when lecturing in English as in Norwegian and “want to be better at English”; therefore it is a lack of responsibility on the part of management in not creating a work environment that listens to teachers’ voice and gives them agency (Zhang & Hu 2010). The engineers and economists, who mainly do not feel the need for courses, could be offered resources e.g. for peer observation/evaluation, mentoring, and if nothing else given time to compensate for the reported extra time involved in EMI preparation. For this group English usage seems to link academia to the perceived status and efficiency of commerce and industry. The status of the PD courses with no credits and often taught by hourly-paid staff might influence their decision. However, it is just this group who could benefit from pedagogic language training for coherent lectures in a multi-cultural classroom as Björkman’s (2010a) study in Sweden reveals.
The other participants who want preparation for EMI are either not given courses or attend short, traditional EAP courses teaching the language of the prestigious group as described in section 2.3 (Benesch, 2001; Pennycook, 2001). The participants found them useful as the courses supplied traditional skills for a traditional TESOL milieu, thus giving them more confidence in their language competency. The lecturers show great loyalty to their HEI and students in their approach to EMI. They “throw” themselves into EMI before they are ready, do their best in the auditorium and take responsibility for their English academic PD through reading and the Internet.

6.2.1.2 International Staff

By not learning Norwegian international staff are contributing to a lack of democracy at HEIs as they cannot partake in activities nor undertake faculty administrative responsibilities. Internationalization has caused an increase in bureaucrats to deal with the extra tasks of co-ordination of international programmes and qualifications (Kjeldstadli, 2010). Administrators and non-academic professionals are taking more responsibility in HEI faculties, and the inability to speak Norwegian by academics is contributing to this situation. When meetings and administration take place in English, Norwegians are disempowered by not using their L1 at work. The concept of parallel languages is worthless if there are non-Norwegian speakers on the staff who face no consequences for not learning Norwegian. If no action is taken HEIs will become like international companies with English as the working language. However, the role of the universities is very different in that it is a public sphere for educating and creating critical citizens (Giroux, 1997).

Neo-liberalism in HEIs seems to value highly productive article-writing international academics who up the rankings, so that they do not enforce the terms of their contracts to learn Norwegian before being confirmed in their posts. These international academics are restricting the choice of teaching material to Anglo-American texts. In addition, in some cases they are down-grading Norwegian academics to teaching the Bachelor courses as they can only teach in English on the Master courses. Equality in the workplace is being eroded formally and informally, as English is also used socially. Not only is it important to change the culture of acceptance of monolingualism, but international staff
need opportunities and time to learn Norwegian and realise they are in a climate where bilingualism is the default position (Phillipson, 2009b).

6.2.2 Language competency and native speaker ideals
In aiming for idealised NS norms, many of the participants experience linguistic insecurity (Jenkins, 2007) and consequently socio-culturally they are unable to transform their situation at work nor conform to it, and some participants regard themselves as failed NSs rather than as users in their own right (Lantolf, 2000). This attitude is hardly surprising from the traditional TESOL environment in which they have learnt and use English and is confirmed in their acceptance of NS language ‘corrections’ and recognition of Anglo-American bias when publishing in journals. Some aspects of ELF can be seen as valuable in my context regarding attitudes to NNS grammar and pronunciation deviations from NS, broadening ownership, despite few precise definitions of ELF emerging at the moment (Jenkins, 2007, 2009; Mauranen et al., 2010; Seidlhofer, 2011).

However, I find ELF ideals in academic written English more difficult to embrace (Sowden, 2012). It is too rigid to maintain that NNSs from the Expanding and Peripheral Circles will best be served by a single English variety (Trudgill, 2002). I prefer Canagarajah’s (1999, p. 166) “[s]trategies of negotiating discourse” in accepting communicative norms of specific contexts, with an addition of the possibility to appropriate and merge discourses which can lead to text enrichment. Despite the power of the Anglo-American publishing industry, my participants felt more content with the norms of written academia as they appreciated the structure and were able to follow it for their own articles and experienced success.

6.2.3 Lecturers’ sense of self
The research shows a close connection between language, identity and culture. These seem to play significant roles in shaping the participants’ ability to change their personal and professional identity in different EAP contexts (Hall, 1996). In one situation they are accepted as having learnt the powerful groups’ language practices (Jenkins, 2007), whereas in another they are perceived as having low education or intelligence levels, especially when experiencing ‘foreigner talk’ by NSs (Ibid.). In an external context, Wenger’s (1998) CoP theory can be used to explain the former empowerment and inclusion. In the
latter case the participants’ agency and habitus seems reduced internally when they feel that their linguistic capital diminishes, which will be illuminated below in Bourdieu’s theory of habitus (2009).

6.2.3.1 Community of Practice

In the international arena where English is vital for academic communication all the participants’ linguistic and social interaction enables them to enjoy engagement and participation, and be welcomed into their CoP (Wenger, 1998). Although they might not be content with their language competency, they relate feelings of status as their standard of English is higher compared to other NNSs, thus allowing them to be respected and valued in their CoP (Bourdieu, 2009). In fact, the findings in Jenkins’s (2009) research study on Scandinavian English accents being near NS pronunciation seems to give my participants prestige in this environment. The participants adapt their identity to the communities’ norms and practices, e.g. Anglo-American politeness principles, and feel respected as experts in their own field. In this environment they have sufficient agency to create their own identity in the group, and feel comfortable with their habitus, but they might well be acting as gatekeepers to other NNSs.

It can also be argued that in yielding to the Anglo-American norms and values of the dominant group to enter their CoP, the dominant group gains hegemony (Bourdieu, 2009). However, they are using their knowledge of linguistic and socio-cultural conventions and norms, and have thus gained linguistic capital, habitus and economic capital (from publishing and grants), which they use to their advantage externally. The convention of academic CoPs is more straightforward and generally does not require as much engagement during presenting as required in teaching, hence they find giving presentations much easier than teaching, and presenting generally easier than answering questions.

6.2.3.2 English usage internally at HEIs

EMI has resulted in increased use of English in administrative spheres in HEIs and lecturers feel that they do not possess the social or linguistic capital to position and create themselves within the power allowed in the HEIs administrative environment (Bourdieu, 2009). Their academic capital is disregarded and they feel they do not have the linguistic capital and habitus;
consequently many appear to be marginalized and disempowered in their own institutions.

The top-down environment of EMI implementation and use of English at meetings means that the participants who are less confident in English are unable to negotiate their position resulting in disengagement and non-participation (Wenger, 1998). This erodes democracy at HEIs and limits ownership of decision-making. If episodes where staff insist on translation at open meetings in English, as illustrated by Canagarajah’s (1999) example of Tamil in Sri Lanka, could be replicated in Norway, domain loss and a lack of confidence in using Norwegian locally could be changed.

In this context it is not just a question of mixing codes for communication and enhancing bilingualism, biculturism and dual identities as Canagarajah (1999) maintains, but it is an increase in the use and status of Norwegian as the working language. The concept of “use Norwegian when you can and English when you have to” from the Norwegian White Paper nr. 35 §5.7.9 (2007-8, p. 83) could be good practice. International staff, particularly English NSs, seem to be taking advantage of the power they have when using English. Not only are they often requiring English usage, but the use of Anglo-Saxon small talk conventions, cultural metaphors and puns, as well as use of humour, seem to lead to the disempowerment of some Norwegian academics in Norwegian HEIs.

6.3 Quality of teaching
The success or failure of the policy of EMI in the classroom must show that the learning experience is not adversely affected (Troudi & Jendli, 2011) and that teachers can teach and function in the classroom to the best of their ability, and hopefully as transformative educators (Johnston, 2003). At the grassroots level, teachers are innovating and finding solutions to EMI through dynamic interaction with their students, thus leading to ways of linguistic inclusivity and cultural variation e.g. negotiating when a language is used, using translanguaging situations and code switching (Garcia, 2009; Ljosland, 2008). My respondents experience considerable autonomy in the classroom, so at this level they shape language policy to suit their situation and meet the students’ needs (Zhang & Hu, 2010). So even if there is little room for manoeuvre with the
management, teachers are appropriating and adapting EMI at the classroom level.

My research supports Björkman’s (2008)’s and Bolton and Kuteeva’s (2012) studies in Sweden as to the different approaches to EMI by different disciplines. English “is largely a pragmatic reality” in sciences, whilst in the humanities it is “an additional or auxiliary language” in parallel with Swedish in their situation (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012, p. 444). In the former nomothetic disciplines knowledge construction is by transmission, in comparison to the latter idiographic disciplines where it is constructed through discussion and relies heavily on linguistic formulations and styles of expression (Björkman, 2008). Consequently, this seems to play a role in the enthusiasm and confidence with EMI in the sciences, compared to the more reluctant stance from those in humanities.

6.3.1 Language
EMI places strains on the linguistic communication needed for following Vygotsky’s socio-cultural learning. In the social interaction of co-construction of knowledge, particularly using the mediated mind principles and working to find and use the ZPD, good communication skills are essential (Lantolf & Poehner, 2008; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). The teachers’ general reaction to EMI is more preparation and sticking to the manuscript, which leads to a lack of flexibility and engagement, and less interaction and more note taking from the students as seen in studies from Sweden and the Netherlands (Airey & Linder, 2006, 2008; Klaassen, 2001).

In Hellekjær’s (2007, 2010c) report on English usage in Norwegian business and governance, his findings are similar to mine in that Norwegians’ English is good at the conversational level, but lacks proficiency in professional language. In addition, from my own experience, Norwegian students are similar to the Swedish in complaining about “their teachers’ poor language skills” (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012, p. 435), as also the case with Dutch students in the Netherlands (Klaassen & Bos, 2010). Hellekjær (2010c) maintains that Norwegian professionals can be over-confident about formal English. My research shows some aspects of this in the sciences, but the majority of my participants are preoccupied with the quest for NS competence at the grammar and
pronunciation level, rather than concentrating on the meta-language of lectures and pragmatic communicative proficiency.

The cultural academic context encourages the desire for NS language competence as if it were the benchmark for which to aim (Jenkins, 2005, 2007), and even using NSs to improve language skills is recommended in a Netherlands’ PhD thesis (Klaassen, 2001). It is the perceived status and prestige of the NS accent, rather than the comprehensibility of the accent by the students, that prevents most of the participants looking beyond the Anglo-American context and be proud to speak Norwegian-English with the aim of mutual intelligibility in the classroom (Ibid.). In fact, local and international students in Hellekjær’s (2010a) study on lecture comprehension found Norwegian EMI teachers’ pronunciation difficult to comprehend on account of lack of clarity, and incorrect stress and word segmentation. I find this difficult to agree with, but perhaps Norwegian intonation caused the confusion, as I agree with Jenkins (2007) that Norwegian teachers’ pronunciation is similar to NSs, and consequently should be comprehensive in the traditional EAP environment.

Swedish and Norwegian empirical studies show that non-standard morphosyntax, e.g. subject-verb concord, causes little disturbance in communication during lectures and high language proficiency does not necessarily ensure communicative effectiveness (Björkman, 2011; Hellekjær, 2010a). At the phrasal level my participants also reflect Björkman’s (2010a) study that NNSs’ language usage does not disturb the lecture. However, successful communication is shown by employing communication-enhancing pragmatic strategies such as explaining terms and concepts, making the intention clear and creating common ground, as well as using repetition and signalling to help the learners orient themselves as found in Björkman’s (2010), Bolton and Kuteeva’s (2012) and Hellekjær’s (2010a) studies.

Brock-Utne (2007) identifies the problems of cultural transfer of concepts from English to languages in developing countries, and many of my participants have a similar experience in Norwegian. In the social sciences in particular there are distinctions between Scandinavian concepts and Anglo-American ones with which the participants struggle. The Norwegian Language Council is starting initiatives to address the situation. However, basic terminology is presenting
linguistic and presentational problems in the classroom, for which Klaassen (2001) recommends more language training aimed at context-specific vocabulary.

Lecturing language skills as identified for example in Biggs (1999) are crucial in the EMI context where communication is mainly between NNSs. In fact, Airey’s (2009) PhD thesis reveals similar problems when lecturers used their L1, and that using the L2 was just accentuating them. In addition Björkman (2010a) maintains that being a NS, or having NS competence without appropriate pragmatic lecturing skills is no guarantee for success in lecturing. My research supports the conclusions of Shaw & McMillon’s (2008) study that giving students time to process content, speaking slowly and including redundancy leads to successful learning. Interestingly allowing time for processing knowledge is a point for Norwegian lecturers to consider in the EMI classroom as Hellekjær’s (2010a) empirical research showed that German students needed more time for processing EMI content than their Norwegian contemporaries.

I think all my participants are sufficiently competent in grammar and pronunciation, so students may be incorrect in complaining about poor language skills; rather the teachers need to be aware of becoming pragmatically effective speakers (Björkman, 2008). By using pragmatic strategies and efficacious pedagogy lectures can be more dialogic and interactive (Hellekjær, 2010a) thus enabling the students to negotiate meaning and gain clarification through socio-cultural learning.

6.3.2 Pedagogy

Studies from Sweden and the Netherlands support my research in identifying a lack of emphasis on adapting pedagogy to suit the international classroom, and teachers’ failure to take into account the extra demands of creating a comfortable, stress free learning environment with good interaction and knowledge acquisition using EMI (Gustafsson & Raisanen, 2006; Klaassen, 2001, 2004). I would go further in wanting to awaken the moral dimension of teaching in EMI from a critical pedagogical perspective. The learning occurring in my context appears to be a form of banking of knowledge (Freire, 1972). Instead teachers could be transformative educators who, through dialogic
pedagogy, could allow students from different cultures to question and challenge the teaching based on their values and beliefs and explore knowledge to empower them to create a preferred future for themselves (Freire, 1972; Giroux, 1997). In my context I agree with Johnson’s (2003, p. 71) more pragmatic view in that the job of the transformative educators is:

“empowering the learner, giving them voice, helping them to see the interestedness of knowledge claims and allowing them to become producers rather than only consumers of knowledge – quite simply constitute excellent pedagogy, from a moral standpoint as well as an educational one.”

On a practical level there are many pedagogic techniques that can aid learning for and engagement with the students (Biggs, 1999). In studies by Hellekjær (2010a), Klaassen (2001) and Airey (2009) pedagogy proves to be more important than language skills. My findings support Björkman’s (2008) study showing increased student comprehension when lecturers are more engaged with the students. I agree with Hellekjær’s (2010a) study’s findings that increased use of well-designed visual aids and well-structured material enhanced comprehension. In addition, I would add that a dynamic body language with good eye contact is also fundamental to effective lecturing.

With its dual focus on language and content and respecting Vygotsky’s socio-cultural, constructivist perspectives on learning, CLIL offers many techniques to develop professional interconnectedness and language awareness (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). CLIL is mainly used in primary and secondary schooling, but Coyle et al. (2010) make valuable suggestions to aid my teachers not only in the classroom, but in PD as well. Although Gibbons’ (2003) qualitative CLIL study using socio-cultural mediated teaching was carried out at schools in Australia, the way she managed to show how teachers find the ZPD and together with students create discourse to co-construct knowledge could be useful in Norway. In my context scaffolding, active learning, peer co-operation, interaction even in lectures and negotiating meaning could help my participants and their students (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008).

The authenticity of tasks in CLIL can help motivation for language learning. Linguistic diversity is recognized and accepted as language development and multiple varieties of language (Coyle et al., 2010) which slides into some of the
values of ELF which are conducive to diminishing the power of the NS. Although CLIL is accommodationalist in not challenging the philosophy of globalisation and in wanting the individual to learn English for their individual success, rather than seeing it being a gatekeeper for others, there is interesting work in Sweden using CLIL when resources are invested into it (Bergman & Eriksson, 2013). The drawbacks of CLIL can be that the psychological aspects of language learning are not taken into consideration, and without including good language teachers, the language element can suffer, e.g. fossilization. In his paper from the Indonesian context, Ibrahim (2001) supports this as students’ language competency does not improve on EMI courses and they need a language bridging programme before starting on EMI courses. However, in Bergman et al.’s (2013) CLIL courses the manner in which language teachers are valued by the engineers and scientists could regenerate the influence of language teachers and the humanities professional status.

6.3.3 Learning environment

Multi-cultural classrooms with a variety of linguistic and academic competencies are presenting some challenges to my participants as also reported in research studies collated by Coleman (2006). In giving advice to this context Biggs (1999) suggests teaching to accommodate student difference, using active methods and focusing on what the students are doing in their learning. I will now discuss the reactions to international students and then the use of Anglo-American teaching material.

6.3.3.1 Students

The positive reception of international students in the classroom by nearly all of my respondents means that they do not see them as the ‘reduced other’, contradicting Grimshaw’s (2007, 2011) research, as they see the culture that they bring as a resource to the classroom. The international students’ habitus gives them cultural capital and status (Bourdieu, 2009), as well as economic capital, for they are a valuable tradable commodity to the institution and necessary for Norwegian students’ exchanges. However, wide scale EMI courses have only developed during the last ten years, so the positive attitude seems to be influenced by attitudes of “celebrating difference” concerning stereotypes already criticized in the 1990s by Sarangi (2011) and stereotyping
nations or indeed regions (Grimshaw, 2007). PD, not just in Norway, fails to consider the complexity, dynamism and mutability of cultures (Ibid.).

In my context ‘otherness’ does not cause mistrust or reticence, but there seems to be a hint of exoticised accounts of the ‘other’ from their interviews, a factor also identified in Grimshaw’s (2011) work. The participants meet these students with kindness and interest, and give of themselves to make their time in Norway academically and socially successful also outside the classroom, similar to the extra help given to UAE students illustrated in Troudi & Jendli’s (2011) study. However, students are disadvantaged as to their proficiency in English and by attitudes towards them of needing help in an environment that separates their language and education (Ibid.). Developing critical pedagogy in EMI can aid empowerment and give learners a voice (Johnston, 2003). However, I do not think generally the students are given a language from their traditional EAP and EMI courses with which to be critical. In addition, Brock-Utne’s (2007) study shows that foreign students feel that they learn too little Norwegian to be able to engage with Norwegians whilst in Norway, thus all their international experience seems to be defined through the English language.

Brock-Utne’s (2007) study maintains that Norwegian students have better oral and written English than most of her African students, but Hellekjær’s (2010) quantitative study found no statistical difference between Norwegian students and international students’ comprehension, which contradicts his previous study from 2007. My own experience is that a great variety of levels of English exist in the EMI classroom and Norwegian teachers seem to have problems understanding African and Far East dialects and accents, and naturally understand English influenced by Norwegian more easily. This could be an argument for aiming towards a NS norm, but I reject this because of the power and status involved with prestigious types of language weighing so heavily. However, Sowden (2012) thinks this is just the reason why some NNSs want NS norms so that they do not risk having their academic self-image undermined by using a variety of English that is treated as inferior in the international environment. A shift in perspective and attitude is needed by NSs and NNSs to create a more equable environment.
In a Swedish study, students’ L2 productive language skills were shown to be challenging and learning difficulties were also caused by subject-specific terminology (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012); the same challenge was experienced by my participants. Often the students do not know the terminology in their L1 as they are learning their discipline at the same time as learning the language (Hellekjær, 2010b). Lecture comprehension by NNS students in Scandinavia is also reduced as they have difficulties understanding the structure of EMI lectures (Björkman, 2010a) and need more time to process the information (Pecorari et al., 2011).

Uncritical stereotyping of the quiet Chinese learner and the passive Norwegian by most of the participants is perhaps not only due to the language and context where students are denied full participation (Macedo et al., 2003), but to Western EMI teaching styles (Grimshaw, 2007, 2011). They also might be silenced as in Troudi and Jendli’s (2011) UAE context, through issues of socio-cultural and linguistic identity, as they silently concentrate on achievement and employability. In the Swedish context Shaw & McMillon’s (2008) study suggests that passive students are affected by the course design and examination system that gear learning towards content rather than applicability. In addition, Bolton & Kuteeva’s (2012) research on silent students also in Sweden and Ellwood & Nakane’s (2009) study in Australia of Japanese silent students questions the pedagogy in not encouraging students to give their own views and in not making it clear they are allowed to speak and ask questions. In Mack’s (2012) action research study in Japan she found that silent students were vocal after they were given agency in how classes were taught and with teacher-centred methodology to encourage active participation. Conversely, Hellekjær & Wilkinson’s (2003) study found success was more likely with a student-centred approach.

Bolton & Kuteeva’s (2012) study suggests that international students can experience inclusion and/or exclusion by parallel language policies when the home language is used parallel to English. My participants are then in a difficult situation as they are trying to ensure Norwegian students understand the teaching material and know the terminology in both languages and create an inclusive environment.
6.3.3.2 Teaching materials

Studies reveal that the prevalence of the use of English textbooks in Scandinavia means that students’ ability to read and learn from them is essential for their academic success (Hellekjær, 2005, 2010c; Pecorari et al., 2011; Shaw & McMillion, 2008). Consequently, it is taken for granted that students have the linguistic and reading skills to read these books, but research studies (Ibid.) and most of my participants’ experience show this not to be the case. The upper-secondary school does not prepare local students for HE (Hellekjær, 2005) and the IELT scores for international students do not reflect the reading skills required (Pecorari et al., 2011); thus the teachers are meeting unprepared students. Pecorari et al. (Ibid.) found that NNS students need 25% more time to read texts than NS students, mainly due to difficulties with vocabulary and the rhetoric structure of textbooks. Sometimes students spend time reading which eats into time for other learning tasks, or more commonly and as my participants experience, students decide not to spend the extra time on reading, but rely on lecture notes resulting in a lack of breadth and depth in their education.

One way of helping students cope with the books could be based on the principles behind CLIL. Much of the materials, especially using new technologies, endorsed by Coyle et al. (2010) could help students engage in the reading by transforming texts. In the Indonesian context Ibrahim’s (2001) work shows how reading can contribute to language acquisition, and my participants found interesting texts within their student’s ZPD that functioned well as comprehensible input. The reliance on L2 textbook reading requires pedagogic adaptions and support systems (Hellekjær, 2009; Pecorari et al., 2011). The HEIs and the teachers have a duty of care to the students, but perhaps in this area they lack the pedagogical linguistic skills required to help the students to read and acquire knowledge from EMI textbooks.

EMI relies on English textbooks, to which many of the engineers and scientists are positive. However, at the Bachelor level an extra dimension is the use of English language textbooks on courses taught in Norwegian. There are a lack of Norwegian textbooks at the Bachelor level (Hellekjær, 2005), partly due to the academic publishing system and partly to market forces as the State is reluctant to subsidize Norwegian textbooks. Market forces appear to be behind
some course material choices as opposed to pedagogic choices (Pennycook, 2001).

6.4 Conclusion for discussion
In the beginning of chapter six I questioned who is gaining and who is losing from the policies and practice of EMI. A balance is needed in linguistic usage as English is needed internationally, but the question is how far English is being used in domestic areas which are best served by the national language. English seems to be like fire – great for cooking with, but terrible when it burns down the house. I conclude the discussion by looking at the benefits and costs of EMI and English usage at Norwegian HEIs in turn; at the international/national, HEI level and individual level.

Firstly, I think a major winner seems to be capitalism through globalisation and the accompanying internationalisation (Molesworth et al., 2011). Thus market values based on the EU free market for goods and services have entered education with Bologna, and in so doing have turned education into a commodity. International trade could be heightened for Norway because of English skills; but it does not have to be through EMI. The increased use of English seems to be making English more prolific as is seen in the amount of English used in the EU and in commerce.

National educational policies repeat those values with rankings and the accompanying finance and prestige for HEIs result in educational hierarchies (Giroux, 2004). The role of the HEI is changed from a public institution for debate and critical thinking, into one in a system that financially rewards HEI for the number of students on exchange programmes and rankings that measure the amount of EMI courses. HEI management possibly gain with more administrative positions and seem to increase their power in encouraging faculties to have EMI courses.

Academic mobility is beneficial for HEIs, both to and from Norway, to increase expertise, particularly in the sciences and small niche fields. Entry into CoPs appears to be facilitated and allows the interest and diversity of an international classroom. Local and international students are benefitting from opportunities to study abroad with their overseas course accepted by their parent institution.
(Doiz et al., 2013). Individual self-fulfilment might be at the cost of the group and English is gaining ground at the cost of Norwegian.

Nationally Norwegian seems to be losing out because English is entering more areas of Norwegian life including education. Lack of journal articles and course material written in Norwegian, as well as the inability of academics to express themselves in Norwegian to the public are all leading to a lack of free choice and are causing concern for the Norwegian language. The policy of parallel languages is in doubt if international staff are not learning Norwegian, and democracy in the workplace for Norwegians seems to be reduced when internal communication in HEIs is in English.

My research started with the teachers’ situation, and they do seem to be paying the highest price for EMI, particularly those from the humanities. EMI involves much extra work and the management seem to place more importance on rankings than on dialogue with the academic staff. It seems most probable that teaching is not improved by EMI, yet the management do not invest in language and pedagogy PD to ameliorate the situation. A lack of dialogic teaching makes co-constructed learning difficult and transformative pedagogy more difficult to achieve, consequently, the students might not be getting the best possible education.
CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSION, CONTRIBUTIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

Concluding this critical exploration into the effect of EMI on teaching academic subjects at HEIs in Norway, I want to link back to the research questions in the conclusion (7.1), explain firstly the theoretical (7.2) and secondly the pedagogic contributions (7.3), before moving on to implications for practice (7.4), then the recommendations (7.5), which is divided into institutions (7.5.1), teachers (7.5.2) and language (7.5.3). I suggest further research (7.6), and then end with my reflections (7.7) on this research journey.

7.1 Conclusion

RQ1 deals with the participants’ reaction and attitudes to EMI and English usage. They seem generally to accept the top-down decision making by the administration on the increase of EMI and English usage. Policies of internationalisation stated in Bologna and national policies combined with the power of English seem to result in adoption of accommodation strategies. The change in the role of the HEIs influenced by commodification does not seem to bring about counterarguments questioning neo-liberalism in HEIs.

Although there are some signs of opposition by the social sciences, they seem to be disempowered, especially when many in the more prestigious sciences actively embraced English and some want English as the working language in HEIs. Men from all disciplines are generally more positive to English than women, and more accepting of English publishing and textbook usage. This division is also reflected in concerns about Norwegian domain loss. Internally, there are different levels of acceptance, e.g. to give an international milieu to local students, and rejection, e.g. at meetings in English. Nevertheless whatever their attitude, all the participants had a desire to be as successful as possible in EMI and they worked very hard to ensure their success in this environment, despite not always being given sufficient time, resources and preparation for EMI by their HEIs.

RQ 2 covers the practice of EMI with the underlying uncertainty of possible deterioration in teaching quality. What I mainly found was that the participants felt they always wanted to be better at English; especially in grammar, pronunciation and terminology. However, they seemed unaware of the
pragmatic level of communication required for teaching and did not recognise the necessity of pedagogic training for EMI. Despite this lack of training they adapted to multi-cultural/lingual classrooms in a pragmatic manner, but were not given spaces for counter-pedagogies, critical pedagogy and the ideals of the transformative intellectual. The social sciences and teacher training participants were particularly concerned with the lack of Norwegian textbooks for the Bachelor programmes where teaching is in Norwegian with the use of English language materials. Externally, all the participants were pleased to be involved in their CoP and found this international connection more congenial than the domestic EMI environment.

I would say that my research concludes with five areas of concern:

a) inadequate English language at the pragmatic level for the demands of EMI resulting in poorer communication
b) inadequate pedagogic skills for the multi-lingual and -cultural classroom resulting in poorer teaching
c) concern over local and international students’ level of English resulting in poorer learning
d) standardized, Anglo/American teaching materials leading to a lack of diversity and critical approaches, and
e) the threat to academic Norwegian from international academics not learning Norwegian, the publishing reward system at HEIs and the perceived status of English and less dissemination to the general public.

Juxtaposed to the above are the positive aspects the participants experience of internationalisation in the classroom and their good reception in academic CoP resulting in an ambivalent attitude to EMI.

7.2 Contribution to theory

The value of my theoretical framework is that it is the first time exploratory and critical paradigms are combined in an EMI context in Norway in a small qualitative study focusing on academics’ opinions and practice, and their interpretation of their EMI situation. In acknowledging the many socially constructed realities involved and the multi-layered understanding of the participants’ world, the symbolic interaction constructs rich descriptions of my subjects’ situation. However, as I am not entirely neutral with my critical agenda,
so Schostak and Schostak’s (2008) methodological interdisciplinary approach of radical research is valuable for the political and social context and how this affects individuals’ voice and agency. Consequently, I can focus on power, democracy, justice, inclusion and employ emancipatory practice to the research.

The critical component is continued into linguistics by drawing on CALx theories (Pennycook, 2001) in problematizing givens and challenging assumptions, and in questioning the role of English in a moral and ethical light. Phillipson’s (1992, 2009b) theories of linguistic imperialism add to this perspective informing on globalisation and the spread of English. Thus, I have increased critical understanding of the interaction between micro and macro environments and questioned the nature of EMI education.

In EMI research more generally my research framework is a distinctive contribution to empirical research as it combines the above theories with three very effective theories. Firstly, postmodernism helps me question assumptions and open up to different ways of seeing and dealing with the participants’ worlds. It marries well with the critical paradigm in the critique of official knowledge and is useful in the sphere of human interaction within education. Secondly, Bourdieu’s theory of habitus is invaluable in understanding relationships of status and power in the context. Thirdly, Wenger’s theory on CoP underpins ideas on the participants’ relationships with their international discipline. The adoption and combination of these theories in my context have added breadth to inform and enrich my study.

The valuable contribution to empirical research on this topic is due to the varied and rich theoretical framework which critically questions EMI values and qualities. As far as I know, no critical work has been carried out solely on Scandinavian lecturers’ perceptions, so it contrasts and complements the Norwegian qualitative studies mainly on students (Schwach, 2009), a case study on an HEI department (Ljosland, 2008) and quantitative work by Hellekjær (2007 & 2010). This exploratory critical study fills a gap, in looking at four very different HEIs, with 20 interviews and five observations from diverse participants and in using this distinctive theoretical framework provides a refreshing angle on the everyday perspectives and practices of the participants.
7.3 Contribution to pedagogy

This study provides an interesting and unusual contribution to the field of EMI research, in that it takes into account the socio-economic climate and juxtaposes it with Vygotsky’s theories of socio-cultural learning and critical pedagogy. It is the links and gaps between the chosen aspects of these theories that enrich the study, and some of which have previously been used in a TESOL context, (Troudi, 2005) but not in EMI. The tough financial criteria for HEIs in Norway require seats to be filled and revenue produced. EMI can be seen as a solution to internationalisation in a neo-liberal educational climate which seems to be resulting in standardised teaching. However, my pedagogical framework wants to investigate and highlight alternatives through using the above pedagogic theories.

Firstly, socio-cultural learning requires a congenial work environment for engagement with the students’ ZPD, and uses the tools of language and textbooks for successful learning. The collaborative and transformative way in which knowledge is co-constructed leads to problem solving, critical thinking and then independent learning can occur. Secondly, critical pedagogy has informed my pedagogical framework by perceiving teaching as a moral act (Johnston, 2003) and with a responsibility to develop students’ voice and critical thinking (Giroux, 1988). Johnston’s (2003) pragmatic view of critical pedagogy has been more realistic than Freier’s (1972) emancipatory pedagogy in my context. In connecting beliefs and values to practice, two aspects of critical pedagogy, reflective practice and transformative educator, inform my study. The greatest influence has been Giroux (1988, 1997) and his principles of transformative educator to give voice and agency to my participants. I also embrace the Outer Circles’ coping strategies to contain the power of English (Canagarajah, 1999), which could inform the Peripheral Circle

7.4 Implications for my practice

I would like my teaching philosophy to be underpinned by critical pedagogy in believing that teaching English is a socio-political issue (Canagarajah, 1999; Rajagopalan, 1999) and when preparing academic staff for EMI I will create an atmosphere for questioning globalization and the role of English as a lingua-franca. I want to empower my students by trusting them to take responsibility and not do them a disservice by strong top-down classroom management. They
can be empowered by me sharing power in the classroom; my students are professional adults. Benesch’s (2001) requirements analysis would be a beginning to aid inclusion and voice. Time can also be given in lessons to allow students to reflect on values and beliefs, as well as keeping journals and bringing up relevant topics in class.

By accepting and appreciating the students as they are, Bourdieu’s theories on habitus and symbolic capital can be helpful in empowering them. It also helps me understand why despite having learnt the linguistic skills of Standard English from their community of practice, some aspects of their habitus are not given symbolic value. By rarely using Norwegian in the classroom I have endorsed concepts behind linguistic imperialism; I can easily use Norwegian for class administration, thus giving the students the example of experiencing a non-Norwegian managing in her L2. I now realise that global EAP literature gives a stereotype picture of NNSs, and I can use more authentic material from my context. I can produce more of my own teaching materials to endorse my student’s cultural capital and link more directly to what I see in the observations.

Concerning teaching methods and if and how to teach Standard English, I am still thinking through how to deal with the communicative method and the emphasis on appropriacy and what this means in a larger context. This is part of an on-going reflection that is being incorporated into my practice. However, there are many practical skills I can incorporate into teaching. I can focus on meaning rather than grammar and draw attention to different ELF varieties of English. I would like to work more closely with departments, develop projects with teachers and students and include some CLIL techniques as in Sweden (Bergman & Eriksson, 2013) to enhance engagement and communication in English.

### 7.5 Recommendations

Recommendations must take into account the HEIs’ international climate of work that is framed and executed in global competition and English usage, and with the resultant hegemonic patterns of knowledge production. I want to put forward realistic solutions for some of the dissatisfaction identified by my participants and for their concerns for Norwegian. Although the HEIs do not have the freedom to opt out of international and national policies that clamp
them into a system of rankings and quantitative assessments, I would suggest that in this time of great socio-lingual change, the administration’s main job is to create the best conditions and motivational environment for the staff to perform to their best and enable students to achieve their potential. The quality and satisfaction of the staff are the HEI’s greatest asset; by whatever method they are measured.

7.5.1 Institutions
Institutions should recognize that EMI involves more than just changing to English, and concerns on the amount and standard of EMI courses could be focussed on, not just considerations for quantitative rankings. Increased dialogue between administrative staff and academics should explore the challenges. The administration seem to endorse Crystal’s (1997) pragmatic approach to EAP, with more and more administration and documents in English, without thinking of the consequences of loss of domain for Norwegian. Therefore, I hope that my research can inform HEI administrations, so that they listen to their academic staff, but also will inform the Ministry for Higher Education of the grassroots perceptions and practices resulting from the major commercial and linguistic changes in HEIs. Give the teachers space for their voices to be heard and do not rely so heavily on quantitative questionnaires could be a beginning. This section covers three areas directly in the HEIs domain: PD, student admissions and EMI, and application of socio-linguistic demands required of international staff.

7.5.1.1 Professional development
HEIs can facilitate teacher agency and job satisfaction with a wide variety of PD from training courses to time and space for informal collegial collaboration that are supportive to their working context (Zhang & Hu, 2010). The HEI’s have a responsibility to give cultural, language and pedagogic preparation to all of their staff (Grimshaw, 2011). PD should cover both English and Norwegian skills (and maybe other languages) for all staff as recommended in Oslo University College (Gulden, 2011).

I think the most successful PD occurs when individual teachers choose their own type and form of PD in their own context. For some, space, time and resources for reflection, exploring values and beliefs or for preparation for EMI
lectures at an individual level may be sufficient. For others, collegial discussions for learning from one another about critical incidents, peer-observation or mentoring, and coaching could be useful. Action research projects could be developed with encouragement from the administration and the possible promulgation of experience and results could help others (McNiff & Whitehead, 2006).

At a more formal level language and pedagogic courses need to develop from the traditional EAP format to include more critical aspects (Benesch, 2001) e.g. using ELF concepts on gaining familiarity and knowledge of speakers other than NSs and using local authentic EAP material. Needs analysis and course planning from the teachers is necessary.

A big change could come in acknowledging the status of the HEIs’ English teachers who teach EMI, e.g. permanent tenure and the possibility of research fellowships in EAP. English departments often regard the role of EAP as demeaning, but by offering research driven teaching, and credit bearing English language courses on PhD and Norwegian Higher Education Pedagogic programmes, EAP could gain credibility and influence in the implementation of EMI.

In Copenhagen University all Danish teachers go through an accreditation course for using EMI (Kling, 2012). The encouraging and supportive manner in which necessary training is given to allow everyone the language and pedagogic help needed to manage EMI is commendable. Pedagogic skills could be achieved through voluntary courses, but this model functions well. In my context I would also recommend that international staff should be accredited to teach in Norwegian after three years. It was refreshing to see the equality in status and value of all teachers in Gothenburg with the inclusive CLIL preparation of lessons where the content and the language teachers bring together many excellent pedagogic techniques to facilitate learning in the EMI classroom (Bergman & Eriksson, 2013).

Some HEIs provide proof reading services, however I think this is generally insufficient without individual interactive, pedagogic feedback on language and rhetorical structures; information on proof reading programs on the Internet could be more useful and resources directed to other PD. HEIs could invest in
language centres and set up interactive Intranet pages with links to relevant Internet pages (Clark, 2013).

7.5.1.2 Students’ competencies
Although HEIs need to fill up seats in the classroom, they should recognise that the English language admission criteria are not always in alignment with the real academic demands for students. It is a big jump for students from school English to EAP and more language provision should be made for unprepared international and local students. HEIs have a responsibility to provide Norwegian and English courses and study skill courses, e.g. for coping with Anglo/American rhetoric in textbooks. I can again endorse the actions of Oslo University College in starting workshops and student mentoring (Patel, 2012).

7.5.1.3 International staff
For the sake of Norwegian and local staff the administration should make clear that English monolingualism is unacceptable, and that bilingualism is the default position (Phillipson, 2009a). The democratic principles for Norwegian staff could be strengthened by enforcing regulations on international staff’s contracts for Norwegian competency after three years and giving opportunity and encouragement to learn Norwegian. Then they would be able to also take their fair share of faculty administrative duties required of academics. HEIs should not change to English at faculty and institution meetings, but translation into English if and when necessary. Care should be taken in avoiding the increase in administration and documents in English, without thinking of the consequences of loss of domain for Norwegian.

7.5.2 Norwegian teaching academics
The participants’ language concerns on grammar and pronunciation seem unfounded, and it is unfortunate that many believe in chasing NS norms. Their quest for NS ideals, perhaps relating to status within academia, and relating to their sense of identity is a hard state of mind to shift, but I want to encourage ELF concepts such as being satisfied with Norwegian-English. PD can provide the pragmatic language skills required for lecturing and the Norwegian Language Council needs to begin their work on translation of academic terms to allow confidence and fluency with terminology. I recommend efforts being put
into pedagogic competency for the multi-cultural classroom to create the engagement required for favourable learning environments (See 7.4.1.1).

7.5.3 Language
The acceptance of the demands of France to protect cultural services from the EU trade negotiations with the USA (Lewis, 2013) gives a clear indication that the values behind ensuring languages diversity are separate from those of tradable commodities. The power of English and Anglo/American culture is such that minority languages need nurturing; so, although they are invaluable socially and culturally, it costs to allow a minority language to develop (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Translation can be increased of some textbooks into Norwegian and funds can be invested in academics writing their own university textbooks (Troudi, 2007). Norway understands this in the film industry (2013), e.g. subsidies of over USD 34 million in 2013, but I do not believe the full impact of EMI on academic Norwegian has been understood. It is not a question of ‘preserving’ Norwegian, but to allow the language to live and develop, which need funding from the State and HEIs.

7.5.3.1 Domain loss
Practical measures to prevent academic domain loss at HEIs have been mentioned above in the form of courses, use of technology and language culture. Awareness-raising of HEI language policies, including parallel language policies, can develop a culture of language mindfulness. Staff can recommend not having an EMI programme, or having it as an additional programme to a Norwegian one. Learning to write good Norwegian for the next generation of students requires having good models of discipline narrative in teaching material. The Bachelor courses taught in Norwegian very often use Anglo/American textbooks which might have the advantage of students learning some terminology, but many students are choosing not to read the books (Shaw & McMillion, 2008). Therefore, the state should give resources and professional credit to academics to write Norwegian textbooks for first and second year university students. Additional resources should be given for the Norwegian accompanying web materials to make them more attractive to busy academics.
Domain loss is unquestionable caused by the Tellekant system of rewarding academics publishing in prestige English journals (Ljosland, 2008). Professional credit and acknowledgement need to be given for writing in Norwegian for a wide range of domestic outlets, e.g. newspaper articles, or informing the local community about research and activities. The role of the public intellectual (Giroux, 2012) needs to be encouraged for democracy of knowledge in the community and to create a climate of interest in academia.

7.6 Further research
The current study has highlighted many themes from the teaching academics’ point of view about the changes in culture and language which are occurring inside and outside Norwegian HEIs. Further qualitative research could investigate macro themes, e.g. power and language, or on a micro level, e.g. how teaching academics enter their discipline CoP. However, as a practitioner, the most valuable research would be further investigating the pedagogy of EMI. Most studies on EMI are from the students’ perspective (Airey & Linder, 2006; Hellekjær, 2010a), so exploring and critiquing the success of the social and learning outcomes in the auditorium from both the teachers’ and the students’ perspectives would be valuable; in particular, focusing on the humanities for whom the language burden of EMI can be challenging.

The increase in EMI courses in Europe calls for comparative studies for which my data could contribute in understanding the Norwegian teachers’ experience. A case study developing Ljosland’s thesis (2008) would be valuable in charting the development of the effect of EMI on a department in a Norwegian HEI. In addition working closely with Norwegian researchers on HEI administration could give a fuller picture of the role of English in changes in HEIs (Kyvik, 2002).

Politicians often need statistics to aid them in making changes, so quantitative research could be used to investigate the prevalence of some of my identified themes in Norway. Generally, further studies in Norway and Scandinavia are required to investigate the long-term educational changes brought about by EMI to teachers, students and teaching. EMI is a new issue for education and the public, and a fuller understanding of the benefits and the challenges can inform the debate and possibly bring change.
7.7 Reflections

This study has been born out of my own EAP experience of training teaching academics for EMI and a desire to gain insight into their attitudes and practices so that I might be able to meet their EMI needs more closely in the future. I wanted to link theory to my practice with the desire to understand my teaching situation more deeply. To understand my journey I must explain my starting point.

I come from a traditional EAP teaching background, where my purpose was to transfer linguistic knowledge to my course participants as efficiently as possible. I maintained that if they were motivated they would learn sufficient English to cope in their EMI situation, for I did not consider how the classroom and participants are connected socially, politically and culturally to the outside world. If I think back I was not very democratic in just taking the power and responsibility for steering my students to a narrow form of EAP competency. My quest in teaching appropriate, Standard NS English gave little consideration to L1 and none to cultural identity. Now I realise their training will be more useful and successful if they gain agency to take action for themselves. I want to provide space for them to acquire their own opinions on EMI, and I have no desire to foist my own agenda from the past or present on them.

My introduction to critical issues as an option on the TESOL doctorate was an awakening to the complicated and controversial aspects of EFL. During my personal journey I have tried to be critical of theories and ideas, open-minded to solutions and not underestimate Western capitalism’s strangle-hold on the academia that we are so proud of in our “free world”. However, in hindsight I could have been more critical to CALx, but having once embraced the concepts I felt I had an agenda for change in EMI in Norway. I realise it is not sufficient to teach and research without desiring a change towards more social justice and equality. My teaching and personal philosophy have been inspired by values and beliefs expressed by Freire, Pennycook, Phillipson, Canagarajah and most of all by Giroux. My practical skills of project management have been developed by Exeter University Gradskills courses, and my self-knowledge has been strengthened by the process of writing this thesis. I was surprised how lonely research is and I often have to dig deep into my personal reserves.
The most challenging part was the methodology concerning data management and analysis. I had difficulty controlling my vast amount of data, and was exhausted from dealing with data categories that proved too descriptive and difficult to link to the research question. Next time I will think more abstractly for categories and separate the data management from the data analysis. I think I categorised too early and was not sufficiently disciplined in following up themes that would answer the research questions, which lead to having so many themes in different sections that I had to separate findings and discussion. However, in the discussion the three important themes and sub-themes came to me quickly and then I patiently matched my findings with the literature and tried to develop my voice about the different phenomena. Again, much to think about, but this time in a meaningful, deep, quiet way to find out how I could carry the themes of the findings into the discussion in a profound and coherent manner.

After 30 years teaching I feel so privileged to have had time and resources to reflect and think about my practice. It is perhaps only in Norway that a practitioner like myself would be invested in for a professional doctorate. One of the reasons my employers gave was that they believed in the opportunity for self-realisation for all of their staff. That generous principle will be repaid many times when I return to work with new ideas and energy, and my EAP teaching will be research-based. However, it is not only my professional life that has been enriched for I realise that everything is connected.

I have become quite radical from my Royal Navy background. The connections I am making between politics and the Arts keep emerging in my mind. For example when reading Malcolm X’s famous references to house slaves and field slaves I have felt parallels can be drawn with the house slaves as NS and field slaves as NNS, and the fact that we are both slaves is because of the tyranny of linguistic imperialism with the English language caused by Western interests. In addition, in an open art lecture at the university I saw Fougeron’s (1913-98) picture (overleaf) and could not stop looking at it. The more I looked the more I saw that related to inequality, disempowerment and effects of capitalism on which I was working.
Even listening to music whilst typing, particularly modern minimalistic music of Phillip Glass, has inspired me to take a critical stance and has linked past knowledge to a new understanding. Appreciating the different thinking behind John Cage’s (1912-1992) “4’33’” (1952) links to concepts in postmodernism and really challenges concepts of the performers and the audience’s role in music; silence can be a ‘voice’ for the powerful, and even a loud voice for the disempowered is useless if it is not heard.

In one of my assignments I used Robert Graves’s poem “In Broken Images” (2013) and I want to use it now as it has the same relevance to the cyclic process of my thoughts as I struggle with my understanding of new concepts:
“He is quick, thinking in clear images;  
I am slow, thinking in broken images.

He becomes dull, trusting to his clear images;  
I become sharp, mistrusting my broken images.

Trusting his images, he assumes their relevance;  
Mistrusting my images, I question their relevance.

Assuming their relevance, he assumes the fact;  
Questioning their relevance, I question their fact.

When the fact fails him, he questions his senses;  
When the fact fails me, I approve my senses.

He continues quick and dull in his clear images;  
I continue slow and sharp in my broken images.

He in a new confusion of his understanding;  
I in a new understanding of my confusion.”

I take both “he” and “I” as both parts of me and this is the process I’ve been through and the last line reflects where I am now. When I chose to study at Exeter University it was partly because I was going to be a student in the School of Education and Life-Long Learning (now Graduate School of Education to reflect employability no doubt) and my process of learning is indeed going to be life-long.

I would like to conclude my thesis in acknowledging the insight that it has brought to my life by reflecting on T S Eliot’s words from *Little Gidding* in *Four Quartets* as I feel I have returned to my starting point with new insight and “know the place for the first time” in the words of T S Eliot (2001):

“We shall not cease from exploration  
And the end of all our exploring  
Will be to arrive where we started  
And know the place for the first time.”
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Appendix 1 – Example of part of my EAP course for EMI preparation

XXXX – ORAL ACADEMIC ENGLISH COURSE

SUMMER 20XX

Ideas for the Course

Here are some ideas that we could use as a basis for discussions at our first lesson on Friday 29 April. This is just to get something down on paper and, of course, everything is open to negotiation.

Aim

To give a thorough grounding in oral communication skills essential for academic English in higher education (lecturing and leading seminars) and the secondary aim is to improve general English oral fluency.

By the end of the course you will be competent and confident about:

1. speaking English in an academic environment
2. giving a lecture in English
3. leading a seminar in English, and
4. understanding cross-cultural communication.

Methodology

Emphasis is placed on giving the participants the opportunity to practise the language actively. It is envisaged that two- and ten-minute presentations will be given to camera by each of the students and role-play will form a key part of the seminar training. Different learning and teaching strategies will be investigated to suit the needs of the students.

Course Material

After the first session tailor-made course material will be written and videos and cassettes /CDs collected, but most of the material will probably be from the participants’ own discipline.

Language

Apart from the first lesson when the course content is discussed, the course will be conducted entirely in English. Vocabulary and phrases from academic life will be introduced in a systematic manner and grammar problems will be taken up as they arise in the class.

Classes

There will be eight participants on each course and teaching will take place on Fridays starting on 29 April. Several of you have difficulties attending all the sessions, so we can be flexible about the Fridays and perhaps meet on another day, divide up into smaller groups or have individual sessions on different dates. At the moment the dates look like this for the beginning of the course:
29 April, 6 May, 13 May, 20 May (possibly not as this looks like a bad day for quite a few of you and me), 3 June,

The last couple of sessions are in small groups or individual, so we can arrange some convenient dates in June.

The classes will be held in building 46 (the one with the clock outside it) room 209. The sessions will be from 0900 to 1145 for the morning group and from 1215-1500 for the afternoon group (three times 45 minutes (with a couple of fifteen-minute breaks in between) for the first four sessions, then for session five the group is divided in half and there will be individual feedback when convenient.

Course Content

On the next page there are some suggestions for the contents of the course based on previous courses. What do you think? What are your needs?

Miscellaneous

There is no formal “homework” other than preparing lectures and looking at the next lesson (and perhaps looking over the previous lesson). If time is precious, even spending 10 minutes on the next lesson’s material is invaluable. I am very happy to mark any written work for your lectures (particularly PowerPoint slides).

I do recommend reading an English book during the course and I could bring some in for you to choose from in the first lesson. Listening to the BBC World Service or Voice of America to hear the news can also be useful.

The sessions can feel rather long sometimes, so I would suggest that we have coffee/tea from the staff-dining hall for our breaks for the first three sessions. It will cost NOK 5, - per session - I hope that’s a good idea.

In conclusion, it is most important that you enjoy your English lessons, feel you are making progress and feel confident about using English in the work place, so if there is anything you want to change or adapt during the course just say so.

Lizzie Griffiths,

English Lecturer

P.S. If you need to get in contact with me, my e-mail address is:

XXXX

my home telephone number is:

XXX
Suggestions for the Oral Academic English Course – Summer 20XX

The idea is to have three areas of study: lectures, seminars and cross-cultural communication. I don't know what you think about this use of time for the sessions – it's just a suggestion so please come with any ideas for topics that would be useful for you (perhaps some special things you have to do in your job).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday 29 April</th>
<th>Friday 6 May</th>
<th>Friday 13 May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning</td>
<td>- Introductions</td>
<td>- Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Introductions</td>
<td>- Meeting &amp; Greeting</td>
<td>- Video 2-min. beginning of lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic vocabulary (diag. test)</td>
<td>- Introductions</td>
<td>- Class feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thoughts about lecturing in English</td>
<td>- Voc. from academic life (voc. test &amp; film)</td>
<td>- Voc. from academic life (XX film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Books, videos, newspapers, etc.</td>
<td>- Some helpful hints for language learning</td>
<td>- Lecture work – structure, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cross-cultural communication – How do others see us?</td>
<td>- Lecture work</td>
<td>- Cross-cultural comm. (game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cross-cultural communication</td>
<td>- Seminar work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seminar Techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday 20 May (?)</th>
<th>Friday 3 June</th>
<th>Thursday 7 June (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mingling</td>
<td>(Divide group) Video lectures (with questions) and feedback</td>
<td>Individual feedback with video (25/30 mins. each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lecture work – language work, tackling questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic vocabulary (diag. test)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seminar work (role play)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voc. from academic life (game)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- News discussion (film)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Oral English

Programme for the First Session

I. Planning
   - Course ideas (attachment to e-mail 23/4)
   - Some pedagogic principles

II. Introductions
- Teacher/Participants/each other/problems
- Some phrases that could be useful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom, this is Jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie, do you know Sevleta?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne, have you met Maria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I introduce you to Mark Daniels our Head of Department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d like you to meet …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you Ms Betty Peters by any chance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You must be Gunter Schmidt?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentioning common interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think you both know Svein-Olav from the University of York.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- both like skiing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are both interested in the new project at Newcastle University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice to meet you.</td>
<td>Well, I really must be going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a pleasure.</td>
<td>Anyway, I’ll see you soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased to meet you too.</td>
<td>Hope to see you again soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you do?</td>
<td>It was nice meeting you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was good to see you again.</td>
<td>(Source: based on Market Leader p.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Academic vocabulary (diag. test)
– Vocabulary from the academic world (diagnostic test returned)

VI. Lecture techniques
1. What are the purposes of lectures?
2. What makes a lecture effective?
3. What is the worst lecture you have ever experienced?
4. Even experienced lecturers can make mistakes. Can you give any examples from first-hand knowledge?

- Type of Language:

Complete the following lecture excerpts with suitable words from the boxes. This is straight from my Master's dissertation and could perhaps be from a paper delivered at a conference, more than from a lecture at college, but we can begin with this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-14</th>
<th>15-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After that</td>
<td>indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally</td>
<td>talked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To start with</td>
<td>You will notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifically</td>
<td>draw your attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outline</td>
<td>interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring you up to date</td>
<td>expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illustrate</td>
<td>move on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then</td>
<td>referring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thank</td>
<td>In conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum up</td>
<td>priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describe</td>
<td>recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tell you</td>
<td>pointed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concluding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Good afternoon, everybody, I’d like to (1) .................. you all for being here.’

‘My (2)................. today is to (3)................. about my research into the first encounter, and, more (4) .............., to ................. with my recent research on miscommunication during the first encounter due to cross-cultural misunderstandings.’

(6)............ I’d like to (7)................. briefly the context of the first encounters. (8)................. I’ll (9)............... some of the problems arising from culturally specific politeness principles according to Lakoff. (10).................I’ll (11) ............. the type of
language used and the role of silence in this kind of communication. (12)........... I'll quickly (13) ........... before (14).............. with some recommendations that could be helpful for our language learners.'

'Please feel free to (15)............. me if you have any questions at any time.'

'Now I’d like to (16)............. to graph B showing the frequency of question tags in the native speakers dialogue compared to the non-native speaker. (17)............... that the native speaker uses this involvement strategy 50 per cent more often during the dialogues than the non-native speaker.'

'I've (18) ........... about the linguistic difficulties with the first encounter and I've (19) ............. some of the problems non-native speakers are facing. Well, what (20) ............. do our students have with the language of the first encounter? Once they are aware of the situation where do they go from here?'

'As I have already (21) ..........., I think the first (22).......... is gaining awareness of the situation. I'm (23) ............ of course, just to Lakoff's politeness principles. Let me quickly (24) ............. on these principles before we (25) ..............'

'I strongly (26) .......... we put our efforts into further research into this problem in the first encounter.'

'(27)...................... , may I thank you all for being such an attentive and responsive audience. Thank you for your pertinent questions. Are there any final questions?'

Answers:

1. thank 13. sum up 25. move on
2. purpose 14. concluding 26. recommend
3. tell you 15. interrupt 27. In conclusion
4. specifically 16. draw your attention
5. bring you up to date 17. You will notice
6. To start with 18. talked
7. describe 19. pointed out
8. Then 20. options
9. illustrate 21. indicated
10. After that 22. priority
11. outline 23. referring
12. Finally 24. expand

Based on an idea from Cotton, D. & Robbins, S, Business Class, Longman 1993
VII. Books, videos, newspapers, etc.

- See Appendix I

VIII. Cross-cultural communication

- See Appendix II
- Stereotypes - danger
- Other people’s opinion of Norwegians?
- Typically Norwegian?
- Game (if time)

Homework for the third session (Friday 13 May):

Preparing a two-minute introduction from one of your lectures. (Videoing facilities will be available.)

Sources:
Cotton, D & Robbins, S Business Class Longman 1997
Evans, D, Powerhouse Longman 2000
Stott, R et al. Speaking your Mind Longman 2001
## Appendix 2 – List of Participants

### List of interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ac dis</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Level taught</th>
<th>EMI competence</th>
<th>Judge EAP competence</th>
<th>EAP course taken</th>
<th>Att to dom loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Vocational Uni</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øystein</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bach, Mast + PhD</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Not concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silje</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Vocational Uni</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Vocational Uni</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>No wanted to</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Technological Uni</td>
<td>Bach and Mast</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No wanted to</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>above 60</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freya*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idun*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siv*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signe*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>above 60</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bach and Mast</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knut</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Master + PhD</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leidul</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Sports Sci</td>
<td>Vocational Uni</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>No wanted to</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingvald</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Technological Uni</td>
<td>Master + PhD</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audun</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Technological Uni</td>
<td>Bach, Mast + PhD</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Technological Uni</td>
<td>Master + PhD</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>No wanted to</td>
<td>Not concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Vocational Uni</td>
<td>Master + PhD</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No not wanted</td>
<td>Not concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sverre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Sports Sci</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No wanted to</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* participants with observations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R Q</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain purpose of research</td>
<td>- Age?</td>
<td>- Discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal level of English?</td>
<td>- Years teaching at uni.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Years teaching EMI? Courses teaching EMI?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 1.</td>
<td>What is the situation at your institution concerning English language usage?</td>
<td>- Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tasks</td>
<td>- International staff (learn Nor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language policy (parallel)</td>
<td>- Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 2.</td>
<td>When is English used at your HEI? (When have you used English outside the auditorium at your HEI?)</td>
<td>- Formal/informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Types of courses</td>
<td>- Amount in courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attitude</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 3.</td>
<td>Who decides if a course is to be taught in English?</td>
<td>- Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attitude</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 4.</td>
<td>How has EMI been implemented?</td>
<td>- Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increments</td>
<td>- Ratio Nor/Eng courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Certification?</td>
<td>- Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 5.</td>
<td>How are you using English in your teaching?</td>
<td>- Amount?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal/formal</td>
<td>- Types of tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the Auditorium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 6.</td>
<td>What preparation have you received before teaching an EMI course?</td>
<td>- Courses, certification, feedback, improvements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transferable skills</td>
<td>- English language impr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 7.</td>
<td>How competent do you feel when using EMI?</td>
<td>- International auditorium, pedagogic challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 8.</td>
<td>In what other academic situations do you use English for your work?</td>
<td>Reading/conferences/publishing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attitude</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 1.2 2, 2.2 /3 9.</td>
<td>How do you feel about your own experience of EMI?</td>
<td>- Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 10.</td>
<td>What do you feel about English usage generally at your university?</td>
<td>- Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Power</td>
<td>- Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 11.</td>
<td>What challenges and benefits have you experienced with EMI and general academic English usage?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Are there any other comments on this area that you’d like to add?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 – Copy of e-mail asking for an interview and consent form

Request for interviews

1. My initial e-mail asking for permission to interview (and translation)

>Hei,
>Jeg heter Elizabeth Griffiths, og har undervist akademisk engelsk på X i mange år, men nå holder jeg med på en doktoravhandling med Exeter University om norske akademikeres erfaring og holding med å bruke engelsk i undervisningssituasjoner (se problemstilling nedenfor).
>
>I den forbindelse, har jeg veldig lyst til å intervju noen akademikere fra XX som har undervist sitt fag på engelsk. Jeg vet at det er en travel tid for dere med studieoppstarten, men jeg ville vært svært takknemlig å kunne intervju noen på slutt av august når jeg er i XXX. Det ville bare ta 45 minutter, og jeg kan komme ut til høyskolen.
>
>Håper på et positivt svar.
>
>Mvh
>Elizabeth Griffiths
>
>Problemstillingen:
>
>1. How do Norwegian university lecturers react to the implementation of a policy of English as the medium of instruction (EMI) for their programmes?
>1.1 How are they currently using EMI in their teaching and in other academic situations?
>1.2 What is their attitude to the usage of EMI?
>2. How have these lecturers been prepared for the implementation of this policy and how do they cope?
>2.1 How do the lecturers judge their EAP language competence?
>2.2 How do they feel about their preparation for using EMI?
>2.3 What are their perceptions of their own experience of using EMI?

Translation of e-mail:

Hello, 
My name is Elizabeth Griffiths, and I have taught academic English at X for many years, but now I’m working on a professional doctorate at Exeter University researching Norwegian teaching academics experience and attitude to using English for teaching (see research questions below).

Therefore, I would really like to interview some academics from XX who have taught their subjects in English. I know it’s a busy time for you with the beginning of the semester, but I would be very grateful to be able to interview some staff at the end of August, when I’m in XXX. It would only take 45 minutes, and I can come up to the university college. Hoping for a positive response.

Best regards,
2. Exeter consent form attached to e-mail

CONSENT FORM

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project.

I understand that:

there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation

I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me

any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications

If applicable, the information which I give may be shared between any of the other researcher(s) participating in this project in an anonymised form

all information I give will be treated as confidential

the researcher(s) will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

(Signature of participant)    (Date)

(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher(s)

Contact phone number of researcher(s): 00447547547656 or 004797156674

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact:

Elizabeth J Griffiths, Doctoral Student in Education, St Luke’s Campus, Heavitree Road, Exeter, UK EX1 2LU
OR
Dr Salah Troudi, TESOL/Dubai EdD Programme Coordinator, Exeter University, St Luke’s Campus, Heavitree Road, Exeter, UK EX1 2LU

Data Protection Act: The University of Exeter is a data collector and is registered with the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as required to do under the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for research purposes and will be processed in accordance with the University’s registration and current data protection legislation. Data will be confidential to the researcher(s) and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties without further agreement by the participant. Reports based on the data will be in anonymised form.
Appendix 5 – Example of an interview transcription, summary and verification

1. Thomas’s interview transcription

Thomas August 2012 Transcription 22.42 mins (L = interviewer, T = interviewee, E = English and N = Norwegian, XXX = Thomas’s institution)

L: (Administration, consent form, can choose between N or E for interview, age:45, years taught HE: 6, EMI: 6. all said in N.)

So let’s begin then, Can you explain in your job when you use E?

T: I use E most of the time, because of most of our Master students speak E, it’s an international programme, where we have roughly let’s say 40% N (Yes), but the programme is basically in E. so I need to speak E to all the international students and whenever I talk to them and then when I teach in class I have to speak E to everybody, even if there are Norwegians, so it’s in the classroom situation and I am also the programme co-ordinator for two of our Master programmes and the PhD programme we have in technology so in these functions I need to speak E most of the time.

L: Could you tell me a bit about the programmes that you work on?

T: Yes, there are two Master programmes, one in process technology and the other one in energy and environmental technology, and then there is a PhD programme on energy, environment and automation engineering, so these are let’s say, very focused on industrial processes and deals with the processes themselves but also environmental matters, energy considerations, pollution and these sorts of things, and also control of these processes.

L: Yes, and why was it decided to use E in these programmes?

T: The reason was that some years ago, well first of all there were these Master programmes which started at X, back in the late 80s, I think the first started in 1988 and there were a lot of students, but towards the end of the 90s, I think the number of students fell drastically; at that time these programmes were N (Yes), so it was a decision from the faculties to just simply to switch to an international, to international programmes at the Master level to get more students, and that was done in 2004 as
far as I know and from then on the number of students has continually increased and now we are back to full classes.

**L:** *Why do you think the Norwegian students reduced in level 10 years ago or so?*

**T:** Probably it was a combination of a quite good market job market, good for Bachelor’s engineers (Yes) those who had taken a three year education, so that was one thing, and another very important thing was that many other university colleges and also universities in Norway started programmes quite similar to the ones we had her in TUC (Yes) so there was a lot of competition, so I think may be these two points.

**L:** Yes, and now what is the ration of N students to International students?

**T:** I think it’s, uhm, if you have a few moments I can check, because I have my file here, yes, ok so that’s 42% then it’s a little bit up and down depending on the year, ok so it’s roughly 40 % N students, and 60% international, possibly a little bit higher last year

**L:** Where do those international students come from?

**T:** It’s, we nearly always have some students from Shri Lanka and China, and Nepal and definitely we have some special agreement with some universities in these countries?

**L:** And is this through UD (The Foreign Office)? Are these students financed by the N government?

**T:** Just a few of them, so most of them come here by themselves and pay for the living and so on, we have every year a few stipends (scholarships) going to students, typically three, four, but the rest of them they have to pay themselves.

**L:** How does XXX recruit these students?

**T:** For the students coming from the institutions that we cooperate with, in China, and Nepal and Shri Lanka and so on, we have a special let’s say, sometimes we go there interview students, we go there to give information about our Master programmes and so on. Foreign students coming from other countries, and we probably have students from 30 different countries, so something like that in the years that I’ve been
here, and I think these students basically find the information on our web pages and things like that. We don’t do anything very active in recruiting these students.

L: And when these students get here is there much difference between the international students’ level of knowledge and the Norwegians?

T: I would say the international students is very wide range of knowledge and skills competence, they are from the very best to quite poor actually (Yes) so it depends very much on which country and also which university they come from in that country, so we have, well for the N students it’s about the same, so we have the entire range, but I would say the most clever students are usually, or the ones with the best grades (Yes) are usually the international students.

L: Yes, and what level of E do they have to have, or what certificates do the international students have to have?

T: They have to have these IELTS tests or certificate, and we require 6.5 as a score there I think to admit them, we have actually changed these requirements more or less every year, or adjust them, so we basically, of course, require that they have the right background whether it is chemical engineering or whatever, things like that and we require that they have some special mathematics background and a few special courses and then it’s of course the language, they need to speak E well, and finally they need to have good grades, so the language requirement has been adjusted from I think from 5.0, which I think is the probably the lowest pass grade the first year I was here, then we increased to 5.6, then 6 so we are up to 6.5 actually last year. Actually we have had an experience that many of them struggled with the E.

L: Yes, I was going to get to that, although they have these IELTS scores how is the communication orally with the international students?

T: Of course many of them are very good and we have no problems, but with some students it seems that they have sometimes trouble understanding the teachers and they have difficulty explaining when actually speaking E, but it’s a little bit that it depends where they are from, I have a feeling that the Chinese students have more problems than other students.

L: Does XXX do anything; put any initiatives in to help this communication?
T: I don’t think so.

L: I was just wondering about when you are teaching in E, do you find any differences between when you are speaking E and N when you are teaching?

T: Not really, there are some N students, most N students are quite good at speaking E I think, but many of them don’t speak that much anyway, and some international students are very good and they speak a lot, it’s actually the entire range among the international students I would think. For the N students it’s not a problem (No) but I have a feeling that some N students are a little bit afraid of going into an E programme so in a way I think that partly explains why there isn’t a higher fraction of the N students here. I’m not sure, but I have a feeling and I’ve heard that from some students, that they would rather go to another university where the programme is in N, they think it’s easier.

L: In the classroom how easy is it to get the students to work together?

T: That is easy; I don’t see that as a problem at all.

L: If you go back to your own experience, what preparation have you had to teach in E, has XXX given you any courses?

T: No

L: Would you like any?

T: Not really, I think that I have my experience from the process industry and an international company, so in a way I get used to E as the working language in that company, and because of that I don’t feel I need any course or things like that.

L: How long were you working in an E language environment in working life.

T: That was eight years

L: Have you had any courses in E since upper secondary school?

T: No

L: So it’s your experience really. If we move out of the classroom and into the institution generally, how much E is used informally in the corridors, or in meetings?
T: In general at the college?

L: If you had a meeting would it be in E?

T: Typically no, typically it would be in N for meetings yes, of course, I have colleagues who don’t speak N and when they are present we probably switch to E, and if I have meetings with students I have every semester at least one meeting with the student and then we speak E of course, but apart from that, when it comes to faculty meetings, these things they are in N.

L: How do you feel about the foreign academics who are not learning N?

T: Whether they start to learn N?

L: Or should they learn N?

T: To a certain extent yes, but sometimes it takes some years,

L: Thinking outside XXX, what settings do you use your E in then, for example conferences?

T: Conferences, yes, research projects, international research projects.

L: What sort of projects are you involved in?

T: I’m involved in, … you see I have a part-time position at a research institute, which we cooperate a lot with in the field of research and in that position I take part in some projects. These are mainly, or very often with industrial partners, usually involving at least one foreign company, yea, could be for example right now I came from a meeting with a French company called X, then of course we speak E in these project meetings.

L: What about written publications, how many would you do of those a year?

T: Well, I would say on average maybe two, yes in E.

L: What sort of help do you have with the language before publishing?

T: No help

L: How do you feel about that?
T: Of course it would be nice to have some expertise available, uhm, in correcting things and so on, but it's not possible, but would be nice.

L: Do you get any feedback that the journals correct the language?

T: Rarely when it comes to language.

L: To finish off, how do you feel generally about the amount of E that is being used in your work?

T: I like it I think it is OK

L: What do you think about the situation for N generally in the technical world?

T: Well, it has probably been replaced more and more, I think so, yes, we tend to switch to E in most situations, so in a way we are getting more and more international, it's always important to have international partners in N projects and these things, so in a way, N is not used a lot.

L: How easy is it to network in E?

T: I think it is fairly easy.

L: And how easy is it to understand Chinese E or is that just the same as other Englishes?

T: Well, that's a point, I think it is well, quite difficult to understand, because the Asian and Chinese students, also actually African students, they usually speak E quite well, but some of them are quite difficult to understand, their pronunciation.

L: Just to finish off have you got any comments generally you'd like to express about the situation of E in N generally?

T: I don't think so, I think for us it's been a good opportunity to survive in a way, so in that sense it's been very good. I also think it's to prepare the students for using E as the working language in different companies, it's actually a good thing, which they,.. they value that when they come through when they are graduated, but in general I feel comfortable with the situation I would say
2. Summary of Thomas’s (No. 8 at the time) interview sent for verification

8 is positive to E usage generally and EMI has enabled his courses to survive and thrive with good student recruitment of both N and international students. The courses were originally in N, but 8 years ago the courses were switched to E as a result of falling numbers, mostly caused by the good job market for Bachelor graduates in Norway, and from competition by other HE institutions which were already using EMI. There are students from over 30 countries, most are self-financing, and a few from developing countries receive scholarships from Norway.

He is the coordinator for two Master’s courses and teaches EMI at this level. With 8’s experience from working in an international business environment, he has not felt the necessity to take EAP courses, although despite thinking it’s not possible, he would appreciate proof reading before publishing. On his courses he finds that although many International students have a high level of E, previously many had experienced problems with E, so the IELT requirements have been continually upgraded to resolve this situation. N students often maintain that they would prefer to attend a Masters taught in N, but EMI course are seen as valuable preparation to enable N students to feel comfortable when entering the increasingly international workplace.

8 is equally competent teaching in either E or N. In his classroom there is a wide range of knowledge, skills and E language ability. In the classroom often Norwegian students are reticent to engage, but the international readily partake and XX manages to get the two groups to mix well.

Most of 8’s work is in E and in technical work using E is the norm. Most college meetings are in N, but E is used when international staff who don’t speak N are present. 8 publishes and attends conferences using E, as well as working on international research projects mainly with industrial partners.

3. Verification process of summary:
   a) e-mail and translation asking for verification:

Hei (Thomas),
Takk for at du la meg intervjue deg i september: det var så hyggelig å høre dine meninger på min problemstilling.

Jeg har nå fullført transkripsjoner, og har skrevet en kort oppsummering av min forståelse av dine kommentarer nedenfor. Som jeg nevnte i slutt av intervjuet, håpet jeg å sende deg en kopi av dine kommentarer for å bekrefte eller endre / legge til hvis du ikke er enig i denne oppsummeringen. Jeg ville være så takknemlig om du kunne svare, da dette ville øke gyldigheten av arbeidet mitt.

Jeg har ikke tatt noen kvantitative data, f.eks kvalifikasjoner og bare inkluderte emner som er
relevant til min problemstilling. Selvfølgelig er all din informasjon konfidensielt i tråd med Exeter University etiske komité og psydonavnene vil bli brukt.

Mange takk på forhånd.

Med vennlig hilsen,

Elizabeth Griffiths

Translation of my e-mail:

Hello (Thomas),
Thank you for letting me interview you in September, I really appreciated hearing your opinions on my research topic.

I have now completed the transcripts, and have written a brief summary of my understanding of your comments below. As I mentioned at the end of the interview, I hoped to send you a copy of your comments for you to confirm or change / add if you do not agree with this summary. I would be so grateful if you could answer, as this would increase the validity of my work.

I have not taken any quantitative data, e.g. qualifications and only included topics relevant to my research questions. Of course, all your information is confidential in accordance with Exeter University Ethics Committee and pseudonyms will be used. Many thanks in advance.
Best regards,
Elizabeth Griffiths

b) Thomas’s reply and translation:

Hei, Elizabeth!

Det var bare hyggelig. Det er helt fint det du har skrevet. Jeg har bare et par kommentarer:

Kanskje utsagnet «There are students from over 30 countries» kan endres litt. Dette er det totale antallet nasjonaliteter som har tatt masterprogrammet siden oppstarten av det internasjonale programm. Antallet nasjonaliteter per år varierer noe. I skrivende stund er det ca 20 ulike nasjonaliteter som tar master (1. og 2. årskull).
I det nest siste avsnittet er initialene («XXX») ikke erstattet med pseudonym («8») (tenkte bare jeg ville nevne det).

Mvh.
(Thomas)
Translation of e-mail:

Hello, Elizabeth!

It was a pleasure. It is just fine what you have written. I only have a few comments:

Perhaps the statement "There are students from over 30 countries" may be changed slightly. This is the total number of nationalities who have taken the Master’s programme since the start of the international program. The number of nationalities per year varies. At the moment there are about 20 different nationalities taking Master (1st and 2nd cohort).

In the penultimate section, the initials ("XX") are not replaced with a pseudonym ("8") (just thought I'd mention it).

Best regards.

(Thomas)

4. Amended summary of 8’s comments and he is given the pseudonym Thomas:

Thomas is positive to E usage generally and EMI has enabled his courses to survive and thrive with good student recruitment of both N and international students. The courses were originally in N, but 8 years ago the courses were switched to E as a result of falling numbers, mostly caused by the good job market for Bachelor graduates in Norway, and from competition by other HE institutions which were already using EMI. There are Master students from 20 countries in two cohorts at the moment, most are self-financing, and a few from developing countries receive scholarships from Norway.

He is the coordinator for two Master’s courses and teaches EMI at this level. With Thomas’s experience from working in an international business environment, he has not felt the necessity to take EAP courses, although despite thinking it’s not possible, he would appreciate proof reading before publishing. On his courses he finds that although many International students have a high level of E, previously many had experienced problems with E, so the IELTs requirements have been continually upgraded to resolve this situation. N students often maintain that they would prefer to attend a Masters taught in N, but EMI course are seen as valuable preparation to enable N students to feel comfortable when entering the increasingly international workplace.

Thomas is equally competent teaching in either E or N. In his classroom there is a wide range of knowledge, skills and E language ability. In the classroom often Norwegian students are reticent to engage, but the international readily partake and Thomas manages to get the two groups to mix well.

Most of Thomas’s work is in E and in technical work using E is the norm. Most college meetings are in N, but E is used when international staff who don’t speak N are present. Thomas publishes and attends conferences using E, as well as working on international research projects mainly with industrial partners.
Appendix 6 – Extract from log during data collection

Example of log entry after interview 5

03/09/12
At X university collected three interviews and lunch with leader of international office. Participant 5 (later Ingvald) = very international work situation, positive to EMI, (but concerned about N), does not feel the need for preparation courses as feels E very good (Link level of English to participants’ identity), feels students’ E can be challenging (link to learners’ cognitive burden?)

After 5 interviews themes coming up – accepting policy of EMI, implementation – “no-one forced but hear tales”, Problematizing positive and negative of EMI, but not that straight forward. Many, particularly women doing what they are told, thinking about their own careers, and not thinking of the wider implications.

Participants generally focusing on language (vocabulary/grammar), but films = communication more important and grammar slips don’t seem to matter – participants say difficult to think quickly for examples and vocabulary, feel control class more, some International NNS very difficult to understand

Problem to recruit to those who are not coping, or experiencing difficulties – work on contacts.

Lunch – X uni offering more organised courses, e.g. 1 and 2 week EMI residential courses in Eastbourne, with sessions before and afterwards at X. 2 day writing course for PhD candidates, Medicine one E only semester. Language policy clears parallel languages. Unquestioning in desire to have more EMI courses and train staff to teach well in EMI – nothing about Norwegian, self-inflicted neo-colonialism? But need E internationally – change involves loss.

Areas to explore – globalisation, commodification, classroom communication (criteria to judge successful communication?)

Reflections – good responses so far, ten interviews seem manageable and five films. Must improve interview technique to follow up points. Preparing for conference in Kristiansand, will be good to collect my ideas together for a work in progress presentation.
Appendix 7 – Examples of observation feedback and categorising

1) **Categories for analysis used for the observations of participants’ lectures** (*‘x’ represents where each of the participants scored; hence 5 “x”s per line*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The voice was used well to indicate meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pace was varied</td>
<td></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of pauses</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to follow what the speaker was saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of notes/speaking well without notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The eye contact with the audience was strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker checked to see if the audience were following</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady body language</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of gestures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenter seemed enthusiastic about the subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right amount of material was presented for the time available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x too</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visuals were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The grammar flowed well</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The style of the language was suitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of links and connectors was shown</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of stress and intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenter used involving language</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) An example of feedback on a participant’s lecture in English from a previous course
Freya – How Quantum Theory Appeared in (to the) Physics: Quantum Theory and the Discussion between Nils Bohr and Albert Einstein concerning the Interpretation of ___ (the) Theory

1. Pronunciation
You
About
The
Schemes
Know
Another (funny because you’re so good with theory, the)
Don’t
The (in the questions)

2. Grammar
These theory (ies)
Every (All) physics students learn/ Every ph. student learns (sing./pl.)
It is possible to measure both velocity and the position accurate__(ly) and at the same time
Nobody expect__(s)
Except the experimentally
The physicist create__(s)
A.E. never except__ these principles
Light consist__(s) of
Like __(a) particle
An atom consist__(s)

3. Delivery
Really good fluent English; these are just tiny details I’ve picked up and didn’t affect the flow – most of them, as you see as about the “s”
  – plural “s” on the noun/singular “s” on the verb
  – the one “s” rule, if you’ve got it on the noun don’t have it on the verb, and vice versa.

You are such an experienced lecturer, that it is a joy to see how steady and organised you are, with full control over your material, yourself and your audience. (You explained a very complex subject in a manner that included all the audience). You seemed so well rehearsed and very knowledgeable about your subject.

Body language relaxes and improves as the lecture goes on and you become more personable. (Look at the question section then you seem much more yourself)

You could vary your voice more – tempo, pace, volume,…

Good eye contact and very including for all the audience. Well answered questions
A powerful, complex, inspiring lecture!   Super!   Well done you!
**Lecture Feedback for Freya**

**Presentation**

**Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The voice was used well to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicate meaning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pace was varied</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of pauses</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to follow what the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker was saying</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of notes/speaking well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without notes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The eye contact with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience was strong</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker checked to see if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the audience were following</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady body language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of gestures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenter seemed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic about the subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right amount of material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presented for the time available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visuals were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating of the delivery out of a score out of 10: ______7_____

**Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The grammar flowed well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The style of the language was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of links and connectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was shown</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of stress and intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenter used involving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating of the language out of a score out of 10: _____6_______
3) Example of field notes when observing Siv’s lecture as an external file on Nvivo (Used as part of the process of forming codes to inform the findings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting:</th>
<th>comfortable, small lecture theatre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students in front two rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal compared to UK – dress, body language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with /ð/ and /θ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion of ‘w’ and ‘v’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some subject/verb agreement slips – does not interrupt flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally very sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General language:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-correcting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for words both content and non-content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident stance – stood well, had presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft voice not enough variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady, but perhaps needs to be animated, perhaps too careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed more energy, didn’t engage with the audience fully, More timid than in N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading too much particularly at the beginning - eye contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t understand one of her questions - methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lecture needs to be more organised, with links to where we are going – more linking and signalling, and scaffolding of our knowledge |

| Pedagogy not language? Needs more high points (look at Exeter’s Going Global presentation HO, and LTHE notes, compare with original feedback in the course for Siv ) |
Appendix 8 – Coding – manual and Nvivo coding

1. Example of initial inductive coding on paper transcript
   (Not original colour coding and codes adapted and developed later from these descriptive codes.)

Bart’s transcription 08/12 25 mins … 5 minutes into the interview

… L: Why do you want international students

B: Well, we send students out of the country, so then we have to take some back. I also think that it is very nice to have an international (mm) environment

L: I just wonder, before you started teaching in E what sort of preparation did you have from your university?

B: None

L: How did you feel about that?

B: That’s usually the case isn’t it, you get your PhD and you start to teach. (Right) There is no back up from the university whether you teach in N or E. They offer some classes in how to teach and all that stuff, but when you have been studying as many years as we (yes) you have a quite good feeling (yes) so there is no backup. But what is the case in my subject or business, most of the literature, textbooks are in E even when you teach in Norwegian, so even in N textbooks they usually use E textbooks.

L: How does that work out?

B: Well, uhh I think it’s ok

L: Do students read the books?

B: Humm, not as much, but that is the general problem, students don’t read they want to go to the lecture and be fed everything (Yes) they need for their exam. But I’ve been teaching classes with E textbooks I’ve used my slides in E and I’ve been talking Norwegian

L: How does that work out?

B: It’s ok, I’m quite sure you’ll find students that doesn’t approve of that, but I think it’s ok, (right) but I also think that tends to make my slides, … well, many textbook come with slides, but I also want to have my slides in E in case there is (mm) a need to switch to E or something.
2. Using Nvivo 10
   a) Initial inductive coding on Nvivo building on and developing from the paper version’s coding

Bart’s transcription 08/12 25 mins continued

L: How much notice do you get if you have to switch a course to E?

B: Well, it depends; usually it’s just a month or something. It depends on how much in advance we decide on who is going to teach what.

L: Is that quite agreeable to decide who does what?

B: Yes, between ourselves (yes) there’s no problem, but my guess is that more and more classes will be in E for foreign students.

L: Yes, What do you feel about that?

B: No problem.
b) Nvivo Nodes word frequency scans to inform on possible codes (50 words)

50 highest word frequencies in tree map
c) Node classifications of participants used for overview and in Appendix 2

d) Organising nodes to answer the research question
Details of nodes within the research question areas

Details of nodes within the research question areas continued
Details of nodes within the research question areas continued

e) Coding example for node “status using English”: 

![Coding example for node “status using English”](image)
Example of coding “status of using English” – texts view

Reference 1 (4,28% Coverage)

L: How do you feel about NSs using puns and such like?

LA: It’s a very sympathetic way of communicating, but sometimes you feel rather inferior, of course you can get into that situation, but that’s like all other types of communication, in your own language as well, I think, if people like to practice an advanced form of language communication, they put a lot of challenges into their language, and you’re not understood and the others may feel humiliated by your language, the impression could be that you are arrogant.

Reference 2 (1,16% Coverage)

LA: Well, the milieu I’ve been in has been quite tolerant, but of course the Anglo-American dominance NS, could be a bit troublesome at times.
LA: Within academia there is always competition and I think that it gives you an advantage if you can speak E fluently, and so that is also part of the picture, it gives you a certain prestige – not mine at the moment.

but the informal style and puns in NS’s advanced form of language communication may humiliated NNS, but also makes NS appear arrogant.

He finds that within academia there is always competition and it gives you an advantage and carries a certain prestige to speak E fluently.

contributors have divested themselves of their foreign accent

L: Why are you writing in E?

F: For my own sake I have to learn the E language better, travelling around, speaking, it's a great advantage, but often I have experienced that a bad lecture in E is not as bad as a bad lecture in N, may be you get some credit, because it is in E itself.

and then it was a competition in a way for the best one speaking E in a way. People had their own power in the situation.

It is almost abuse of power: status also follows with speaking English. When things are in English they are lifted up a level, so the contents comes afterwards, but it shouldn’t be like that.
Courses seem to have more status when taught in E,

Reference 1 - 1.52% Coverage

S: It's a bit of a cross to bear, if I may say so, that one is so very cool and international if one uses E and at the same time one knows that much of the quality of the E does not meet the standard required.

Reference 2 - 4.03% Coverage

S: Those from Kampuchea, we have cooperation with them and they cut the end of every word, or the sounds with r and l are a whole chapter in themselves, but then I feel very superior when they are at that level, I feel that I'm almost a genius at E, but I remember the way that the N R94 has been translated into E, for it was written in an old fashioned N, and E students have asked if the translation was really E, because the language used for the terminology and culture and context, and it many of the NS who come here, they have a basic level of E.

Reference 3 - 0.60% Coverage

She is irritated by the high, cool status of E when often the quality of E is poor.

Reference 4 - 0.91% Coverage

She admits to feeling her own credibility being high with E compared to other NNS, but knows that often N E can be contrived.

Reference 1 - 3.92% Coverage

K: Some people may choose to use E words when they don't really have to (Mmm) and you've noticed a few of those. The word caps, I'm not sure why we need that word, it's a plural for cap and why not call it something N so there is there seems to be. Some social groups seem to feel that if they use a lot of E words as they seek to express things imply that we don't have those words in N, which I don't think is true and it is chic to do these things; in other groups it is frowned upon, so in an egalitarian society we need a few things to differentiate us
L: So in what groups do you think it would be frowned upon to use these E terms instead of N?

K: Well, People who have a relative strong N identity (Yes, identity) would want to have N words for these things, and umm

Reference 2 - 1,40% Coverage

K: I don’t know if you know Garrison Keller (Yes) When he went to Denmark he said when you try to get by in a foreign language, you loss 20 IQ points (Yes) and I think that is true

L: I hadn’t heard that one before, that’s great

K: So initially I think one losses a few points

Reference 3 - 1,02% Coverage

I think it is important to do this in N as well, so that we don’t create an inferior and superior language for expressing ourselves, because of World War II E came in as a relatively important language,

Reference 4 - 1,81% Coverage

K: Books have a cultural bias and the gatekeepers to journals have prestige hung up in this, and especially in ethics, because we are programmed into a set of values in our hearts and minds we feel that something is bad and the reasons to go along with it, so Wailing is good and we have reasons for it and in the United States one feels that it is bad (Yea).

Reference 5 - 2,48% Coverage

typically in the area of business and in sociology, most Norwegians are Marxists and the other ones, and even in England they are mostly on the left side (yes) but I think you should also show signs of Norwegianism when you say teaching (undervisning) and elev we would like to call ourselves professors and students, and we seem to be eliminating that language in N right now (Yes) so we are more like an extended high school than a proper university, that may be a problem (Yes the terms)
However, at the same time Norwegian should be kept alive, and not made to be considered inferior, by offering both E and N Master courses.

Also closer to home, he finds value differences encompassed in language; for example, with status, N academic vocabulary for university life implies egalitarianism, whereas the E ones bring more status because of the terms in the E language.

Although, he has experienced that others view his intelligence more highly when he is speaking his native language.

chatting is no problem, and traveling the USA to meet with some American skiers and I am with them, and that is fine, especially Americans, they're talking completely normally to me, but the English, the British, they're talking to me in a simpler manner than they usually speak.

L: So you notice that they use a sort of foreigners’ English language to you, a little slower, a bit more careful?

S: Yes, Americans are a little more careful, I don't know what, while the British have different dialects, so they chatter away quickly and then, ohh I'm now speaking to a Norwegian, and so they moderate their accents so that I can understand them. We have two exchange institutions, York and Worcester; they say that they're talking more plainly to me.
so I think that when I see colleagues who are poorer than me in English, students are also extremely happy with them too,
### Example of marrying the participants’ quotes and the research questions to write the findings

**R.Q. 1 part A - How are they currently using EMI in their teaching … ?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently using EMI</th>
<th>Descriptive Topics</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor level</td>
<td>Unwritten principle</td>
<td>“…but with my faculty or at least my institute the situation is different, we don’t have courses until late in the Bachelor and in the Masters”.20kristine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bach - E</td>
<td>“so I teach in E most of the time, except when I teach undergraduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L: Oh yes so the undergraduates, what sort of courses would they have in E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K: I don't know if they have any, there may be some electives in the third year (yes) but all the required courses are in N 2Knut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He is in favour of N generally for Bachelor level 2Knut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K: It was a course in analysis in mathematics for the higher level in the final year of the Bachelor programme. 3Katerine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N: Yes, I teach two regular courses in E (Yea) which are a third year course and a fourth year course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L: So that third year course is under graduate level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N: This is normally in N, but since this is also available for international Master programme it’s taught in E.7Nils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>so the general consensus was that we should create a European Bachelor of Physical Education, and we were 10, 12 colleges and universities in the network, and so we should have offers of 30 study points in the Bachelor programmes. … so that during the three years they could spend, half a year abroad, and also a half plus one half year, but so it was only us who were the developers, so we have the network, so we have a cohort of 12 students on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diff years, diff disc – humanities later – look art re. discussing hum. vs sci lang

flexibility

Close co-op – local initiative
one-half years course, so the next step now is to develop it to 24 students. 9 Sverre

It was started up as part of a Bachelor programme, it was adapted here at the institute, and actual educational course has become a bit different, as we have both a Bachelor and Master degree, and so suddenly we also needed a year program, and we had these plans from before with the Norwegian outdoor activity 9Sverre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic changes of perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this is quite interesting, because it was about world religions and secular world views and because of tradition, institutional tradition, we had not included Christianity as a world religion on this course as mainstream realities, as we have other courses going into Christianity, 20Kristine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But also because of Int staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Yes I think that is, well it's a principle, but there are some exceptions of course, but we have a brilliant professor in the aircraft technology, he his name is XX, so obviously he is not N, and he has been here for almost 20 years, but still he is teaching in E. These students are very motivated as they are going to become XX, so there is no problem with that. 11 Eilif</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS teachers not learning N – so teach in E Abuse of NS status?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I take lessons in E in our institute, but we have two E speaking professors, and this means that this year we have one course in E at the level 2 Bachelor level, advanced, not the first year at all, but the second year 20Kristine.” And there is another course we do this on the first year students, this autumn the same E speaking colleague, because he had to fill up his job, we were two native Ns sharing the responsibility for this first year course, but then we changed part of the set reading list into E, our E speaking colleague was also a member of the team performing this course and I would say that it has worked well. 20Kristine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don't know how wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F: Uhm, I have to speak for the situation at my department, the Belief bach N, but</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... continued with many descriptive topics e.g. “Class sizes”, “Costs vs. courses combined to save money / one course divide” in the Bachelor level, then same for Master and PhD, as the beginning for the Findings in 5.1 This method was used to use the data to answer each research question.

| spread | department of X, I don't know if there are any Bachelor courses that are regularly taught in E, but not for Bachelor, where all the courses are taught in N.16Freya (but not so – plenty of courses taught in E in faculty) | not in practice |
## Appendix 9 – From categories in the Findings to themes in the Discussion

The Nvivo nodes used from the findings for theory creation in the discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Findings from Nvivo nodes</th>
<th>Themes in discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</td>
<td>6.1 Power and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude to EMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</td>
<td>6.1.1 The power of global English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Market forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- Internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Exchange for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- Attitude to English generally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Norwegian students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1B</td>
<td>Admin &amp; CoP in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int staff Norwegian learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Attitude to EMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture language use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Status using English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</td>
<td>6.1.1.1 Commodification of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Market forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- Internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Exchange for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- Attitude to English generally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Norwegian students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1B</td>
<td>Admin &amp; CoP in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Admin in English at the uni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community of Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Publishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Attitude to EMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture language use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.1B | Admin & CoP in English  
- Admin in English at the uni  
- Community of Practice  
- Sabbaticals and res proj  
- Publishing  
- Networking  
- Conferences  
- International staff  
- Int staff Norwegian learning |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1.2   | Attitude to EMI  
- Domain loss  
- Local initiatives and pub in Norwegian  
- Terminology  
- Translation |
| 1     | React & who decides EMI courses |
| 1.1A  | Using EMI teaching  
- Staff writing textbooks |
| 1.1B  | Admin & CoP in English  
- Sabbaticals and res proj  
- Publishing |
| 1.2   | Attitude to EMI  
- Local initiatives and pub in Norwegian  
- Status using English |
| 1     | React & who decides EMI courses |
| 1.1B  | Admin & CoP in English  
- Admin in English at the uni  
- International staff  
- Int staff Norwegian learning |
| 1.1B  | 1.1B Admin & CoP in English  
- Admin in English at the uni  
- International staff  
- Int staff Norwegian learning |
| 1.2   | 1.2 Attitude to EMI  
- Local initiatives and pub in Norwegian  
- Status using English |
| 1     | React & who decides EMI courses  
- Market forces  
- Internationalisation |
| 1     | React & who decides EMI courses |
| 2     | Preparation and coping for EMI |
| 2B    | Coping  
- Teaching in EMI  
- Preparation time for EMI  
- Difference teaching in N or in E  
- Classroom management |
| 2.1   | Language competence |

- Status using English

- Domain loss

- Local initiatives and pub in Norwegian

- Terminology

- Translation

- 6.1.3 Domain loss

- 6.1.3.1 Publishing reward system

- 6.1.3.2 Parallel language policy

- 6.2 Equality

- 6.2.1 Democracy

- 6.2.1.1 Professional development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Teaching in EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EMI classroom language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1A</th>
<th>Using EMI teaching - textbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff writing textbooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1B</th>
<th>Admin &amp; CoP in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int staff Norwegian learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meetings in English or Norwegian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Status using English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Preparation and coping for EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Language competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Teaching in EMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1B</td>
<td>Admin &amp; CoP in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community of Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.1  | Language competence |
| 2.3  | Teaching in EMI |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1B</th>
<th>Admin &amp; CoP in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conferences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.1  | Language competence |
| 2.3  | Teaching in EMI |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1B</td>
<td>Admin &amp; CoP in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Admin in English at the uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int staff Norwegian learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meetings in English or Norwegian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.1  | Language competence |
| 2.3  | Teaching in EMI |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Market forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internationalisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1B</th>
<th>Admin &amp; CoP in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Admin in English at the uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int staff Norwegian learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meetings in English or Norwegian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.1  | Language competence |
| 2.3  | Teaching in EMI |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attitude to English generally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 6.2.12 | International Staff |
| 6.2.2  | Language competency and NS ideals |
| 6.2.3  | Lecturers’ sense of self |
| 6.2.3.1 | Community of Practice |
| 6.2.3.2 | Internally at HEIs |
| 6.3    | Quality of teaching |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Domain loss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Teaching in EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Classroom management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1A</th>
<th>Using EMI in teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Norwegian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nor stud level of Eng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Terminology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>International students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int stud level of E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int stud ac competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Teaching in EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Translation in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching EMI communication with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparation time for EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecture notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EMI classroom language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Difference teaching in N or in E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Class composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1A</th>
<th>Using EMI in teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Norwegian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nor stud level of Eng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Attitude to EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Terminology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 | Preparation and coping for EMI |
|   | Language competence |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>International students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int stud level of E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Int stud ac competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Teaching in EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Translation in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching EMI communication with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparation time for EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecture notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EMI classroom language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Class composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Teaching in EMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.1</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.2</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.3</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1A</td>
<td>Using EMI in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Attitude to EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Preparation for EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Language competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>International students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Teaching in EMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>React &amp; who decides EMI courses</th>
<th>6.3.3.1 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1A</td>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1B</td>
<td>Admin &amp; CoP in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Attitude to EMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Teaching in EMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local initiatives and pub in Norwegian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Terminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EMI classroom language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Difference teaching in N or in E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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