Crossing disciplinary boundaries: English-medium education (EME) meets English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

Emma Dafouz
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
edafouz@ucm.es

Abstract

Framed against the backdrop of internationalization of higher education, this paper argues for the need to cross disciplinary boundaries and build stronger bridges between the domains of English-medium education and ESP/EAP, particularly at a time when English-taught programmes seem to challenge the *status quo* of ESP professionals. To this end, this article will first briefly describe the objects of study – ESP/EAP and EME – and map out the relationship between the two. Secondly, a description of what are called the 'diverging zones' between these two educational approaches will be developed. In this section, major differences in curricular goals, in the way English is conceptualised, in students' and teachers' profiles, as well as in the pedagogical practices developed will be examined. Thirdly, the section entitled 'converging zones' will look into some of the contact points of EME and ESP theories and practices so that possible gaps are bridged. Finally, the last part of the paper, titled 'emerging zones' will provide suggestions for joint collaborative research and the development of teacher education programmes that truly respond to the current needs of EME and ESP/EAP professionals and students as well.

Keywords: English-medium education, ESP, EAP, internationalisation, higher education.

Resumen

Cruzando las fronteras disciplinarias: La enseñanza en inglés (EME) se encuentra con el inglés para fines específicos (ESP)

Enmarcado en el contexto de la internacionalización de la enseñanza superior, este artículo defiende la necesidad de cruzar las fronteras disciplinarias y tender

puentes más sólidos entre los ámbitos de la enseñanza de contenidos en inglés y el inglés para fines específicos/académicos (IFE/IFA), especialmente en un momento en que la enseñanza en inglés parece desafiar el *statu quo* de los profesionales de IFE/IFA. Para ello, este artículo describe primero brevemente los objetos de estudio - ESP/EAP y EME - y examina la relación entre ambos. En segundo lugar, el trabajo describe lo que se denominan las "zonas de divergencia" entre estos dos enfoques educativos. En esta sección, se abordan las diferencias en los objetivos curriculares, en la forma de conceptualizar el inglés, en los perfiles de estudiantes y de profesores, así como en las prácticas pedagógicas desarrolladas. En tercer lugar, en la sección titulada "zonas de convergencia" se profundiza en los puntos de contacto de las teorías y prácticas sobre las que se sustentan EME y ESP con el fin de salvar las posibles diferencias. Finalmente, la última parte del artículo, titulada "zonas emergentes", ofrece sugerencias para la investigación conjunta y el desarrollo de programas de formación del profesorado que respondan realmente a las necesidades actuales tanto de los profesionales de EME y ESP/EAP como de sus estudiantes.

Palabras clave: Inglés como lengua de educación, inglés para fines específicos, inglés para fines académicos, internacionalización, educación superior.

1. Introduction: Setting the scene

In a world that is more globally connected than ever the presence of English has increasingly grown, to the point that it is now essential for communication in commerce, science, technology and academia. In the case of academia, the last two decades have also witnessed a widespread use of English, not only for research and publishing, but also for educational purposes, particularly in higher education institutions (Dafouz & Smit, 2020; Doiz et al., 2013; Hultgren et al., 2015; Macaro et al., 2019). This use of English as language of instruction is broadly connected to the internationalisation of educational settings, wherein English has been given roles that contribute to employment opportunities, international mobility, as well as the development of global skills and disciplinary knowledge (Beelen & Wit, 2012).

A wide number of empirical studies researching this gradual shift to English-medium education (or EME) in tertiary settings have been conducted in the last years. Such studies have focused on a vast range of topics that span from examining policies and the motivations for the introduction of EME (e.g. Altinyelken et al., 2014; Bonancina-Pugh, 2012), to describing its

implications at the classroom level, or exploring participant attitudes (e.g. lecturers', students' or managers') and their beliefs and perceptions of this phenomenon (Aguilar, 2017; Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2020; Dafouz et al., 2016; Kuteeva et al., 2020; Llurda et al., 2014). By and large, it can be said that the diverse research findings have adopted either a positive tone, underlining the opportunities of EME for teaching and learning in present day higher education, or, in contrast, a discouraging tone, emphasising the loss of quality in education as a result, amongst other factors, of teachers' and learners' poor (academic) English language skills.

Arguing against this binary and somewhat simplistic interpretation, this paper aims to add depth to current understandings of EME by focusing precisely on the affordances (and challenges) that this educational change can bring to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) professionals and learners; and, vice versa, to reflect on the opportunities and challenges that ESP can bring to EME lecturers and participants. As pointed out in Nesi (2020, p. ix) 'modern ESP … learners increasingly need to be able to interact within and between a range of cultures; they will also belong to diverse discourse communities with differing demands for standardisation and accuracy, and differing communicative purposes'. At the same time, in EME there is now a growing recognition that for these programmes to reach their full potential, explicit awareness of academic language and disciplinary literacies needs to be factored into subject-learning curricula (Dafouz, 2018; Meyer et al., 2018)

Adopting the two-fold standpoint of a researcher involved in EME for over two decades as well as of a policy advisor responsible for curricular internationalisation at my university, I will argue here for the need to cross disciplinary boundaries and build stronger bridges between the EME and ESP domains, particularly at a time when English-taught programmes seem to 'compete with ESP courses and challenge the *status quo* of ESP teachers' (Bocanegra-Valle & Basturkmen, 2019, p. 131). Thus, this article is primarily geared toward the interests of ESP participants who are (or may be in the future) in EME settings as well as of those who would like to investigate further in these areas. Additionally, this study calls upon the growing number of EME professionals that acknowledge the importance of language(s) in their educational practices. In doing so, I will touch upon several key questions that are deemed relevant for ESP and EME practitioners, namely what are the needs in EME that ESP professionals can help to address? What are the gaps in ESP that EME professionals can aim to fill? How can EME and ESP teaching and learning be supportive of one

another? And finally, which research avenues can this alignment open up for researchers?

The paper will first briefly describe the objects of study – ESP and EME – and map out the relationship between the two. Secondly, a description of what I have called 'diverging zones' between these two educational approaches will be developed. In this part, major differences in curricular goals, views of English, students' and teachers' profiles, as well as the pedagogical practices developed in these ESP and EME contexts will be displayed. Thirdly, the section entitled 'converging zones' will look into some of the contact points of EME and ESP theories and practices so that possible gaps are bridged and, finally, the last section will focus on 'emerging zones' where further research is suggested to coordinate efforts and expand investigative initiatives across fields.

2. Defining EME and ESP

As most readers of this journal are LSP/LAP professionals, providing lengthy definitions of what ESP is and what it covers is most likely not necessary. Nevertheless, the purpose of this section is to demarcate the objectives of these two areas, so that hasty assumptions of what ESP and EME respectively cover are not automatically made. I will sketch thus the areas of influence of both so that the zones of convergence and divergence examined later can be traced more easily.

With an initial focus on the term ESP, the general aim has been to develop discipline-related teaching practices tuned to (young-adult or adult) learners whose main objective is learning English for specific educational (Evans & Green, 2007) or professional purposes (Bhatia, 2004). In this vein, the ability to function competently in a range of genres (very often written but not only) is a main concern for these learners as it can determine their access not only to career opportunities but also to positive identities and even life choices (Hyland, 2006). The classic work by Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) describes ESP as traditionally divided into two main areas: English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP). At the university level, students who are expected to enter a professional academic community in a research-oriented university, for instance, would generally require EAP practice. The branch of EAP focuses specifically on the academic study skills usually needed in higher education settings (e.g. reading skills, note-

taking, essay writing, specialised terminology, etc). On the other hand, students who are expected to join the workforce right after graduation would typically need EOP practice, in the form of very specific communicative language that will enable them to use English in their professions (e.g. English for Nursing, English for Accountants, English for Shopfloor Staff, etc). Broadly, by considering students' needs after they have left the university, the choice of focus on EAP or EOP can be appropriately made.

The label EME, or the more widely used to date, English-medium instruction (EMI) (Ekoç, 2020; Macaro, 2018; Pecorari & Malmström, 2018), is generally connected to the growing internationalisation of education across the world. Typically, EMI refers 'to the teaching and learning of an academic subject (i.e. economic, chemistry, aeronautical engineering, etc.) using English as the language of instruction, and usually without an explicit focus on language learning or specific language aims' (Dafouz, 2018, p.170). Furthermore, while not explicit in the acronym, EMI is understood to be mainly implemented at the tertiary level.

In order to delineate the differences between labels, Airey (2016) uses a continuum where language-oriented approaches are contrasted with content-oriented ones, as figure 1 below displays:

Figure 1. The language/content continuum (Airey, 2016, p. 73).

At the left end of the continuum, we find EAP courses with mainly language learning outcomes aiming to provide students with the academic reading and writing skills they need to complete their studies. Here, academic language is viewed as a generic set of skills that can be acquired more or less independently of the content area where they will be used. In the centre, we find Content and Language Integrated Learning (or CLIL). CLIL, also referred to in some settings as Bilingual Education in other

settings (see Lorenzo, 2017), an educational approach developed principally in primary and secondary school settings, where the final goal is to develop both language proficiency and content knowledge in a *balanced* manner (Coyle et al., 2010). At the right end of the continuum, under EMI, language is viewed mainly as a tool for teaching and, consequently, not expected to affect the content taught to any great degree (Airey, 2016).

Within the realm of EMI, other related labels have also been used, such as English-medium programmes (Schmidt-Unterberger, 2018), English-taught programmes (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014) and Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (or ICLHE) (Wilkinson & Zegers, 2007). Similar to CLIL, the acronym ICLHE addresses the integration of both content and language but specifically in higher education. First coined at the University of Maastricht in 2004, ICLHE is usually reserved for tertiary-level programmes that have explicit and integrated content and language learning aims (Valcke & Wilkinson, 2017). However, it could be said that, since its inception, the ICLHE focus has been mostly used in research circles which emphasise the importance of addressing language as a key component in the construction of knowledge, and look into classroom discourse as well 'as an integral part of teaching and learning' (Smit & Dafouz, 2012, p. 2), even if not all programmes include an explicit language focus.

Finally, a recently developed label known as EMEMUS, which stands for English-medium education in multilingual university settings, has been coined to portray more accurately the particular features of this educational setting (Dafouz & Smit, 2016, 2020). To begin with, in EMEMUS the term 'education', which embraces both teaching and learning, is used against the unidirectional 'instruction' and includes also reference to research in university circles. Moreover, EMEMUS explicitly describes the multilingual sociolinguistic setting that characterises present day societies and HEIs more specifically. In European EME settings, for instance, 55% of the student population is on average not local but comes from various settings and thus brings other linguistic repertoires to the classroom (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). In these multilingual scenarios, while English is a central element, its role as a lingua franca (or ELF) amongst speakers of different L1s contributes to re-examining the seemingly uniform role of English from a more dynamic, multi-dimensional and communicative light (Iino & Murata, 2016). Finally, university settings are focalised in EMEMUS, revealing concrete features

not shared by previous levels of education, such as the voluntary nature of university studies, the diversity of the student population and the cognitively mature profile of students (Smit & Dafouz, 2012).

Figure 2 below displays the positioning of EMEMUS (or EME for short) in relation to the ESP/EAP labels, on the one hand, and ICLHE and EMI, on the other. Given that EMEMUS is intrinsically multi-dimensional and therefore encompasses more than the language and content dimensions displayed below, I will place it on a slightly higher level to index that it is more *inclusive* than the labels ICLHE and EMI (for a more detailed account of EMEMUS and its dimensions see Dafouz & Smit, 2016, pp. 399–402, 2020).

Figure 2. EMEMUS in the language and content continuum.

As visualised in Figure 2, and taking into account the distance between the labels ESP/EAP and EMEMUS along the continuum, one would instinctively assume that no relationship can be established. Nevertheless, as stated earlier, the aim of this paper is first to demarcate zones of divergence in order to subsequently address the converging zones that ESP and EME share and, ultimately, conclude with the emerging zones, described as windows of opportunity for research, professional development and collaboration across these two fields.

3. English-medium education and ESP: Diverging zones

While binary distinctions can often lead to simplifying realities that are intrinsically complex, the purpose of this section is to point out the most noticeable differences between EME and ESP, so that potential zones of convergence and collaboration can be discussed later on in section 4.

3.1. The construct of 'English' in EME and ESP settings

The two acronyms examined throughout this paper – ESP and EME – share one letter: the 'E' for English. However, while usually treated as a uniform reality, English cannot be envisaged as a single monolithic construct but rather as a multifaceted one whereby highly diverse functional roles co-exist and are foregrounded depending on the context of use (Dafouz & Smit, 2017). Over the last decade, sociolinguistic research has questioned monolingual norms and conceptualisations of languages as static entities (e.g. Canagarajah, 2011; García & Wei, 2014) and advocated for a more fluid understanding of language(s). This understanding, in turn, responds more accurately to how individuals use the language(s) at their disposal and how they resort to distinct linguistic repertoires when needed (Singh & Lu, 2020). Drawing on this sociolinguistic paradigm, the English that ESP and EME practitioners deal with is substantially different. Thus, according to Basturkmen (2005, p. 5), in ESP or, at least '[i]n the early years of ESP, the objective was … imparting linguistic knowledge with ESP functioning to reveal the facts about the linguistic features of subject-specific language.' Over time, this approach evolved into viewing English as the language used in discourse communities with specific communicative purposes and distinct language patterns grouped under the key linguistic notion of 'genre' (Swales, 2004).

In contrast, in EME the focus is largely on disciplinary content learning and, as a result, English is viewed as the 'tool' to achieve this (Dafouz & Smit, 2017, p. 287). English is an instrument accepted by all 'which does not belong to any specific community and needs to be learnt in educational settings by everyone, including native speakers' (Kuteeva et al., 2020, p. 288). Such an understanding, however, is rather an idealisation which overlooks the diversity and variability of English language uses and users in the real world and in HEIs more particularly. In EME programmes outside the Anglophone world, English has multiple roles that vary depending on the contextual variables. Thus, in addition to the EFL role, it can also be used as a lingua franca (ELF) by L2 speakers of English who employ it as a contact language amongst individuals with other linguistic backgrounds (Jenkins, 2014). The notion of lingua franca has extended so widely in some disciplinary and professional contexts, such as Business Studies, that there is now a special acronym known as BELF (Business English as a Lingua Franca) to refer specifically to this scenario (Komori-Glatz, 2018). Business settings are generally known to be inherently

multilingual, including functional and professional codes, and thus constructed by their speakers in accordance with their individual repertoires and the specific needs and context of their interaction. Under this light, BELF is seen as 'flexible, hybrid and variable, with all participants in the interaction having the right to contribute to, construct and use the shared repertoire as is necessary in order to achieve their interactional goals' (Komori-Glatz, 2018, p. 55). In other words, BELF students are true users of the language.

The conceptualisations described above, both for ESP and EME, form part of language ideologies, which are socially situated and connected to questions of identity and power (Bhattacharya, 2017; Creese & Martin, 2003). Such ideologies have clear repercussions on the teaching and learning practices employed, on the group dynamics or on the assessment criteria followed. Therefore, the aforementioned English standard variety that most EME lecturers believe to be using in their classrooms is rather a reduced version of the multifaceted roles that English plays in EME classrooms where societal, institutional, pedagogical and communicational functions come into play in complex and dynamic ways (Dafouz & Smit, 2017). Thus, a lecturer's preference, for instance, for one English variety over another (e.g. American vs British English) reflects language ideologies that usually align (consciously or not) with certain pedagogical practices and materials. In this respect, while native varieties of English have been reported to be valued by EME students and lecturers alike, such preferences do not enjoy the same status across all settings. Thus, it would be interesting to conduct further research into why such preferences arise in certain sites and not in others (Kuteeva, 2020).

3.2. Participant profiles: Teachers and students in EME and ESP contexts

When comparing the participant profiles of both teachers and students in these settings, notable differences emerge. By and large, the ESP teacher is traditionally an English language expert who holds a degree or has been trained in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) paradigm and afterwards receives training in more disciplinary-focused language teaching (or ESP). Bocanegra-Valle and Basturkmen (2019, p. 128) argue that while ESP and EAP teaching have expanded substantially, 'little is known about what kinds of knowledge, skills and abilities these ESP teachers need and how they are acquired and developed'. In his reflection on how EAP has changed over the

last 20 years, Hyland (2012, p. 33) notes that ESP/EAP professionals were at first responsible for identifying key features of genres and translating them into effective teaching materials, and that while they did not have to 'be experts in disciplinary content … they did need to have some awareness and feel for a particular vocational area'.

In turn, the EME lecturer is most typically a content expert, usually with (advanced) English language proficiency, sometimes as a result of international academic experiences, such as completing studies or a PhD abroad. The level of English that these professionals are required to certify in order to work in EME programmes is known to vary significantly across contexts. Thus, while some HEIs demand a C1 level of General English (Common European Framework of Reference, CEFR) to lecture, others accept a B2 level – a decision which very often depends on the human resources at their disposal or on the university or government policies in place. In any case, what needs to be highlighted when talking about English language proficiency and EME is that even lecturers with a high competence in English usually lack the pedagogical expertise to realise that learning complex content in a foreign language is not only a matter of changing linguistic codes (Dafouz & Smit, 2020; Pavón Vázquez & Ramos, 2018). In other words, most EME professionals do not have the capacity to make their procedural knowledge available to students and thus find disciplinary language so natural that it is 'difficult to analyze it or dissect it' (Llinares et al., 2012, p. 111) in the way that novice students would need them to do. It is precisely the development of such disciplinary language knowledge and practices, which typically belong to the EAP/ESP realm, that constitutes an area where EME lecturers would strongly benefit from guided assistance and collaboration (see section 5.3 for further elaboration of this point).

As for the student profile, ESP and EME students share some features but clearly differ in others. Broadly, in ESP we typically find a homogenous group of local and national students who usually share an L1 and enrol in these courses (which are more often compulsory than not) as part of the degree requirements. It is not uncommon, however, at least in the case of Spain, that students are allowed to validate the ESP/EAP credits if they provide a formal certificate of their English proficiency. By doing this, HEIs avoid large classrooms with highly mixed-ability groups. Moreover, these ESP courses generally view the student population as language 'learners', that is, as non-native English speakers who are deemed perennially deficient and always in search of native-like proficiency. I will revisit this point in

section 5 when emerging zones for EME and ESP collaboration are developed.

In the EME classroom a more heterogenous student body is typically found, where home but also international students come together. Enrolment in EME programmes, unlike in ESP ones, is for the most part voluntary, thus the reasons for joining them vary widely, ranging from a need to have a differentiated curriculum, the pursuit of international experiences, higher employability opportunities, to English language development in settings where English proficiency is traditionally lower (e.g. Ackerley et al., 2017). In contrast to the view of ESP, students in EME are often envisaged as 'users', in the sense that they employ the language freely with other speakers of English from a vast variety of linguacultural backgrounds, as noted when referring to the case of BELF earlier. Furthermore, EME participants focus mainly on developing meaningful communicative exchanges rather than on language accuracy. In other words, EME students switch from the 'language-learning mode' to the 'application mode' (Ke & Cahyani, 2014).

3.3. Pedagogical practices in EME and ESP

As mentioned above, closely related to the construct of English and the teacher and student profiles, we find the pedagogical practices developed in ESP and EME contexts respectively. In an ESP scenario where the teaching objective is the development of subject-disciplinary language and skills, language-learning methodologies are clearly followed. Traditionally, ESP was largely textual in its approach, and, consequently, focused mainly on vocabulary building and the development of student product outcomes (i.e. essay writing, case reports, oral presentations). However, current ESP teaching practices (Kırkgöz & Dikilita, 2018; Terauchi et al., 2020) seem to be gradually moving onto social participation paradigms where issues of identity and leaners' experiences outside the classroom can be seen as an opportunity for collaboration with EME lecturers, as 5.3. below will develop further.

EME, instead, focusses largely on developing content-knowledge and thus a transmission mode of education often predominates in these settings as a legacy of teacher-centred methodologies (in the L1). These teacher-centred strategies conceive knowledge 'as being transmitted from expert teacher to inexpert learner, and the teacher's task is to 'get it across" (Biggs, 1999, p. 61). The focus, ultimately, is on what the teacher does. In this scenario, EME

lecturers usually lack the necessary pedagogical knowledge to face the teaching of complex concepts in another language. Students, on the other hand, are expected to have acquired the necessary language skills to complete the EME course prior to entry and, consequently, subject-specific language is often demoted to a remedial activity carried out outside the standard curriculum. In some Spanish universities the situation for EAP/ESP programmes is even more critical, as some have been removed from the EME official curriculum on the assumption that formal English language instruction is no longer needed as students will pick up language incidentally (Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015; Breeze & Dafouz, 2017; Fortanet-Gómez, 2013). Given the importance of this issue, section 5 will revisit the topic when addressing possible zones of convergence.

Regarding materials, the wealth of textbooks and resources typically developed for the ESP/EAP fields (from business to tourism, engineering, law, etc,) is notable. These texts were designed drawing on student needs and chiefly used corpus linguistics and genre approaches (Swales, 2004). In contrast, the first EME programmes often lacked tailor-made materials and relied heavily on ad hoc adoptions of books written for English-language speakers in Anglophone settings (Banegas & Busleimán, 2021). Moreover, such EME materials often covered disciplinary subjects using examples culturally removed from the students' immediate context and scaffolding was hardly developed to attend the language needs of the L2 users. In this respect, some research suggests that a misalignment between the students' actual learning needs and a lack of proper textbooks and teaching resources may have compromised initially some EME achievements in, for instance, student writing or exam responses (Dafouz, 2020).

Finally, assessment is another area where differences clearly emerge between ESP and EME contexts. As a result of the language-oriented vs content-oriented foci adopted, language is the target in an ESP setting and thus the focus is principally on students' accuracy and/or fluency. In EME, by contrast, the emphasis on content usually prevents language from being assessed, at least formally (and officially). Nevertheless, many lecturers admit to downgrading student work when language errors are too numerous or flagrant, although such a criterion is often not included explicitly in the course syllabus (Abedi et al., 2004; Dafouz, 2020; Dafouz et al., 2014; Kao & Tsou, 2017). Given the unclear focus on assessment in many EME settings, it seems that collaborative research in this area would be very welcome.

Having indexed some of the most noticeable differences, or what I called 'diverging zones' between EME and ESP, I would like now to offer a summary table for the sake of clarity:

	ESP	EME
Curricular goals	Disciplinary-language learning	Disciplinary-content learning
Teacher profile	Language expert with formal training in English Language Teaching (native or non-native)	Content expert with usually no formal training in ELT (native and non-native)
Roles of English	English viewed as specific set of skills and disciplinary language (ESP/EAP)	English as a means of instruction (a tool), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)
Student profile	Fairly homogenous: local and national Student as language 'learner'	Heterogenous: local, national, and international Student as language 'user'
Pedagogical knowledge	EFL pedagogy Student-centred	Content-knowledge pedagogy/transmission mode Teacher-centred
Assessment	Language-focused Focus on language accuracy and fluency	Content-focused Focus on disciplinary knowledge (often declarative)
Teaching formats	Text-based combined with EFL communicative approaches	Mostly lecture-based
Materials	ESP/EAP materials designed for the EFL (L2 learner)	Content materials usually designed for the English-speaking learner or adapted/translated from non-English (L1) sources
Curricular goals	Disciplinary-language learning	Disciplinary-content learning

Table 1. Diverging zones between ESP and EME teaching and learning contexts.

4. EME and ESP: Converging zones

This section addresses the converging zones or points of contact that EME and ESP teaching and learning somewhat share. It examines as well how some of these contact points are currently being tried out and paves the way for section 5 where more concrete suggestions for future collaboration in research and teacher professional development programmes will be addressed.

4.1. Constructivist theories of (language) learning in EME and ESP

Reflecting a socio-constructivist view of education, the New Literacies approach (Street, 1999) viewed ESP and EAP as moving beyond the teaching and learning of academic and disciplinary skills and proposed a view of such skills as social practices. This socio-constructivist position recognises the importance of language in the building of knowledge and of disciplinary identity and shows a greater respect for students' subject knowledge, interests and perceptions (Hyland, 2012). In this view, the teacher, as language expert, is engaged in the co-building of disciplinary content with the student, who is the content-expert-to-be. Similarly, in the EME milieu, the content teacher can be also seen to move gradually beyond the transmission model described above and aim at co-constructing disciplinary knowledge with students by making the classroom more interactive and student-centred. Moreover, in some EME settings students are sometimes found to display higher oral interpersonal skills in English than their lecturers, while the former are stronger in academic language proficiency as a result of researching and publishing in English. Thus, the different strengths that both sets of participants bring to the classroom can be looked upon as complementary rather than threatening and as a way forward in developing constructivist theories of learning. In this vein, empirical research on EME in European higher education has suggested that course design can be facilitated by promoting student-centred learning, wherein students take more responsibility for what and how to learn (Wilkinson, 2013). These suggestions will be touched upon again in section 5.

4.2. Developing Disciplinary Literacies in ESP and EME settings

The sociolinguistic turn in language education, mentioned in 3.1, shifted the focus from a skill-based view of disciplinary learning to envisaging literacies as social practices. According to this paradigm, in becoming socialised into their respective disciplines, students learn both how to communicate in particular ways and how to behave as particular kinds of people (Murray, 2008). Thus, when writing or speaking as academics, as accountants or as philosophers, students gradually become members of their disciplines' respective communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The acquisition of such academic literacies enables students to effectively and legitimately engage with and influence knowledge, both in speaking and in writing.

Against this sociolinguistic background, in ESP/EAP, genre theories have been followed to map how individuals use language to develop relationships, establish communities and 'get things done' (Hyland, 2012). ESP/EAP have also examined the ways genres differ across disciplines and language groups and have encouraged more recently research into languages other than English and into the ways speakers of those languages use English to construct disciplinary literacies. In the case of EME, as pointed out earlier, such disciplinary literacies are often invisible to the content lecturer and thus, despite being experts in their own discipline, EME practitioners are not usually prepared pedagogically to explain the linguistic conventions operating within subject-specific areas. In this respect, I believe EME has opened a window of opportunity for language awareness (Dafouz, 2018) – an opportunity actually identified by lecturers when they come across international exchange students whose institutional, cultural and linguistic backgrounds compel them to reflect on the linguistic goals they have for all their students (whether national or international).

In sum, the concept of disciplinary literacies (DLs) sketched here has thus proved to be a useful starting point for the discussion of disciplinary language learning goals for both ESP/EAP and EME practitioners. Concrete illustrations of how collaboration on this particular area can be further developed will be addressed next.

5. Future directions for EME and ESP collaboration: Emerging zones

Three concrete research areas where both ESP and EME experts can collaborate effectively are addressed in this last section. Evidently, the list of possibilities is not exhaustive, but it could be an eye-opener for new lines of joint action, both in research and teacher professional development, which can be revisited over time.

5.1. Developing a glocal and disciplinary literacies-based curriculum

In this globally interconnected world we live in, the integration of global needs is crucial, as is attention to the local specificities of our context. This 'glocal' perspective aligns closely with EME as it underlines its context-sensitive nature, as well as with 'modern' views of ESP (Nesi, 2020). In this

vein Gustafsson and Jacobs (2013) claim that the change of emphasis when moving from an ESP to an EME approach largely allows for a greater focus on learning and communication processes rather than on assessing solely student products (exams, essays, case-reports, etc). Similarly, Blaj-Ward (2017, p. 101) advises on the need to include 'context sensitive measures of quality in EAP provision, which give the student an active role in designing this provision rather than merely a recipient role, and reflect the principle that language proficiency development is 'everyone's business." Along these lines, the recent work by Jiang and Zhang (2017) in EME Chinese settings suggests that an EME-oriented ESP/EAP course design can also motivate and facilitate students' self-directedness, as is shown in student team-teaching and process-oriented writing activities. Under this paradigm, students' gradually take more responsibility in managing language study through carrier content and, at the same time, develop more agency.

A way to do this is, as explained earlier, by training ESP professionals in viewing subject disciplinary language as social practices embedded in specific settings. In this regard, the use of the recently developed construct known as Cognitive Discourse Functions or CDFs (Dalton-Puffer, 2013) bridges the gap between the cognitive functions that students need to activate and the discursive actions necessary to process content knowledge successfully. Drawing on Bloom's (1956) classic taxonomy for learning, Dalton-Puffer's model indexes seven categories (i.e. Classify, Define, Describe, Evaluate, Explain, Explore and Report), which, in turn, include a wider set of subcategories (or members). These categories ideally 'function as a kind of lingua franca that may enable educators to communicate across subject boundaries' (Dalton-Puffer, 2013, p. 242). Translated to the realm of ESP and EME, CDFs can help both sets of professionals (and their respective students) engage in a dialogue where the discursive conventions of their disciplinary areas can be more clearly approached. Moreover, Dalton-Puffer's construct is context-sensitive in that when applied to one specific setting or to one specific subject it 'may take on a very specific shape and perhaps further elements' (ibid, p. 237). The situated nature of this model enables us also to move beyond perspectives initially theorised from the linguistic angle and adopt a more epistemological view, where content specialists unveil how they actually construct disciplinary knowledge in their teaching and professions (Spires et al, 2018). By way of illustration, the use of the CDFs model in the subject of history in secondary schools in Austria (Dalton-Puffer & Bauer-Marschallinger, 2019) confirms enhancement of

students' subject literacy competence when explicit attention is given to the CDFs typical of history genres. An identification of the CDFs in place in EME disciplines could prove useful not only in supporting students' development of DLs and teachers' content-pedagogy but also in identifying the presence of what have been referred to as 'hybrid genres' or 'blended genres' (Brown, 2017). Hybrid genres are described as texts where some aspects of academic rhetoric in English are blended with features of other (national) rhetorical traditions in a way that the resulting student output is not deemed appropriate in either context. Investigations into these hybrid varieties and how to approach them in a constructive manner would be of interest for EAP practitioners working alongside EME lecturers.

5.2. Valuing Multilingualism and Translanguaging

In vein with the glocal and multilingual nature of present-day HEIs, professionals from EME and ESP need to be aware of the multilingual repertoires that students and lecturers bring to the classroom. While not explicit in the ESP acronym, but an essential component of EMEMUS, the role of multilingualism in the learning process cannot be ignored any longer (e.g. Cenoz & Gorter, 2010; Kuteeva et al., 2020; Llurda et al., 2014). The available literature advocates for a multilingual turn in education, although for that to truly occur, crucial changes need to take place with regard to language ideologies in the classroom. Some of the conflicting views reported by participants regarding, for instance, the use of one vs. various languages when teaching seem to be aligned with an institution's prior traditions or with an individual's personal experience in dealing with international classrooms and their treatment of and response to students' multilingual repertoires (see e.g. Dafouz et al., 2016; Kuteeva et al., 2020; Breeze & Roothooft, 2021). Thus, in the case of universities or individuals with a shorter tradition of internationalisation, the use of various languages in the classroom is often reported as a 'deficiency' and connected to factors such as insufficient teacher or student language proficiency. In contrast, in settings with more experience and tradition of multilingual and international students, the very same practices may be viewed as a resource rather than an obstacle for communication and learning (Jenkins, 2014; Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2021).

Consequently, in order to overcome such monolingual views and English-only practices, ESP and EME practitioners could share real life examples of how multilingual professional practices can be useful for students in certain content areas. Thus, for example, in the case of medical students, the use of

the local language is deemed necessary to engage with local patients, while, at the same time, English remains crucial for research and publishing. Additionally, the creation of bilingual or multilingual online databases and glossaries and bibliographies designed to support students' academic and linguistic development can be used to illustrate students' use of their own home languages for learning purposes. After all, one needs to remember that in EMEMUS programmes the aim is to develop biliterate or pluriliterate users who can employ their different multilingual repertoires depending on their professional needs both at home and abroad (Meyer et al., 2018; Palfreyman & Van der Walt, 2017; Wilkinson & Gabriëls, 2020).

Closely related to multilingual uses and users, we find translanguaging (TL), a construct developed by García and Li Wei (2014, p. 21), who argue that:

> translanguaging does not refer to two separate languages nor to a synthesis of different language practices or to a hybrid mixture. Rather translanguaging refers to new language practices that make visible the complexity of language exchanges among people with different histories, and releases histories and understandings that had been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states.

In this regard, the role of the ESP/EAP expert would first be to become acquainted with this notion and its pedagogical use in the classroom, so that an understanding and appreciation of translanguaging (TL) practices can be shared with EME practitioners. An educational view of such TL strategies can, in turn, enable students with a common L1 to construct their disciplinary knowledge more effectively. Furthermore, as mentioned above, when referring to pluriliteracies, TL has also proved to be helpful in developing students' subject disciplinary language (Mazak & Carroll, 2016; see Paulsrud et al., 2021 for a critical exploration of TLs in EMI). Concurrently, the ESP/EAP practitioner could also point out to EME professionals how such TL practices, which may be useful under some teaching and learning circumstances, can be viewed under a negative light when they exclude international students with no shared L1 competence. In this case, EME educators should be made aware of the dangers of leaving out those who do not have the required linguistic resources to participate actively in the international classroom (Kuteeva et al., 2020).

5.3. Promoting Interdisciplinary Professional Development

Collaboration between EME and ESP professionals, as advocated throughout this paper, is of paramount importance. However, in order for such collaboration to function effectively, Airey (2016, p. 78) rightfully notes that:

> both parties need to understand what the other can bring to the table ... the content lecturer should not view the language expert as a low-level technician dealing with issues of secondary importance and who is responsible for a 'quick language fix' [nor] the language expert fall int the trap of criticizing what may appear to be underdeveloped or naive approaches to disciplinary discourse on the part of the content lecturer.

Discussions and negotiations of what teaching and learning in ESP and EME settings actually entails are therefore needed. In this vein, and drawing on a recent study of ESP teachers from three different universities in Spain, Bocanegra-Valle and Basturkmen (2019) argued that many of the ESP professionals interviewed reported feeling like outsiders to the disciplinary community they attend to and expressed a need to appear 'credible', 'respected' and 'valued' (ibid, p. 136) in the eyes of their content colleagues. In order to achieve this, their work suggests closer collaboration amongst professionals and more preparation in the development of disciplinary literacies adapted to the true needs of the students and academics working in their respective disciplinary areas. This cooperation has been addressed as well in the 'adjunct-CLIL model' proposed by Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés (2015), where language instruction is tailored to disciplinary needs in a balanced CLIL-like manner, and where collaboration between language and subject specialists is organised in a systematic manner. Another example of the fruitful cooperation between content and ESP teachers can be found in the South African context, described in detail in the special issue of *Across the Disciplines* (Gustafsson, 2011). In this project, language experts' partnership with content lecturers begins by uncovering the tacit rules that govern their disciplinary discourse(s) and by asking the type of questions a novice would (Jacobs, 2005, 2007).

In order to achieve this, some authors suggest decentralising ESP units from the English departments at HEIs where they are usually located, and placing them instead in the faculties where they can work more closely with the disciplinary experts and co-develop curricular innovations (Arkoudis et al., 2014; Murray, 2016). Such a measure could bring with it a number of advantages such as allowing ESP/EAP teachers to build their discipline

knowledge and to gain familiarity with the expectations of the faculty departments vis-à-vis the academic literacies of their respective disciplines. This, in turn, could guide syllabus design and pedagogy accordingly, thereby helping to ensure relevance and continuity. Such decentralisation would also facilitate the integration of ESP/EAP teachers into the local academic community and in doing so promote their understanding of its structures, procedures, constraints, and opportunities that afford the development of students' language competence. Furthermore, greater decentralisation or 'embeddedness' (cf. Blaj-Ward, 2017) allows for the establishing and nurturing of productive working relationships with academic and professional staff. This could be seen to facilitate ESP/EAP teachers' capacity to operate effectively and better influence and support both academic staff and students through personal contact and even committee membership.

The other side of the coin, however, views interdisciplinary collaboration and the decentralisation of ESP/EAP units with certain suspicion as it raises particular organisational challenges to departments in HEIs. As departments have been traditionally organised around a disciplinary core, the integration of insights and research from disciplines that do not advance this core is often disregarded (Ng & Litzenberg, 2019). In any case, what teacher professional development for EME ought to foreground is the need to go beyond English language training only and aim for a more holistic understanding of this educational phenomenon, one that repositions EME in a broader international and multicultural frame (Dafouz, 2021).

While substantial efforts have been made to provide pedagogical support to EME professionals often through trans-national project funding (see, for instance, EQUiiP project, TACE project, etc) and the launching of new specialised publications (Breeze & Sancho Guinda, 2021; Morell & Nickolaevna, 2021; Sánchez-Pérez, 2020), there is still room for improvement. For a start, the systemic support of teacher professional development programmes for university professionals, whether in EME or in other innovative practices, needs to be institutionalised. Such provision, I would add, also needs to be extended to students beyond EME and ESP settings and address disciplinary competence building in the L1 as well. If we really want our university students (whether L1 or L2 learners) to develop the necessary communicative, multilingual and multicultural strategies to succeed in this globalised world, support cannot be postponed any longer – a request which, I believe, is food for a whole different paper.

6. Concluding remarks

As global issues become ever more complex, the sharing, integration and collaboration of diverse experiences and expertise across disciplinary boundaries becomes truly crucial. With a focus on EME and ESP/EAP affordances and challenges, this paper aimed to reconcile these seemingly separate areas and unveil shared opportunities for teaching, learning and research. In this respect, three major zones emerged as relevant for collaboration and research: 1) the development of a glocal context-sensitive curriculum designed jointly by EME and ESP practitioners, where real-life tasks and disciplinary-led literacies are included; 2) the valuing of multilingual and translingual practices which host the diverse linguistic repertoires that students and lecturers bring to the current classroom, and which, concurrently, view them as resources for learning rather than as obstacles; and 3) the endorsement of interdisciplinary collaboration across ESP and EME professionals from different disciplinary traditions in search of a common ground that appeals to both. In this respect, if we want ESP to be seen as a site for change rather than accommodation (Basturkmen, 2014), comprehensive measures that truly coordinate language-in-education strategies across institutional levels need to be designed.

Last, while ESP/EAP specialists have expressed understandable concerns with regard to the fast spread of EME programmes in higher education and their fear of losing professional space, this paper has tried to underline instead the opportunities provided by EME and ESP collaboration. In doing so, it is hoped that, on the one hand, EME programmes can view the importance of language awareness for quality teaching and learning and, on the other, ESP can revisit their teaching and learning strategies under a more transformative light.

Acknowledgements

References

Abedi, J., Hofstetter, C. H., & Lord, C. (2004). Assessment accommodations for English language learners: Implications for policy-based empirical research. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 1–28

Ackerley, K., M. Guarda, & F. Helm (Eds.) (2017). *Sharing perspectives on English-medium instruction.* Peter Lang.

Aguilar, M. (2017). Engineering lecturers' views on CLIL and EMI. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*, 722–735.

Airey, J. (2016). EAP, EMI or CLIL? In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 71–83). Routledge.

Altinyelken, H. K., Moorcroft, S., & van der Draai, H. (2014). The dilemmas and complexities of implementing language-in-education policies: Perspectives from urban and rural contexts in Uganda. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *36*, 90–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2013.11.001

Arkoudis, S., The University of Melbourne, & National Senior Teaching Fellowship. (2014). *Integrating English language communication skills into disciplinary curricula: Options and strategies.*

Arnbjörnsdóttir, B. (2020). English at the University of Iceland: Students' perceptions and practices. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities* (pp. 245–265). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6_10

Arnó-Macià, E., & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37*, 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.007

Banegas, D. L., & Busleimán, G. M. (2021). EMI materials in online initial English language teacher education. In D. Lasagabaster & A. Doiz (Eds.), *Language use in English-medium instruction at university* (1st ed., pp. 100–125). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97810031345 34-6

Basturkmen, H. (2005). I*deas and options in English for Specific Purposes*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617040

Beelen, J., & de Wit, H. (2012). *Internationalisation revisited: New dimensions in the internationalisation of higher education*. Centre for Applied Research on Economics & Management (CAREM).

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse. A genre-based view.* Continuum.

Bhattacharya, U. (2017). Colonization and English ideologies in India: A language policy perspective. *Language Policy*, *16*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9399-2

Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research & Development, 18*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180105

Blaj-Ward, L. (2017). *Language learning and use in English-medium higher education*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1

Bloom, B.S. (1956). T*axonomy of educational objectives. Vol. 1: Cognitive domain*. David McKay.

Bocanegra-Valle, A., & Basturkmen, H. (2019). Investigating the teacher education needs of experienced ESP teachers in Spanish universities. *Ibérica, 38*, 127–149.

Bonancina-Pugh, F. (2012). Researching 'practiced language policies': Insights from conversation analysis. *Language Policy, 11*(3), 213–234.

Breeze, R., & Dafouz, E. (2017). Constructing complex cognitive discourse functions in higher education: An exploratory study of exam answers in Spanish- and English-medium instruction settings. *System*, *70*, 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.09.024

Breeze, R., & Roothooft, H. (2021). Using the L1 in university-level EMI: Attitudes among lecturers in Spain. *Language Awareness*. DOI: 10.1080/09658416.2021.1903911

Breeze, R., & Sancho Guinda, S. (2021). *Teaching English-medium instruction courses in higher education: A guide for non-native speakers*. Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350169791?locatt=label:secondary_bloomsburyCollections

Brown, H. (2017). Cooperation and collaboration in undergraduate EMI: Adapting EAP to the emergence of blended academic norms and practices in a Japanese university. In J. Valcke & R. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher education. Perspectives on professional practice* (pp. 151–166). Peter Lang.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In L. Wei (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics*

Review (pp. 1–28). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2010). The diversity of multilingualism in education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2010*(205), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2010.038

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning.* Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A., & Martin, P. (2003). Multilingual classroom ecologies: Inter-relationships, interactions and ideologies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *6*(3–4), 161–167.

Dafouz, E. (2018). English-medium instruction in multilingual university settings—An opportunity for developing language awareness. In P. Garrett & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (1st ed., pp. 170–185). Routledge.

Dafouz, E. (2020). Undergraduate student academic writing in English-medium higher education: Explorations through the ROAD-MAPPING lens. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *46*, 100888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100888

Dafouz, E. (2021). Repositioning English-medium instruction in a broader international agenda: Insights from a survey on teacher professional development. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 34*, 15-38. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2021.34.08

Dafouz, E., Camacho, M., & Ur-quia, E. (2014). 'Surely they can't do as well': A comparison of business students' academic performance in English-medium and Spanish-as-first-language medium programmes. *Language and Education, 28*(3), 223–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2013.808661

Dafouz, E., Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2016). University teachers' beliefs of language and content integration in English-medium education in multilingual settings. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education* (pp. 123–143). Multilingual Matters.

Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2016). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics*, *37*(3), 397–415. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu034

Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2017). A sociolinguistic approach to the multifaceted roles of English in English-medium education in multilingual university settings. In A. Llinares & T. Morton (Eds.), *Language learning & language teaching* (pp. 287–306). John Benjamins. https://benjamins.com/catalog/lllt.47.17daf

Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2020). *ROAD-MAPPING English medium education in the internationalised university*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 216–253. https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0011

Dalton-Puffer, C., & Bauer-Marschallinger, S. (2019). Cognitive discourse functions meet historical competences: Towards an integrated pedagogy in CLIL history education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 7*(1), 30–60. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.17017.dal

Doiz, A., D. Lasagabaster, & J.M. Sierra (Eds.) (2013). *English medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Multilingual Matters.

Dudley-Evans, T., & Saint John, M.-J. (1998). *Developments in ESP: A multi-disciplinary approach* (5. print). Cambridge Univ. Press.

Evans, S., & Green, C. (2007). Why EAP is necessary: A survey of Hong Kong tertiary students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *6*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.11.005

Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2013). *CLIL in higher education: Towards a multilingual language policy*. Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Gustafsson, M., & Jacobs, C. (2013). Editorial: Student learning and ICLHE – frameworks and contexts. *Journal of Academic Writing*, ii–xii. https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v3i1.141

Hultgren, A. K., Jensen, C., & Dimova, S. (2015). English-medium instruction in European higher education: From the North to the South. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education: English in Europe* (pp. 1–15). De Gruyter.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2012). 'The past is the future with the lights on': Reflections on AELFE's 20th birthday. *Iberica*, *24*, 29-42.

Iino, M., & Murata, K. (2016). Dynamics of ELF communication in an English-medium academic context in Japan. From EFL learners to ELF users. In K. Murata (Ed.), *Exploring ELF in Japanese academic and business contexts: Conceptualisation, research and pedagogic implications* (pp. 111–131). Routledge.

Jacobs, C. (2005). On being an insider on the outside: New spaces for integrating academic literacies. *Teaching in Higher Education, 10*(4), 475–487. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510500 239091

Jacobs, C. (2007). Towards a critical understanding of the teaching of discipline-specific academic literacies: Making the tacit explicit. *Journal of Education*, *41*(1), 59–82.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.

Jiang, A. L., & Zhang, L. J. (2017). ESP/EAP through English-medium instruction: Teachers' perceptions and practices. In H. Reinders, D. Nunan, & B. Zou (Eds.), *Innovation in language learning and teaching* (pp. 173–195). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-60092-9_8

Kao, S.-M., & Tsou, W. (2017). EMI course assessment: A survey study of the issues. In W. Tsou & S.-M. Kao (Eds.), *EMI course assessment: A survey study of the issues* (pp. 183–205). Springer.

Ke, I.-C., & Cahyani, H. (2014). Learning to become users of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): How ELF online communication affects Taiwanese learners' beliefs of English. *System*, *46*, 28–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07. 008

Kırkgöz, Y., & Dikilitaş, K. (2018). Recent developments in ESP/EAP/EMI contexts. In Y. Kırkgöz & K. Dikilitaş (Eds.), *Key issues in English for Specific Purposes in higher education* (Vol. 11, pp. 1–10). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70214-8_1

Komori-Glatz, M. (2018). Conceptualising English as a business lingua franca. *European Journal of International Management*, *12*(1/2), 46. https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2018.089043

Kuteeva, M. (2020). Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050. 2019.1637395

Kuteeva, M., K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.) (2020). Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6

Lasagabaster, D., & A. Doiz (Eds.). (2021). *Language use in English-medium instruction at university: International perspectives on teacher practice* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10. 4324/9781003134534

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10. 1017/CBO9780511815355

Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge University Press.

Llurda, E., Cots, J. M., & Armengol, L. (2014). Views on multilingualism and internationalisation in higher education: Administrative staff in the spotlight. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *35*(4), 376–391. https://doi.org/10. 1080/01434632.2013.874435

Lorenzo, F. (2017). Historical literacy in bilingual settings: Cognitive academic language in CLIL history narratives. *Linguistics and Education*, *37*, 32–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2016.11. 002

Macaro, E., Hultgren, A. K., Kirkpatrick, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2019). English medium instruction: Global views and countries in focus. *Language Teaching*, *52*(02), 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000380

Mazak, C., & Carroll, K. S. (Eds.) (2016). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Multilingual Matters.

Meyer, O., Imhof, M., Coyle, D., & Banerjee, M. (2018). Positive learning and pluriliteracies. In O. Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, G. Wittum, & A. Dengel (Eds.), *Positive learning in the age of information* (pp. 235–265). Springer. http://link.springer.com/ 10.1007/978-3-658-19567-0_15

Morell, T., & Nickolaevna, V. (2021). Introduction. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *34*, 7. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2021.34.09

Murray, D. E. (2008). *Planning change, changing plans: Innovations in second language teaching*. University of Michigan Press.

Murray, N. (2016). An academic literacies argument for decentralizing EAP provision. *ELT Journal, 70*(4), 435–443. https://doi.org/10.1093/ elt/ccw030

Ng, D., & Litzenberg, K. (2019). Overcoming disciplinary divides in higher education: The case of agricultural economics. *Palgrave*

Communications, *5*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1057/
s41599-019-0235-8

Palfreyman, D., & C. Van der Walt (Eds.) (2017).
*Academic biliteracies: Multilingual repertoires in
higher education*. Multilingual Matters.

Paulsrud, B., Z. Tian & J. Toth, (Eds.) (2021).
English-medium instruction and translanguaging.
Multilingual Matters.

Pavón Vázquez, V., & Ramos, A. (2018). The
linguistic internationalization of higher education: A
study on the presence of language policies and
bilingual studies in Spanish universities. *Porta
Linguarum*, Monográfico III, 31–46.

Sánchez-Pérez, M. del M. (Ed.) (2020). T*eacher
training for English-medium instruction in higher
education*. IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-
1-7998-2318-6

Schmidt-Unterberger, B. (2018). The English-
medium paradigm: A conceptualisation of English-
medium teaching in higher education. *International
Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*,
21(5), 527–539. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.
2018.1491949

Singh, M., & Lu, S. Y. (2020). *Postmonolingual
critical thinking: Internationalising higher education
through students' languages and knowledge*.
Routledge.

Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (Eds.) (2012). Integrating
content and language in higher education: Gaining
insights into English-medium instruction at
European universities. *AILA Review* (Vol. 25).
John Benjamins.

Street, B. V. (1999). New literacies in theory and
practice: What are the implications for language in
education? *Linguistics and Education*, *10*(1),
1–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(99)
80103-X

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres.
Exploration and application*. Cambridge University
Press.

Terauchi, H., J. Noguchi., & A. Tajino (Eds.) (2020).
*Towards a new paradigm for English language
teaching: English for specific purposes in Asia and
beyond.* Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Valcke, J., & R. Wilkinson (Eds.). (2017).
*Integrating content and language in higher
education: Perspectives on professional practice.*
Peter Lang.

Wächter, B., & F. Maiworm (Eds.) (2014). *English-
taught pro-grammes in European higher
education: The state of play in 2014.* Lemmens
Medien.

Wilkinson, R. (2013). English-medium instruction
at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A.
Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.),
*English medium instruction at universities: Global
challenges* (pp. 3–24). Multilingual Matters.

Wilkinson, R., & Gabriëls, R. (2020). Plurilingual
students in EMI: Perceptions of educational
democracy and linguistic justice. In M. Kuteeva, K.
Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language
perceptions and practices in multilingual
universities* (pp. 217–244). Springer International
Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-
38755-6_9

Wilkinson, R., & V. Zegers (Eds.) (2007).
*Researching content and language integration in
higher education*. Valkhof Pers.

Emma Dafouz is Associate Professor in the Department of English
Studies at Complutense University of Madrid. Her research deals with
understanding the roles of language in education, and particularly, in
English-medium higher education. She served as Advisor for Curricular
Internationalization at her university from 2014-19. At present, she is Chair
of the Spanish Regional Group of ICLHE.