



UiO • University of Oslo

English: Higher Education's Elephant in the Room

A Comparative Case Study of English Language Policies and Practices at Universities in Norway, Poland and Spain

Nina Jasienczyk-Krol

Master of Philosophy in Higher Education

30 credits

University of Oslo

Faculty of Educational Sciences

June 2021

English: Higher Education's Elephant in the Room

A Comparative Case Study of English Language Policies and Practices at Universities in Norway, Poland and Spain

© Nina Jasiencyk-Krol

2021

English: Higher Education's Elephant in the Room

A Comparative Case Study of English Language Policies and Practices at Universities in Norway, Poland and Spain

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

This master's thesis investigates English language policies and practices found in Norwegian, Polish and Spanish higher education. Internationalization has become a prominent facet of universities' strategic agendas, and as such English-medium instruction has found a foothold in helping universities to realize them. While English-medium instruction is not an entirely new phenomenon, it does carry a multitude of implications for teaching, research and policy at large, as well as dilemmas for cultural and national identity. Many universities across the world offer courses and programs in English even though English is neither the first nor official language of the country they are located in. Therefore, the overall purpose of this study is to explore the extent to which English language policies and practices are aligned between Norway, Poland and Spain. Furthermore, language policy issues associated with English tend to get overlooked and most literature surrounding the topic focuses exclusively on the attitudes that students and staff may have. Little attention is given to understanding the implication that internationalization has in relation to language, so this thesis seeks to better understand such issues by examining how universities' strategic plans balance national language priorities with English.

In order to assess the English language policies and practices of Norwegian, Polish and Spanish higher education institutions, a cross-national comparative case study was employed. The data for the empirical study has been collected through document analysis and analyzed using qualitative content analysis. The theoretical framework considers both linguistic and non-linguistic dimensions of language policy which have been adapted from Spolsky's (2004) theory of language policy to fit the scope of the study.

The findings of the study reveal that English is generally positioned favorably with regards to achieving universities' internationalization objectives, as well as greater international prestige. While the degree to which internationalization is explicitly linked to English-medium instruction varies among the three cases, the universities are similar in that they all promote multilingual language policies which integrate English. Despite the inherent geographical, cultural and linguistic differences among the three cases, English can be identified as an important dimension for bridging the gap between global and local language interests as they pertain to education.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank everyone who supported me in the process of writing my master's thesis.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Bjørn Stensaker, for helping me shape this project and guiding me through to its completion. I am very grateful to have had such a patient supervisor who encouraged me to be bold and innovative. I am appreciative of all your constructive feedback, insightful discussions and valuable advice.

This thesis work would not have been possible without the support and kindness of those who have been a part of my journey as a Master's student at the University of Oslo. I would like to thank my professors, peers and classmates for their interest in my research topic and progress, and for making my time in Oslo so enjoyable. A special thanks to JD, Jenny, Philip, Issac and Arianna, and to our program coordinator, Kristi, for her unwavering encouragement and genuine care for each and every student. I would also like to thank my dear friends, both those in Oslo and elsewhere, for keeping me level-headed and reminding me that laughter is life's best medicine.

Most importantly, a heartfelt thank you to my mother, Anita, who refused to let me give up on the completion of my studies upon learning of my father's sudden passing. I dedicate this thesis to both of my parents, who instilled in me the value of hard-work and a great love for education and language.

Table of Contents

Abstract	IV
Acknowledgments	V
List of Abbreviations	VIII
List of Tables	IX
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	2
1.1.1 Mobility	2
1.1.2 The European Language Issue	4
1.2 Rationale and Aims of the Study	6
1.3 Research Questions	7
1.4 Thesis Outline	8
2 Literature Review & Theoretical Framework	9
2.1 Language Policy Components	9
2.1.1 National Ideology and Identity Pressures	10
2.1.1.1 Europeanization, the European Identity and the Bologna Process	11
2.1.2 English as a Mechanism in the Globalization Process	13
2.1.2.1 Mobility Schemes as an Outcome of Globalization	15
2.1.3 National Sociolinguistic Situation	17
2.1.3.1 The Continental Divide	17
2.1.4 Linguistic Rights of Minorities	19
2.1.5 Language Beliefs	20
2.1.6 Language Management	24
2.1.7 Language Practice	26
2.2 Operationalization of Language Policy Conceptualization	27
2.3 Country Context: Norway, Poland & Spain	28
2.3.1 Norway	28
2.3.2 Poland	31
2.3.3 Spain	35
2.4 Operationalization of Expectations within the Case Studies	37
3 Methodology	39
3.1 Research Strategy	39

3.2 Research Design	39
3.3 Selection of Cases and Sampling	40
3.4 Data Collection and Analysis	42
3.5 Other Considerations and Limitations	43
4 Findings.....	46
4.1 Similarities and Differences of English Language Policies and Practices in Norway, Poland and Spain.....	46
4.2 The Position of English in relation to L1 and the Fulfillment of University Objectives	49
4.3 The Relationship between Internationalization and English Language Policies and Practices	54
5 Discussion	57
5.1 Relevant for Norway and Poland	57
5.2 Relevant for Poland and Spain	60
5.3 Relevant for Norway and Spain	63
5.4 Globalization vs. Glocalization.....	65
6 Conclusion	69
6.1 Concluding Remarks	69
6.2 Limitations, Implications and Recommendations.....	70
References.....	74
Appendices.....	80
A. Document Analysis- Norway.....	80
B. Document Analysis- Poland	81
C. Document Analysis- Spain	82

List of Abbreviations

CEFR - Common European Framework of Reference
ECTS - European Credit Transfer System
EEA - European Economic Area
EFL - English as a Foreign Language
EHEA - European Higher Education Area
EMI - English-Medium Instruction
ESL - English as a Second Language
ETP - English Taught Program
EU - European Union
HE - Higher Education
HEI(s) - Higher Education Institution(s)
IA - Internationalization abroad
IaH - Internationalization at home
L1 - mother tongue; first language
MECD - Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture
NAWA - Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange
NES - Native English speaker
NNES - Non-Native English speaker
OECD - Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development
PiS - Polish Law and Justice Party
UB - University of Barcelona
UiO - University of Oslo
UW - University of Warsaw

List of Tables

Table 2.1 General Expectations	27
Table 2.2 Detailed Expectations for the Country Cases	37

1 Introduction

Globalization of higher education is said to go hand-in-hand with the globalization of the English language (Jenkins, 2014). Globalization can be understood as the creation of a global relationship based on the operation of free world markets (Maringe & Foskett, 2010, as cited in Jenkins, 2017, p. 2). The results of globalization on higher education (HE) include greater integration of research, cross-border student and staff mobility, and the use of English as the primary language for scientific communication (Altbach & Knight, 2007). In fact, one of the most significant educational trends worldwide is the growth in the number of courses at universities that are taught through the medium of English (Coleman, 2006).

Higher education institutions (HEIs) may be impelled by an assortment of motives to introduce English taught programs (ETPs) and courses (Coleman, 2006). Of these motives, internationalization is most notable and has become a key strategy by which universities have responded to the influence of globalization, by integrating international and intercultural dimensions into their tripartite function of teaching, research and service. Recruitment and enrollment of international students is one of the more apparent ways in which universities add to their international dimension (Jenkins, 2017). It helps not only in the promotion of institutional profile and reputation, but also with regards to financial imperatives. HEIs may introduce ETPs in order to help with their individual internationalization strategies and to take advantage of the international student market by using English-medium instruction to attract fee-paying international students (Coleman, 2006). What this means with respect to the globalization of HE is that a fast-growing amount of university content teaching is being conducted in English-medium in countries where English is not the first, or even official language (Jenkins, 2017).

English-medium instruction (EMI) can be defined as “the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (Macaro et al., 2018, p. 107). EMI in higher education is a rather recent phenomenon - a majority of EMI courses have only been launched since 1998 (Coleman, 2006) - and despite certain predictable problems, such as ideological objections or inadequate language skills, ETPs have been widely adopted across the European

Higher Education Area (EHEA). While it is difficult to obtain up-to-date and comparable numbers on English-medium programs at HEIs in non-Anglophone European countries (Dimova, et. al, 2015), available data does indicate an exponential increase in the provision of ETPs at HEIs, particularly in the Nordic countries (OECD, 2015). In 2002, only 700 ETPs were reported in Europe, but by 2007 there were 2,389 ETPs, and this number more than tripled to 8,089 by 2013/14 (Maiworm & Wächter, 2008; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). On average, 33% of European tertiary institutions offered ETPs in the 2013/14 academic year (OECD, 2015). Within Europe there are three countries in which a majority of HEIs offer at least one undergraduate or graduate program taught entirely in English- Finland (83% of HEIs), Sweden (81%), and the Netherlands (65%) (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014, as cited in OECD, 2015). Perhaps unsurprisingly, these countries also score well in terms of international student enrollment in comparison to their European counterparts.

If one thing is clear, it is that globalization, and therefore globalization of the English language (Jenkins, 2014), will remain a central force that drives and shapes the future of HE as a whole. It is strongly assumed that English will remain a language in teaching, if not *the* language of teaching, research and scientific communication for the foreseeable future. This phenomenon feeds into what has been termed by Phillipson as the “European Paradox” (2006), which views English as both an opportunity and as a threat. With regards to the EHEA, there is no doubt that English is needed in order to facilitate cross-national mobility and cooperation, however on the national stage it poses an overwhelming challenge to local language, culture and national identity. Such a dilemma has caused a lot of uncertainty and debate, especially surrounding the general role of English in non-Anglophone higher education settings and the implementation of ETPs and EMI courses (Altbach, 2019).

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Mobility

Internationalization is traditionally linked to mobility - mobility of people, programs, projects and providers across national borders (de Wit & Hunter, 2018). However, *internationalization abroad* (IA) brought about by increased student and staff mobility, is only one of the key aspects

of internationalization. The other is *internationalization at home* (IaH), which can be described as more curriculum-oriented and serves as a means to prepare university graduates to live and work in a globalized world. While there is considerable variation in defining IaH, there is a common consensus that simply switching the medium of instruction to English for an international group of students does not constitute an internationalized curriculum (de Wit & Hunter, 2018). However, in addition to other political, economic and cultural factors, the language of instruction is a strong determinant of students' choice of destination. Countries with EMI can be very attractive to international students and improvement of English language skills has motivated many people to study abroad (OECD, 2018).

According to a 2014 Erasmus Impact study, 83% of HEIs consider study mobility to be the most important aspect of their internationalization strategy and of their international profile (de Wit, 2014). While student and staff mobility are typically seen as contributing to the *abroad* component of internationalization, IaH also benefits from incoming mobile students by virtue of non-mobile, domestic students and staff having contact with the mobile, international ones (Jenkins, 2017). Another key finding of the Erasmus Impact study is that less than 20% of European students study abroad despite the fact that they are actively encouraged to do so through programs like Erasmus Plus (de Wit, 2014). Even though this statistic may seem low in comparison to other countries or regions in the world, such as China and India, who together are responsible for more than 30% of the pool of international students studying abroad (OECD, 2020), the EHEA internationalization strategies actually appear to be on par with the European Union Council's 2011 goal of increasing the proportion of European Union (EU) graduates from HE who complete a period of their studies or training abroad to 20% by 2020 (OECD, 2019; Rome Communiqué, 2020).

Since 1999, the Bologna Process aims to make European HE more homogenous and attractive to international students by stimulating mobility of students, staff and researchers. Within the EHEA, "countries, institutions and stakeholders of the European area continuously adapt their higher education systems, making them more compatible and strengthening their quality assurance mechanisms" (EHEA, 2020). This has resulted in the development of the EU as a key geographical area of inward mobility where 1.7 million mobile students are enrolled in the 23

OECD countries that are also members of the EU (OECD, 2019). Even though the Bologna Process attempts to harmonize and streamline various domains and services of European HE at the supranational level, the reality is that at the national, regional, and even institutional level, each country interprets policies as they see fit and implements them in practice using different methods. With regards to English language policy, this is reflected in the distinct English language policies and practices that individual HEIs in the EHEA may have.

While the mobility of people is a critical component of internationalization, it is not the only one. Mobility as a facet of HE globalization exists in two senses: mobile people and mobile *language*. Although there is a tendency to think of language travelling with people, it is increasingly the case where HE is concerned, “that the language, English, ‘travels’ while many people remain in situ” (Jenkins, 2017, p. 1) in local universities that offer EMI courses. While English may be the primary lingua franca of international HE, it is neither the first language (L1) of most people affiliated with HE nor a foreign language, but rather a tool for communication (Jenkins, 2017). A lingua franca refers to the common language that is adopted between speakers whose native languages are different. Therefore, it is important to consider language policy issues that arise in non-Anglophone settings where English is the medium of instruction but not the dominant or local language. Universities that wish to advertise their international status ought to be aware of such developments in order to account for and build them into their stated language policies, internationalization strategies and mission statements.

1.1.2 The European Language Issue

At the country level, Hatakenaka (2004) argues that being a non-Anglophone country¹ means that it is difficult to compete in terms of the benefits of HE internationalization because the international student market is simply skewed due to the dominance of English-speaking countries. The language spoken and used in instruction is likely to affect international students’ choices over their potential destination countries and the prevalence of predominantly English-speaking countries (i.e., the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, etc.) reflects the

¹ Non-Anglophone countries can be defined as those which are not English-speaking, i.e., English is not listed as an official national language. Norway, Poland and Spain are thus considered to be non-Anglophone countries.

progressive adoption of English as a global language (OECD, 2015). Currently, the United States accounts for 18% of the total global market share of international students, and is trailed by the UK and Australia, which both have 8% of the global market share (OECD, 2020). Such indicative statistics lend support to creating the picture of an international HE market in which it is massively advantageous to be an Anglophone country (Hughes, 2008). The introduction of EMI into universities located in non-Anglophone countries, in particular mainland Europe, is said to be driven by three main conditions: to attract fee-paying international students, to enhance an HEIs international prestige, and to develop the English language skills of an HEIs' students and staff. However, another rationale behind the increasing number of HEIs in non-Anglophone countries that offer ETPs and courses can be attributed to the need to overcome their perceived linguistic *disadvantage* (Jenkins, 2014).

According to Hughes (2008), HE providers and policy makers in non-Anglophone countries are coming to the realization that delivery in an influential international language like English can be leveraged and capitalized upon to generate revenue and migration of skilled future labor from abroad. Interestingly, the European language issue has been compounded by the UK's withdrawal from the EU. Following close to 5 years of complex negotiations, the Brexit deal is official and while long-term implications remain to be seen, a casualty of Brexit is the UK's subsequent exit from Europe's renowned student exchange program, Erasmus. For Britain, the withdrawal is a blow to its acclaimed universities, which for centuries have represented its soft power in Europe and around the world, and have been an important source of income for the country (Peltier, 2020). The UK remains second to the US as a destination for international students, but its withdrawal from Erasmus could deter many EU students from studying abroad in the UK, and force them to seek alternatives elsewhere in Europe. While the UK's Erasmus agreement withdrawal certainly presents an opportunity for European HEIs to expand their offering of EMI to attract international students and elevate their own prestige, it also further contributes to the European language issue. With Britain's departure from the European trading bloc, the ease of accessibility to British universities is gone, however the English language has stayed behind.

Regardless of Brexit's impact, the increased adoption of EMI is not without its own distinct set of problems because language is not just a tool for communication, it is also a notable aspect of national culture. As such, there are many dilemmas and consequences that can be attributed to the rising dominance of English as the lingua franca in the international university. Nationalists who advocate for the safeguarding of national cultural heritage argue that the increased use of English results in the loss of local language, and has dangerous consequences for culture and society (Altbach, 2019). An increased use of English can also lead to diminished quality in higher education primary processes due to lack of fluency. Faculty whose command of English is elementary limits their ability to teach, leading to low-quality instruction. This low-quality instruction in turn, when combined with limited comprehension and partial understanding on the part of students who are non-native English speakers (NNES), creates a classroom environment where little learning takes place, challenging one of the fundamental functions of the university. Furthermore, the development of ETPs creates barriers of access to HE, and excludes students who may have had less exposure to English language acquisition at the primary and secondary level. These dilemmas place significant pressure on university policy-makers as they aim to develop effective language policies that balance the need for internationalization and obligations to keep the national language as a primary medium of instruction (Kerklaan et al., 2008). Policy-makers and university leadership are inclined to confront this problem of language choice and whether or not to make changes, and *how* to make them, from the national language to the international standard: English. Therefore, this issue requires the review of HE English language policies and practices in order to have a better understanding of the implications that internationalization has “in relation to the (English) language in which universities and programmes operate” (Jenkins, 2014, p. 18).

1.2 Rationale and Aims of the Study

Internationalization has become one of the main foci and objectives in the strategic plans of HEIs. During the last two decades, this objective has come to include an increasing offer of studies in the English-medium as a means for furthering universities' international profiles. While EMI itself is not a novelty in the world of higher education as the teaching of university courses in English becomes increasingly common, language policy issues related to EMI tend to get overlooked. Previous research favors attitudinal studies which are primarily focused on the

attitudes and beliefs that students and teaching staff have towards EMI. It is only more recently that research into language policy has begun to take shape by situating EMI into a wider socio-political context which can help expose hidden ideologies and social disadvantages (Dimova et al., 2015). There is also an urgent need to address language policy issues more vigorously at the national and supranational level in the EU because much more is at stake in language policy than just language (Phillipson, 2015). Language and power operate in symbiosis, and therefore university authorities need to articulate a clear language policy whose primary objective should be to find a balance between languages utilized, that is, between co-official languages or between the national language and academia's lingua franca - English (Doiz et al., 2011). Furthermore, the span of most EMI research has been quite narrow and embedded in particular national or university environments, so this thesis aims to be a contribution to the gap in the field through its cross-national and contrastive nature. The rationale behind the case selection of a Norwegian (University of Oslo), Polish (University of Warsaw) and Spanish (University of Barcelona) university aims to address this very gap in research.

1.3 Research Questions

For the purpose of the study, the main problem statement of this thesis can be formulated as follows: How aligned are university English language policies and practices cross-nationally in Norway, Poland and Spain, and what are the implications thereof?

To direct and limit the scope of the study, the following research questions have been developed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in university English language policy across mainland Europe and the European Higher Education Area?
2. How is English positioned in relation to the native language and the fulfillment of university objectives?
3. What links are made between English language policies and practices and internationalization, either explicitly or implicitly?

1.4 Thesis Outline

This thesis is divided into six chapters. The first chapter of this thesis is the introduction which provides background information and context for the study, the rationale behind the study and what it aims to contribute to the field of research on higher education, and the research questions guiding the study. The second chapter offers a review of past academic literature on the topic of language policy. From this the theoretical framework and general expectations for the research study are developed and presented. This chapter also includes pertinent information about Norway, Poland and Spain, from which country specific expectations are developed and presented, upon integration with theory. The third chapter explains the research methodology and presents a range of topics covering research strategy and design, data collection and analysis and also considers limitations and quality criteria aspects. The fourth chapter presents the findings of the study. The fifth chapter consists of the overall discussion of the findings and interprets them with reference to the relevant literature, theoretical framework and expectations offered in Chapter 2. This thesis concludes in the sixth chapter, where implications, limitations and suggestions for future research are offered.

2 Literature Review & Theoretical Framework

This chapter provides a review of literature and a theoretical basis as to how the European language issue is portrayed and the components that influence the extent to which internationalization has an impact on English language policies and practices across the EHEA. First, a consistent conceptual framework will be used as a tool for guiding comprehensive analysis. The selected framework is suitable for the purpose of exploring top-down language policy within the scope of the project. Using Spolsky's (2004) theory of language policy as a starting point, I examine how Spolsky and other authors theorize how the European language issue and EMI are portrayed and addressed in the language policies and practices of HEIs. Second, I describe how this study will utilize the concepts and theoretical framework in the analysis of the current study. I first develop and theorize my own set of more general expectations derived from Spolsky's theory of language policy (see Table 2.1). Then, in order to link the empirical cases to the theoretical framework, the national context of the three countries included in this study is given. It is useful to provide some insights regarding the culture and languages of the countries included in the study to better understand the alignment of English language policies and practices of European HEIs. The language ecology of each country is different, yet each of them face similar challenges with respect to a so-called "English invasion". Having a general understanding of the historical, geopolitical, cultural and educational characteristics as they pertain to language issues is necessary as a point of departure in order to link the case universities to the country where they are located. Lastly, I specify and operationalize the aforementioned general expectations regarding the commonalities and/or differences that are prevalent in the language policies of the three respective case universities, and the underlying reasons for them (see Table 2.2).

2.1 Language Policy Components

Language and language policy both exist in highly complex, dynamic and interacting contexts. In addition to the mere linguistic features that shape language policy, there are also a host of non-linguistic factors (i.e., political, demographic, social, religious, cultural, etc.) that influence language policy development and implementation. Such factors regularly account for any attempt by a person or a group of people to intervene and for subsequent changes that may or

may not occur (Spolsky, 2004). In the following sections a theoretical explanation for the interconnected linguistic and non-linguistic factors that sculpt language policy at national and institutional levels is offered. In essence, Spolsky's theory of language policy can be broken apart into four major forces that drive and control the language policy of any independent nation: national ideology and identity, English as a mechanism in globalization, the national sociolinguistic environment and the linguistic rights of minority groups; and into a tripartite conceptualization of language policy within a speech community: language beliefs, management and practice. The remaining portion of this chapter is therefore organized in subsections derived from Spolsky's main theory. However, because this thesis aims to focus on higher education institutions rather than countries, elements of Spolsky's framework are limiting and need to be adapted and elaborated to suit the HE context.

2.1.1 National Ideology and Identity Pressures

Issues of national identity are closely linked to the topic of language policy because language plays a dynamic role in unifying and maintaining national identity (Wright, 1994, as cited in Carter & Sealey, 2007). According to Carter & Sealey (2007), identity has a paradoxical nature in that it is relational and defined by establishing "those whom one is like and also those from whom one wishes to be differentiated" (p. 23). This entails a notion of community in which members share something in common, like language, which in turn becomes a marker of collective group identity. Therefore, language and associated group culture become intertwined, and a threat to language can be perceived as a threat to culture as well (Carter & Sealey, 2007).

For the most part, the classification of languages as distinct and separate entities is unproblematic in our everyday life when trying to determine with whom we share a mutual language and with whom we do not. However, this becomes problematic and acquires practical significance when languages become institutionalized in official policies, be it at the level of national or international government and legislation (Carter & Sealey, 2007). Therefore, language classification becomes a matter of political choice rather than linguistic necessity, and instead of implementing the possibility of a common language, those in positions of authority who have the ability to influence language policy seek to develop two distinct languages - one of which is the official, standard national language, and the second which essentially includes any

language or variety not classified as the former. Across most independent nation states in Europe this is overwhelmingly the case, and is particularly observable in the Nordic region. The five countries that make up this region in Northern Europe each have a distinct language that is considered crucial to national identity (Vikør, 2000, as cited in Carter & Sealey, 2007), and yet the varieties of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish are mutually intelligible among speakers. It can be assumed that such contemporary language practices date back to the historical practice of labelling languages as distinct, bounded entities that embody significant elements of national culture and are linked to territorial units (Carter & Sealey, 2007). Therefore, nationalism gets exemplified in the monolingual, “one nation, one language” (Kaplan et al., 2000, as cited in Carter & Sealey, 2007) ideology that perpetuates even today in many countries.

Nationalism is often related to national identity, and like identity, nationalism wears two faces - the first, an external image which must be sufficiently distinctive to be identified by outsiders; and the second, an internal image which overrides local loyalties and permits all citizens to identify themselves with it (Haugen, 1966). According to Anderson (1991), part of the difficulty in defining ‘nationalism’ is that there is a tendency to view it as an ideology, like liberalism or fascism, yet “nationalism”, “nationality” and “nation-ness” are also cultural artefacts of a particular kind. Taking this into consideration, Anderson defines nationalism as an imagined political community; “imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (1991, p. 6). In essence, nationalism creates nations where they do not exist, and language plays a central role in identity formation.

2.1.1.1 Europeanization, the European Identity and the Bologna Process

Lawn and Grek (2012, as referenced in Kushnir, 2016) apply Anderson’s notion of the imagined community and move past the confined borders of a singular nation, building their own idea that views Europe as “space of meaning” rather than “merely a place” (p. 667). Spolsky’s theory of language policy focuses on the nation-state level, however in the context of European nations it is necessary to expand past the notion of a singular national identity to additionally construct an all-encompassing *European* identity. According to Field (2003, as referenced in Kushnir, 2016), the most straightforward path towards the facilitation of a European identity is through

education. The Bologna Process is Europe's largest and most influential HE initiative, designed to make the degrees of the 48 signatory countries compatible and comparable. In addition to its outlined objectives, the Bologna Process is an essential dimension in defining Europe and the EHEA, and in promoting the idea of a common European identity within them (Kushnir, 2016). One of the main objectives of the Bologna Process is to create a well-developed, prosperous and high-quality European knowledge society that is able to compete with the surrounding world. In order to achieve such a system, standardization is seen as the way of handling the risks of an uncertain and constantly changing future, as well as in constructing a European citizen who is able to face the threats of the future and who feels a sense of belonging to a common cultural space (Fejes, 2008). Such a citizen, who is composed not only of students and staff but also HEIs as active subjects and partners in the joint venture to create a good future, becomes constructed through the creation of a European knowledge society. Moreover, as this citizen is constructed, they are simultaneously a vehicle of action for the development of the EHEA. In fact, the Bologna Declaration of 1999 emphasizes this symbiotic relationship between subject and action: "the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens' mobility and employability and the Continent's overall development" (pp. 1-2).

Mobility and employability thus become two of the central tenants of a desirable European citizen, along with ideas of flexibility, transparency, diversity and shared European values, which seem to be the foundation of European identity. "The European" further becomes defined by excluding those nations and citizens who do not possess these same European values, although *exclusion* as a binary byproduct of *inclusion* is generally not actively acknowledged in policy documents (Fejes, 2008). While the Bologna Process harmonizes and streamlines certain elements of HE in Europe through the promotion of a structure that allows for qualifications to be compared and understood by all actors, it does not aim to create identical programs (Kerklaan et al., 2008). Language is not explicitly mentioned, however the intentions of the Bologna Process, especially mobility and the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), highlight the European language issue and the challenges of communication in a multilingual space like Europe. In fact, Coleman (2006) claims that the Bologna Process itself may contribute to the language problem, given that the Diploma Supplement which describes graduates' acquired qualification is generally issued in English alone or in the language of instruction *plus* English.

Additionally, mobility, in the form of study abroad exchanges, has been a central element of European policy and the implementation of the Bologna Process. Learning outcomes of mobility are tied to future employment and the preparation of graduates to live and work in an increasingly global world, but for even longer, the “principle learning outcome of student residence abroad has improved foreign language proficiency” (Coleman, 2006, p. 9). Study abroad programs are praised as a selling point for individual universities to acquire international recognition and prestige, but usually come with the added attraction that students do not actually need to study the foreign language of the host country, even in cross-national European placements because English alone will suffice.

Ultimately, European identity can be regarded as building commonality together with unavoidable respect for differences (Derrida, 1992, as referenced in Kushnir, 2016), a notion that is amply echoed in the EU’s slogan ‘unity in diversity.’ However, this respect for diversity has a paradoxical nature when combined with the EHEA’s promotion of a common European identity. Convergence of national HE systems is antithetical to divergence and the preservation of diversity, and yet both convergence and respect for diversity are advocated in international ministerial documents which draw from the Bologna Process (Kushnir, 2016). Therefore, it can be said that the development of a European identity is closely linked to the struggle between standardization, homogenization and linguistic convergence towards English, and the preservation of the other official languages of European nations.

2.1.2 English as a Mechanism in the Globalization Process

As stated in earlier sections, globalization and the spread of the English language are said to be inseparable (Coleman, 2006; Jenkins, 2014). Their indivisibility is exhibited by the ‘tidal wave’ of English that is moving into almost every sociolinguistic repertoire throughout the global language ecology (Albury, 2015). However, this English tidal wave, which has increasingly become termed an academic and global ‘lingua franca’ (Carter & Sealey, 2007; Doiz et al., 2011; Jenkins, 2014), can also create tensions between linguistic internationalization and local language interests. What this means is that English may be resisted by way of explicit interventions to protect the status and vitality of local languages that are becoming increasingly marginalized (Albury, 2015).

Globalization and internationalization are often used interchangeably; however, they address different issues (Dafouz & Smit, 2014). The concept of internationalization as a strategy in HE developed in the early 1990s in reaction to the increasing importance of the global knowledge economy and the programs and policies set forth by the European Commission (de Wit & Hunter, 2018). At the university level, internationalization refers to “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2008, as cited in de Wit & Hunter, 2018, p. 2). Decisions to boost internationalization are usually made by education authorities in a typical top-down approach, rather than as the result of bottom-up, grass-roots initiatives (Doiz et al., 2013). Scott (2011) further describes internationalization as a process of “intensifying exchange between nations (or other securely internationalized organizations and agencies), most of which occurs in the public domain” (pp. 60-1). Globalization, on the other hand, describes “the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life” (Held, 1999, as cited in Dewey, 2007, pp. 332-3). Furthermore, globalization tends to be viewed as a force that is imposed and projects outward, away from local communities and into the global arena. However, if one takes the transformationalist globalization perspective, it simultaneously can generate renewed pressures for local autonomy and increased regionalism (Dewey, 2007). Therefore, enhanced interdependence is achieved not only at the global level, but also leads to the reinforcement and extension of international ties at local and regional levels, as seen in the international initiatives consolidated in the European region, such as the EHEA. While such an initiative has a global presence and reach, it is more relevant locally than globally and brings about fundamental consequences for how language models and practices are viewed (Dewey, 2007). Due to their multifaceted role in society, HEIs display both these tensions and synergies and therefore need to address conflict by bridging the gap between international, global, national and local interests (Scott, 2011). This process, commonly referred to as ‘glocalization,’ compels universities to determine a delicate balance between the interaction of these two conflicting, yet symbiotic forces. The introduction of English becomes seen as the “new logic” and natural means for universities and local authorities to establish their internationalization strategies, thus fulfilling their societal role (Soler-Carbonell, 2015).

Adversely, Fishman (1977, as cited in Spolsky, 2004) takes a hyperglobalist perspective and credits the globalization of English to British colonization, and that this, in addition to other partial explanations, is the single best predictor of the phenomenon. ‘Language colonization’ occurs as the language of a colonizing superpower spreads, starting as an additional language and over time developing into the mother tongue. However, Phillipson (1992, as cited in Spolsky, 2004, p. 79) attributes the globalization of English to a concept he calls “linguicism.” Just as racism gives overrepresentation to one race, linguicism gives overrepresentation to one language. More powerful languages drive out the smaller, weaker ones, but in contrast to Fishman, this phenomenon is not natural, rather it is the result of explicitly planned intervention by identifiable human agents. In essence, Phillipson proposes that the spread of English is the result of the deliberate language policy interests of the core English-speaking countries (i.e. the inner circle), however there is no strong evidence to support his claim entirely. Spolsky (2004) suggests that the development of English into a global language is not the end result of language management itself, but that instead it “reflects local and individual language acquisition decisions, [that are] responding to changes in the complex ecology of the world’s language system” (p. 90). As opposed to Fishman and Phillipson’s views, Spolsky acknowledges that such discourse on linguistic imperialism and the “inner circle” of nations fails to account for the role that the outer circle of nations have played in the development of English into a global language. With this in mind, two fundamental points have emerged for the understanding of language policy (Spolsky, 2004). The first refers to the fact that the spread of English is *not* the direct result of self-centered management. The second highlights that while debates and discussions surrounding the dilemma of the European language issue will continue in years to come, they do little to change the circumstance of English as a global language. This is now indisputably a factor that must be taken into account in the language policy by any nation state and/or HEI.

2.1.2.1 Mobility Schemes as an Outcome of Globalization

The employability of HE graduates and the market of international students are among the top reasons that have motivated individual HEIs to introduce ETPs (Coleman, 2006) because the need for communication, which facilitates globalization, has converted English into a social necessity and indispensable tool for international communication and access to the global labor market (Madrid & Julius, 2020). When combined with the concept of citizenship and identity

presented in section 2.1.1.1, HEIs play a central role. Global citizenship is a concept that is inherent to the idea of the university and the role of HE, and Kushnir (2016) argues that flexible, mobile and employable citizens (in this case students) are formed through education mobility schemes.

The Erasmus student mobility program is one of the most powerful tools of European HE integration where the English language functions as a facet that further shapes students' positions towards their development of European identity and individual plurilingualism. Llurda et al. (2016) claim that "the acquisition of a European identity seems rather to be based on the acquisition of plurilingual competence" (p. 327), where 'plurilingual' refers to the repertoire of varieties of language which an *individual* uses and it corresponds with the learning and use of English as a lingua franca. European institutions, like those created vis-a-vis the Bologna Process, have consistently declared that language diversity is one of the important elements of Europe that ought to be promoted and protected against the danger of all Europeans sharing a common language (Llurda et al., 2016). To determine how language policy fits into this context, it becomes necessary to determine whether English should be identified as the sole language that enables communication, as a useful complementary language, or as an imposed institutional requirement. This question can partially be answered by Erasmus students who report that they appreciate the advantage of knowing English to communicate in other European countries, however they do not support that English alone should be established as Europe's official language, because knowing several European languages is important for European identity on account of Europe's linguistically and culturally diverse space (Llurda et al., 2016). English appears as the lingua franca that enables communication over all of Europe, however when it comes to achieving true cultural integration in HE, speaking the local language is presented as essential (Llurda et al., 2016). Certainly, English can compensate for the lack of knowledge of the local language, but only to some extent. So, while English is useful, it is not enough, and HEI language policies should focus less attention to English alone. With this in mind, Kerklaan et al. (2008) and Lasagabaster (2015) formulate intriguing questions with regards to internationalization and language policy that are worthy of consideration: does university internationalization directly mean EMI, and how can universities develop an economically effective internationalization strategy in which the language policy is not limited to English.

2.1.3 National Sociolinguistic Situation

The third condition driving language policy is a nation's attendant sociolinguistic situation, which refers to "the number and kinds of languages, the number and kinds of speakers of each, [and] the communicative value of each language both inside and outside the community being studied" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 219). In order to be aware of how language policy correlates with the linguistic and ethnic complexity of a nation-state, there is a model originally developed by Lambert (1999, as cited in Spolsky, 2004) that sets out three different types of nation-states. The first type of nation-state is the monolingual, which includes countries that are ethno-linguistically homogeneous. Poland is an example of a monolingual nation-state, and even though it may contain linguistic minorities, these are generally perceived to be small and insignificant or geographically and socially marginalized. The second type is the dyadic and/or triadic nation-state which includes two or three ethno-linguistic groups of relatively equal size and power. Prototype European examples of dyadic/triadic countries are Belgium and Switzerland, where French/Flemish and German/French/Italian are each recognized as official languages. The region of Catalonia which recognizes Castilian Spanish and Catalan as equally official languages can be classified as dyadic. The third nation-state is referred to as being mosaic and contains a large number of multiethnic groups. This typology interacts with and affects the kind of language policy that the state and thus its institutions adopt.

2.1.3.1 The Continental Divide

Hultgren et al. (2015) give account of the status of EMI and how it is in different stages of implementation between the north, south, east and west of Europe. Of particular note is the divide between the north and south of the continent, with southern countries meeting EMI with fierce resistance, viewing it as a threat to national language and identity or as a violation to autonomy and academic freedom. EMI in northern European countries is more widespread, with about 26-36% of master's programs fully taught in English in Denmark and Iceland (Hultgren et al., 2015). The implementation of EMI tends to be met with less resistance, although this is an opinion held by students and staff, whereas there is a great deal of concern being held by national language councils and members of the cultural elite. Another context that has been identified as adding to the complexity of EMI implementation is that of countries like Spain, where minority

languages, in addition to English, must be managed alongside the majority language. In the Basque country, English is viewed as a “stumbling block” which allows for the implementation of a multilingual language policy, especially with regards to prioritizing bilingual Basque/Spanish programs (Jenkins, 2014). Furthermore, this study is important because it notes that factors driving “Englishization” may or may not be recognized as such, and EMI may or may not be explicitly listed as a way for HEIs to meet their objectives and strategic priorities with regards to internationalization, in both northern and southern European countries. For instance, based on the analysis of the University of Copenhagen’s (KU) mission statement, ‘English’ is not explicitly mentioned, however the authors state that it is easy to see that KU’s internationalization strategies indirectly foster English (Hultgren et al., 2015).

Ammon & McConnell’s (2002) survey of the use of EMI in HE in each European country further categorizes the continental divide. One of the main findings from their study was that EMI has now widely spread into most European countries as a language of university teaching, alongside the national official languages. This finding is true of countries with “small” and “big” international languages. “Big” languages can be defined as those languages with a large number of native speakers that have played an important role in scientific communication, such as German (Ammon & McConnell, 2002). Germany, which has historically had its own scientific tradition, has been slower to introduce EMI, due to concerns about undermining the international standing of the German language. In the case of Spain, another “big” language country, the reluctance to embrace EMI can be attributed to “language pride and the idea of having their own “world language” that might eventually rival English” (Ammon & McConnell, 2002, p. 173). As of 2000, Spain had no institutions that offered teaching programs in English, and it is only within the last two decades that curricula reforms switched from French to English as the first foreign language of Spanish schools. “Small” language countries, such as Norway or Poland, typically host a greater readiness to accept EMI, possibly derived from the longer standing tradition of using foreign languages for academic purposes and the acceptance of using other “big” languages in international affairs. Pulcini and Campaga (2015) endorse Ammon & McConnell’s findings, by concluding that there is an existence of “two Europes,” divided in half into the northern European countries with a longer EMI tradition and high English proficiency, and

Mediterranean area countries with a less rooted tradition of EMI and a generally lower competence in English.

2.1.4 Linguistic Rights of Minorities

On a broad level, the threat of English to national languages can be extended to minority languages too. The internationally growing interest in the linguistic rights of minorities has compelled nations to offer language rights to their minorities in some way, such as provisions for minority language-medium schooling (Albury, 2015). While language colonization (as mentioned in section 2.1.2) can help explain the globalization of English, language *decolonization* can help explain how minority languages or minority language varieties are used today to bring about political changes that impact language policy (Armenui, 2014). Many regions today, like those inhabited by the Sami people of Norway for example, are striving to revive their local languages “by uprising and emphasizing the emergency of the national identification that is provided by the language” (Armenui, 2014, p. 274). Even though many nation-states proclaim a single national or official language constitutionally², it is often the case that these countries are not actually monolingual in practice. Many nations that are constitutionally monolingual often include a qualifying statement (“monolingual but...”) to do with implementing the rights of individuals and groups who speak other languages (Spolsky, 2004).

There are a few difficulties with the term “minority” because the numerical implication of the term is not always appropriate due to the fact that some linguistic minorities may actually be dominant, such as is the case in Catalonia. Spolsky (2004) identifies two dimensions relative to power that are seen as important, the first being whether the minority is legally recognized or not, and the second whether the minority is indigenous or immigrant. In the European context, there is general support for multilingualism, however there tends to be a lack of specific implementation of linguistic minority rights. In 1992, the Council of Europe adopted a European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, guided by the ideals and principles of protection,

² Norway has two official languages – Norwegian and Sami – however, a country like Poland is constitutionally monolingual. Spanish is declared as Spain’s official language spoken throughout the country, however some regional languages are recognized as co-official in particular regions or provinces.

use and value of minority languages in Europe, so long as the protection of such languages is not to the detriment of official/national languages. The Charter leaves a great deal of room to maneuver and allows individual nation states who have signed and ratified the Charter to develop their own model as they see fit. Current data shows only 25 member states of the Council of Europe (including Norway, Poland and Spain) have ratified the Charter. As of 2002, only 16 member states had ratified the Charter, which shows that while there has been an increase in signatory countries over the past two decades, implementation is rather slow and challenges the nationalist ideologies and traditional language policies of member states (Spolsky, 2004).

The rights of minority languages are greatly interconnected not only with national and European identity, but also with English as a mechanism in the globalization process, or rather the ‘glocalization’ process. In light of modern communications technology, where information gets diffused with greater intensity and velocity, Dewey (2007) claims that the local becomes defamiliarized while the global becomes increasingly familiar. However, rather than viewing this intensity of interconnectedness as a root cause of linguistic imperialism, enhanced interconnectivity may lead to greater (linguistic) pluralism and diversity as interactions transcend regions and borders on account of new infrastructures and innovative channels of communication which make censorship and oppression of local identities and minorities more difficult to maintain (Dewey, 2007). Virtual communities, cultural networks and the mobility afforded by modern technology create a space that links ideas and practices of marginalized groups, allowing for peripheral situations, like Catalonia’s bid for independence from Spain, to raise their profile globally.

2.1.5 Language Beliefs

Members of a speech community share a general set of beliefs about what should happen with languages by assigning value and prestigious status to particular language or language varieties. The language beliefs that are the most significant are the values assigned to named languages, varieties, and features because their status “derives from how many people use it and the importance to the users, and the social and economic benefits a speaker can expect by using it” (Jenkins, 2014, p. 75). Even though many language varieties can make up a speech community’s

repertoire, usually only one is dominant, designated from the speech community's consensus on what they think should happen with language (Albury, 2015).

Phillipson (2006) likens the advance of English in HE in continental Europe and the threat it represents to other European languages to a cuckoo bird. Famous for laying its eggs in the nests of other birds, the cuckoo has been considered a parasite in the ecology of ornithological species. When it comes to the language ecology of Europe, to what extent can the same be said about English being the invading 'cuckoo' in HE which irrevocably leads to domain loss? Phillipson's article analyzes the discourses promoting English and language policy statements from several countries aiming to find a balance between English and other languages. A significant revelation of the article with regards to the European language issue is that it is too simplistic "to consider language policy as being either 'for' or 'against' English. English opens some doors and closes others. It can be used for good or bad reasons, with good or bad effects, but in the modern world it cannot be ignored" (Phillipson, 2006, p. 14). At the national level, the threat of English dominance over national languages has traditionally been mitigated through the enforcement of laws to legitimize the standardization and propagation of national languages (Lasagabaster, 2015). Nation-states throughout the European continent are quite devoted in such enforcement efforts by regulating language dynamics to promote particular languages and/or force the declination or total elimination of others. Lasagabaster (2015) claims that beliefs at the meso level are driven by economic and monetary cost. There are costs and benefits that can be computed in association with particular languages. The anticipated rate of return "may make the learning of a dominant language more profitable and this may eventually erode the importance of the linguistic capital of the speakers of non-dominant languages" (Lasagabaster, 2015, p. 262). On account of such beliefs and the tendency that national education budgets come under increased strain year after year, the outcome is that English has become the dominant language, whereby other foreign languages are in sharp decline (Lasagabaster, 2015). Despite the fact that members of the national speech community appear to assign more value and prestige to English nowadays, research indicates that a multilingual world is seen as being more prosperous than one which operates in a monolingual manner (Lasagabaster, 2015).

At the supranational level, the Bologna Process plays a key role in shaping language beliefs within the EHEA. Driven by the objective to create a more improved, modernized and harmonized EHEA, the Bologna Process helps expedite the recognition of academic qualifications, mobility programs and employability. Under the European Action Plan, European HEIs have an influential role to play in promoting language learning and linguistic diversity because they are regarded as key actors in the promotion of societal multilingualism and individual plurilingualism (European Commission, 2004, as referenced in Lasagabaster, 2015). The EU has outlined a goal commonly referred to as the “mother tongue plus two other languages” policy, whose objective is to make every citizen linguistically competent in two languages in addition to their mother tongue. This policy has been subject to speculation and arguments that the Bologna Process leaves very little, if any, room for foreign languages other than English and actually undermines the European goal of multilingualism because English is irrefutably the leading “other” language. Furthermore, despite its overarching objectives that drive internationalization forward, the Bologna Process is still a rather bumpy and uncharted road (Phillipson, 2006). Following such a road too hastily through a greater use of English in HE and the introduction of EMI courses has led to warnings in that “a language policy, which departs from the conviction that the introduction of English-medium instruction will be unproblematic, will most probably not lead to the hoped-for internationalization of the university” (Phillipson, 2006, p. 22). Phillipson concludes by stating that the fluidity of language policies is affected by many beliefs: unresolved tension between linguistic nationalism, institutional multilingualism, English becoming dominant in the EU, a largely uncritical adoption of Englishization, and a rhetoric of language right and advocacy of linguistic diversity. While these factors have been recognized, the forms of cohabitation between English and other languages are relatively underexplored, and there is a confirmed need for language policies to be formulated explicitly rather than being left to unrelenting grips of nature, which in a HE context present as market pressures, both national and international.

While English is a de facto part of any HEIs internationalization strategy, multilingualism, on the other hand is a significant European asset that is “highly valued by international students and should be encouraged in teaching and research throughout the higher education curriculum” (European Commission, 2013, as referenced in Lasagabaster, 2015). In fact, multilingualism and

the learning of the (national) language spoken in the target university, and *not* proficiency in English, has to be remembered as being one of the main objectives of European mobility initiatives like Erasmus. This objective is becoming increasingly impeded on account of the growing presence of EMI courses offered at undergraduate, graduate and doctoral levels in the EHEA, especially in demographically smaller European countries. A leading belief in northern European countries is that students on exchange who only want to study for a semester or two “couldn’t be expected to do that study in Finnish or Swedish” (Lehikoinen, 2004, as cited in Lasagabaster, 2015, 263).

European institutions at the supranational level cannot dictate language policies to member states, they can usually only make recommendations, therefore it is HE stakeholders’ beliefs and ideology that are of the utmost importance in shaping language policy. At the micro level, language beliefs can be understood as the way in which English is talked and written about in European universities, and how such rhetoric affects language choice (Lasagabaster, 2015). The most significant stakeholder language beliefs are those concerned with language proficiency, language choice and conformity to native standards. Local students are significantly less positive about EMI than teaching staff, administration personnel and international students, and their less positive attitude is closely related to overall lower proficiency in English (Lasagabaster, 2015). HEI staff view English language policy as a necessary component of the modern university, and there is a positive link between university language policy and staff and student proficiency in English because explicit language policy can guarantee better quality of lectures (Jenkins, 2014). According to Lasagabaster (2015), these results indicate that English language competence plays a paramount role in academic lingua franca settings. However, it is also worth noting that international students may experience an attitudinal shift during their study abroad period. International students, who were originally more positively oriented towards EMI than local students, later came to view English as an imposed lingua franca, and become very critical of “those exchange students who only take English-medium courses and leave the host higher education institution without having made any effort to learn the local language” (Lasagabaster, 2015, p. 270). According to Jenkins’ (2014) “multilingualism-multiculturalism approach” in assessing English as the primary lingua franca of HE, she finds that for successful intercultural communication to take place, staff and students should be willing to learn the national language

of the country in which they are working or studying, at least to a certain extent. However, she also identifies conformity to native English standards as another important belief. English cannot be ignored and while very few HE stakeholders question the role of English as the universal lingua franca of HE at all, its role in internationalization and institutional language policy can be acknowledged as controversial.

2.1.6 Language Management

Language management is concerned with how authorities intervene to regulate language through “explicit and observable efforts by someone or some group that has or claims to have authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices and beliefs” (Spolsky, 2007, p. 4). At the national level, interests in direct manipulation of language policy tend to be confined to government instruments such as legislation, policy and official programs (Albury, 2015; Dafouz & Smit, 2014). Studies of language policy attempt to understand which non-language variables co-vary with language variables, and direct efforts to modify the language situation present an important question that is simple in query but certainly more complex in answer- who exactly is the language manager? According to Spolsky (2004), the language manager could be a legislative assembly writing the national constitution or a national legislature drafting a law to determine which language should be official. It could also be an institution deciding which language to use to teach and publish in. However, even where there is a formal language policy, its effect on language practices and beliefs is not guaranteed or coherent across all levels, because “just as speed limits do not guarantee that all cars abide by them, so a language law does not guarantee observance” (Spolsky, 2004, as cited in Jenkins, 2014, p. 76). An explicit written policy may not be implemented as intended, or at all, and therefore there may not be an obvious answer to what the language policy of a specific nation or institution is. While language management generally refers to the formulation and proclamation of an explicit policy, it is possible that some institutions, like HEIs, may not have observable written language policies, in which case language management and its manager have to be derived from language practices and/or beliefs (Lasagabaster, 2015).

According to Dafouz and Smit’s (2014) extended ROAD-MAPPING model, language management also needs to consider a factor that is “conspicuous by its absence, namely, a lack of

explicit regulations in higher education institutions” (p. 10). While language management measures can manifest in tangible statements like White Papers generated at the supranational level or explicit language policies displayed on individual university websites for instance, certain aspects of language policy may continue to remain unmentioned, which is sociolinguistically relevant in itself (Dafouz & Smit, 2014). In Pauwels’ development of a multimodal framework for analyzing websites from both a medium specific and socio-cultural perspective, he refers to this concept as ‘in-depth negative analysis’ (2012, p. 252). This inverted analysis focuses on the aspects, issues and arguments that are not covered and “which exactly by their absence seem to become significant (Pauwels, 2012, p. 256).

Therefore, it is noteworthy that not once in the lengthy communiqués from the biennial EHEA Ministerial Conferences is there any reference to languages, let alone English (Phillipson, 2015). In the most recent 2020 Rome Communiqué, there is no connection to supranational policies that aim at promoting all the languages of Europe and an outright lack of reference to the European language issue. If anything, the document only briefly alludes cross-national communication as a dimension of European identity by calling for “the enhancement of the fundamental values of the EHEA that will foster self-reflection, constructive *dialogue* and peer-learning across national authorities, higher education institutions and organisations” (Rome Communiqué, 2020, p. 5, my italics). Another example of absenteeism at the institutional level is in the epistemic use of “foreign” or “other” in place of “English” as evidenced in Danish (see 2.1.3.1) and Finnish HE (McCambridge & Saarinen, 2015). The Finnish internationalization development plan argues for the use of “other” languages in addition to the official languages, without making an explicit reference to English (Dafouz & Smit, 2014). Therefore, the unique status of English is kept somewhat invisible and gets camouflaged behind a call for multilingualism, when this might not actually be the case. These examples demonstrate that initiatives that aim to address issues of language management wholly fail to address the European language issue. The Bologna Process has in reality been largely subordinated to the global market forces that strengthen English (Phillipson, 2015). The expansion, and in some instances outright takeover of EMI at EHEA universities may well be a subtractive rather than additive measure, and such a strategy is in conflict with the multilingual ethos of Bologna when multilingualism policies are widely disregarded (Phillipson, 2015; Wright, 2009). While allegiance is pledged to multilingualism,

there is a greater use of English as a lingua franca within HE. This apparent mismatch between policy and practice perhaps continues to be upheld in the role that language managers play, for half the actors are unable to “compromise on language issues, and the other half barely recognizes that there is a problem” (Wright, 2009).

2.1.7 Language Practice

Language practice refers to the habitual pattern of selecting among language varieties to make up a speech community’s linguistic repertoire. In other words, language practices are the observable choices and behaviors that members of a speech community display. These chosen linguistic features “constitute policy to the extent that they are regular and predictable (Spolsky, 2007, p. 3), and exclude language choices that are not habitual. As mentioned in 2.1.6, the existence of explicit written language policies does not guarantee implementation, and there may or may not be explicit or observable efforts at language management. However, there generally exist one or more ideological views about appropriate language use and behavior, and thus there will certainly be observable patterns of language practice.

Language practices at the university level refer to the actual languages that people embrace and use in different academic situations. Language practices and questions of identity are strongly intertwined, and therefore it is crucial for students and teachers to have the possibility of performing their daily academic activities in the official language of the national academic environment, but it is equally important for them to accept the presence of English as an enriching element (Dafouz & Smit, 2014). Lasagabaster (2015) states that HE students’ language practices are very often determined by their own English proficiency. The fact that a Spanish and a Chinese speaker can communicate in English is a breakthrough, however “a Spanish and a French speaker having English as their only common language of communication can be deemed a serious backward step, since both languages are typologically very close” (Lasagabaster, 2015, p. 272). This demonstrates how EMI contributes to and encourages the idea that as far as acquisition of foreign languages is concerned, English is enough. Such ideologies that position English as the central language of a language policy leave little room for language choice on the part of HE stakeholders, which consequently affects the language they “choose” to practice in the HE context.

Language policy itself is about *choice* - choice of a specific sound, expression, variety of language, etc. (Spolsky, 2004). If one looks at the language policy of a nation, or of an institution like a university, one will commonly find incongruence between the language policy set forth in the explicit written policy and the actual practices of a speech community. Thus, one might be inclined to ask what the *real* language policy is. According to Spolsky (2004), the most realistic answer resides in language practices. While language ideologies, management and practices are equally influential and interconnected in shaping overall language policy, one ought to look at what people *do* and not what they think they should do or what someone else wants them to do, in order to ascertain what the real language policy is.

2.2 Operationalization of Language Policy Conceptualization

The theory behind language policy design and implementation is incredibly complex. There are a multitude of reasons for how and why particular language policies come to exist at various levels (supranational, national, regional, etc.) and subsequently how they become institutionalized at the university level. Based on the transformationalist *globalization* perspective, one could hypothesize that due to the forces of globalization, there are many commonalities that can be identified among the three case universities included in this study, despite national peculiarities. Alternatively, against the backdrop of the *glocalization* perspective, which places more emphasis on local attributes, one could theorize that a closer link exists between national level policies and the actions universities are taking. In this case, the globalization thesis is somewhat flawed and one can expect that national language policies and/or institutional autonomy, as opposed to supranational initiatives, are given more weight. The more general expectations derived from Spolsky’s theory of language policy are presented below in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 General Expectations.

Globalization Perspective	Glocalization Perspective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence of supranational level (i.e. EHEA, Council of Europe, etc.) over institutional language policies is greater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence of local levels (i.e. national Ministry of Education, national language councils, etc.) over institutional language policies is greater

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual HEI English language policies are similar • European identity stronger • More homogenized language policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual HEI language policies are very different • National identity stronger • Reluctant towards English language policy standardization • Partial and more limited adaptation of supranational policies
--	---

2.3 Country Context: Norway, Poland & Spain

2.3.1 Norway

Located in Northern Europe, Norway is a smaller country with a population of approximately 5.3 million people (“Norway - OECD Data”, 2021). Unlike Poland and Spain, Norway is not a member of the EU, however its relations with the EU since 1994 are managed through the European Economic Area Agreement (EEA). Despite its small geographical size, or perhaps because of its status as what Ammon & McConnell (2002) would term a ‘small language country’ (see 2.1.3.1), Norway boasts long historical ties to the outer world. In the postwar era, British and American culture have exerted a major influence across Europe, and this has left a mark on Norwegian culture. To this day, diplomatic international relations with the English-speaking world are of utmost importance and can be discerned from actions big and small, for example in the symbolic annual gifting of the Trafalgar Square Christmas tree which represents a token of gratitude for British support to Norway during World War II. Furthermore, the English language has become integrated into the linguistic landscape in Norway, playing a pivotal role in the academic domain. English is considered as a vital and life-long skill, and Norwegian curricular reforms in 1997 (L97) and 2006 regulate that all learners enrolled in the national education system must study English (Mureşan & Pop, 2020). Therefore, English is introduced in the first grade and continues as a compulsory subject throughout primary and secondary education (Sunde & Kristoffersen, 2018). A 2003-04 Country Report by the Ministry of Education and Research on the Language Education Policy Profile further describes how the national curriculum positions both Norwegian and English. The National Curriculum (L97)

explicitly links Norwegian language to identity by stating that “language is the most distinctive feature of man; it is a characteristic of every society and of every individual... The subject Norwegian, then, is about identity” (Utdannings-og Forskningsdepartementet, 2003-2004, p. 8) When it comes to the teaching of foreign languages, the National Curriculum (L97) explains the predominance of English as the first foreign language because it is a major world language, which is intended to be interrelated with Norwegian. The Language Council of Norway (Norsk Språkrådet, hereinafter Språkrådet), then, is the Norwegian government’s advisory body on matters pertaining to Norwegian language use and language planning in schools, and above all language choice within the HE sector.

With regards to reforms in tertiary education, dating back to 2009, all study programs were required to take measures in order to make HEIs more attractive and competitive, both nationally and internationally (Mureşan & Pop, 2020). Even though English lacks an official status in Norway, and most university programs are taught in Norwegian as the primary language of HE, the European Commission reports that approximately 250 Bachelor’s programs and 250 Master’s programs use English as the academic lingua franca (“Norway - Education and Training - European Commission”, 2021). A study conducted by Airey et al. (2017) looked more broadly at the expansion of EMI in Nordic countries and what it signifies for language policies at the university level. The countries in the study (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden) have relatively small populations, and the official national languages tend to be constrained to the Nordic region with limited global dispersion. With such a small number of first language speakers, and hence a small internal market, it is unsurprising that Nordic countries have been at the forefront of the introduction of EMI in their HE systems in order to internationalize and respond to disciplinary, institutional and politically motivated changes (Airey et al., 2017). While English has gradually gained a well-established place in the academic sector in Norway on account of curricular reforms, its influence in Norway can also be attributed to its omnipresence in pop culture and audio-visual media, such as television, film and other leisure activities that involve rich English input (Sunde & Kristoffersen, 2018; Mureşan & Pop, 2020). The constant exposure to English in academic and other informal settings has led to increased engagement in language mixing and direct lexical borrowing of English words and expressions into colloquial Norwegian. Research on language borrowing of English loanwords into Norwegian can be traced

back as early as 1945, and more recent research conducted by the Research Council of Norway in 2014 showed that 70% of 4500 surveyed respondents (students of different ages) use English when they engage in spoken or written communication on social media and when communicating with peers and friends (Mureşan & Pop, 2020). Mureşan & Pop (2020) claim that there are a few explanations for this phenomenon. On one hand, the need for incorporating English terms into a Norwegian's language practice simply stems from a need to use words for which there is a lexical shortage in the L1. Alternatively, this phenomenon can be explained by code-switching, a concept that refers to the shift “between two or more languages simultaneously or interchangeably within one conversation” (Grosjean, 1982, as cited in Mureşan & Pop, 2020, p. 120). It is important to note that code-switching is not a random usage or mixing of words, because it requires users to have knowledge of both languages and communication is marked by multilingualism and multiculturalism. Thus, code-switching is usually associated with a bilingual environment and an adequate proficiency or mastery of both languages used in communication (Mureşan & Pop, 2020). On account of the substantial English language practice inside and outside of the classroom, it is unsurprising that English is now regarded as the first foreign language in Norway. However, Sunde & Kristoffersen (2018) claim that the reputation for English fluency among Norwegians tends to be exaggerated, and Hellekjaer & Hellekjaer's (2015) investigation into the needs and uses of English of staff in government ministerial jobs and how these are reflected in ministerial job advertisements supports this claim. Their study shows that Norwegians may not have the requisite English skills for certain occupational roles and reports that Nordic HEIs ought to pay greater attention to improving their students' English skills (and standard of written English skills in particular) by enhancing language learning in EMI courses, because a lack of such university programs/courses amounts to a failure to adequately prepare students for their future careers (Hellekjaer & Hellekjaer, 2015; Sunde & Kristoffersen, 2018). Sunde & Kristoffersen ultimately conclude that the status of English in Norway is “best described as occupying a transitional space between a foreign and second language” (2018, pp. 278-9).

When assessing the state of Norwegian HE, Airey et al.'s (2017) study also found that there are opposing motives for language policy between university and governmental levels. While universities have become interested in attracting more international students at the Bachelor's

and Master's level, this goes against the general national language policy that aims to promote the use of Norwegian. This illustrates the very real challenge that Norwegian universities face in that “the pride one has, as a small lingua culture, in that which is culturally unique is far often overridden by one’s newly earned pride in mastering the new, “universal” culture and language, and an eagerness to demonstrate this mastery” (Greenall, 2012, p. 84). Overall, Nordic governments adopt a laissez-faire attitude to institutional organization of EMI. Språkrådet’s *Guide for language choice in the university and university college sector* only provides concrete and adaptable “recommendations” on what HEIs can do to balance their use of English and Norwegian. However, this faces growing criticism due to the perceived risk of domain loss on account of diglossia - a division of functions between languages- where English becomes the leading language in the academic domain, and Nordic languages are relegated for use in administration and everyday social interaction (Airey et al., 2017).

2.3.2 Poland

The population of Poland is around 38.4 million people (“Poland - OECD Data”, 2021). For the most part, Polish society has a unique national and monocultural character. The majority of people (98.2%) living in this Central European nation were born within its territory, and 93.9% of the total population is dominated by individuals of homogenous Polish national-ethnic identity and heritage (Żuk, 2018). Therefore, in the overall Polish education system there tend to be very few students of different, non-Polish ethnic origin resulting in few practical opportunities to meet “other” people. According to Żuk, this creates a paradoxical situation in Poland - “the existence of racism without real foreigners” (2018, p. 1051) - and strengthens distance, stereotypes and hostility as seen in recent ultranationalist demonstrations. Given these aspects, Żuk claims that one could expect government policy and education reforms to campaign for greater openness toward any form of cultural differences in the sector. However, in Poland this is not the case, and it can partly be attributed to the current Law and Justice (*Prawo i Sprawiedliwość*, hereinafter PiS) political party in power. PiS is considered to be conservative, right-wing oriented and campaigns on a platform of Polish patriotism, nationalism and traditional Catholic ideals. Recent education reforms at the tertiary level brought on by PiS, which commenced in 2015, have caused controversy among the country’s intellectual elites and are reported to have destabilized university streams of funding and recruitment of students (Odrowąż-Coates, 2020). Odrowąż-

Coates argues that not only have the sudden and rapid reforms left people confused and uncertain about the future of Polish HE, but also that there are identifiable changes in the government's rhetoric which unveil a linguistic embrace oriented towards an increased use of the English language. Despite the monoculturalism and monolingualism in Poland, the English language appears to be a strong tool of neoliberal agendas, used to empower or marginalize certain HE stakeholder groups by creating new dependencies or disestablishing existing power structures (Odroważ-Coates, 2020). For example, promotion to higher academic titles is contingent upon academics' capabilities of publishing in English and ability to participate in the global dialogue facilitated by English. To be considered for a PhD, a formal language certificate certifying proficient (i.e., near-native) knowledge of English is necessary. This means that previous, internal university qualifications are no longer sufficient and have been replaced by qualifications that are costly to obtain, in effect creating a disparity in English language acquisition between different age cohorts and compromising access to HE (Odroważ-Coates, 2020).

In contrast to the Nordic countries, Poland is a country which for historical reasons has only recently adopted English as its first foreign language in place of Russian. Polish political history and ties to the former Soviet Union have had a significant impact and the drive to offer academic subjects in the English medium comes from the backlash of the compulsory study of the Russian language in the Polish education system until the fall of communism in 1989 (Dearden & Macaro, 2016; Odroważ-Coates, 2020). A foreign language is taught in Polish schools as a compulsory subject starting in grade 4 of primary school, but it need not be English as this is not imposed as obligatory on the national scale (Ministry of National Education, 2005). However, the linguistic shift from Russian and the increasing dominance of English within the Polish education system, in addition to Poland's signing of the Bologna Process in 1999, gives English a dominating position among foreign languages. The Bologna Process enabled Poland to enter the exchange of EU students and staff, and the Erasmus mobility scheme relies on English as a medium of communication. According to Kachru's three concentric circle model, which splits speakers of English into the 1) inner circle (made up of those who are native English speaker-NES), 2) outer circle (made up of those for whom English is a second language- ESL) and 3) expanding circle (for whom English is a foreign language- EFL), the position of English in

Poland is shifting from EFL to ESL (Doiz et al., 2011; Odrowąż-Coates, 2020). Despite this classification, Polish HE reforms are orientated more so towards the inner circle, at least in terms of access.

In what have been constantly amended, updated and seemingly non-ending HE reforms over the last five years, Odrowąż-Coates claims that the democratically elected decision makers who are shaping the future of Polish HE use *chaos* as a tool to increase their power and control over the academic world. According to her, the academic world is “more haunted than ever by internal conflicts and a lack of solidarity between colleagues at different organizational levels. The element of chaos and surprise relies on the fact that multiple elements central to the reforms are as yet unknown and “in process”” (Odrowąż-Coates, 2020, p. 13). These sentiments can perhaps be partially attributed to the fact that the overall Polish education system is characterized by a combination of central and local/regional responsibilities. At the HE level, the Ministry of Science and Higher Education develops and carries out the national education policy, but universities in Poland are autonomous and play an important role in language policy matters. The 2018 Law on Higher Education and Science which aims to increase the quality of research and teaching through internationalization and grant-based funding of HEIs, also proposes major changes for HEI governance, affording more autonomy and flexibility in organizing the structure of HEIs (“Poland - National Reforms in Higher Education - Eurydice - European Commission”, 2021). Therefore, individual universities have freedom in deciding how to organize their respective language programs. For example, the University of Warsaw has organized its language policy through a number of regulations passed by the rector and university senate which are based upon the Council of Europe’s Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR). The CEFR scale is therefore used as a guideline for curriculum, syllabus and examinations but is not strictly followed (Council of Europe, Language Policy Programme, Strasbourg & Ministry of National Education, Poland, 2007). The implication of such autonomy with regards to university and language-teaching policy is that consideration needs to be given for the full integration of universities into national planning for languages. The autonomy of universities should not be a hindrance to including them in an overall national language policy, but rather their expertise should be systematically made use of to develop and implement a

coordinated overall state language policy by the Ministry of Education, in cooperation with the local voivodeships and autonomous HEIs.

According to a study conducted by Dearden & Macaro (2016), which investigated the attitudes of university teachers engaged in teaching their academic subjects through the medium of English, it was found that the same sense of chaos at national level reforms permeates within Polish HEIs as well. This study of Polish universities found that with regards to language policy and whether policy makers and university managers give sufficient consideration to the administrative and teaching resources needed to support an effective implementation of EMI, the majority of teachers suspected that while there probably was some kind of strategy in their university, they were uncertain and it was not explicit (Dearden & Macaro, 2016). Moreover, the interviewees claimed that EMI seemed to be growing organically, rather than in a planned way, a claim reflected not only in the apparent lack of a clear institutional language policy, but also in the general lack of administrative support and the seemingly random choice of subjects taught in English. The authors ultimately conclude that the major driver in the implementation of EMI in Polish HE is internationalization aimed at attracting more foreign students. ‘Internationalization’ and ‘globalization’ emerged repeatedly as buzzwords and English was seen as the key to university success. However, a causal link between the introduction of EMI and “successful internationalization” has yet to be established. University teachers expressed a desire to give their students more opportunities via EMI, whereas they viewed the central administration and Rectorate’s desires to introduce EMI as solely for financial reasons in order to survive and compete with other universities on an international stage. However, the challenge posed by EMI is on the infrastructure of the HEIs themselves. The purposes for EMI implementation are rarely clearly articulated by policy makers and university managers, and differences exist both within countries and across Europe. Therefore, the authors claim that there is an urgent need for research to establish whether this divergence is a positive reflection of different cultural needs, or whether it is simply an overall lack of understanding of EMI’s implications, poor program preparation, or chaotic decision making. If Polish universities are to accept and successfully integrate international students, then they may need to adapt their organization and culture.

2.3.3 Spain

Spain is located in Southwestern Europe on the Iberian Peninsula, with a population of 46.7 million people (“Spain - OECD Data”, 2021). As indicated in 2.1.3.1, Spain is what Ammon & McConnell (2002) refer to as a ‘big’ language country. The Spanish language is the world’s second mother tongue by total number of speakers, after Mandarin Chinese. Data collected by the Instituto Cervantes in 2019 shows that the total number of native Spanish speakers is 483 million. By contrast, English boasts only 360 million native speakers. However, the reported number of potential Spanish users worldwide is 580 million (7.6% of the global population). This figure includes native speakers, second language learners *and* foreign language learners. With such a large number of speakers, it is no surprise that Spanish claims status as a leading language of international communication across many spheres (Instituto Cervantes, 2019). With regards to foreign language learning, Instituto Cervantes estimated (using data compiled from the European Commission’s 2019 Eurostat) that in 2019 approximately 22 million students studied Spanish as a foreign language (SFL) spanning across 110 countries. It is also estimated that in the next decade the proportion of those who choose to learn Spanish as a foreign language will surpass learners of other European languages like French or German. In fact, between 2013 and 2016, the number of SFL students increased by 8.4%, whereas the increase in the number of French and German language learners was only 6.6% and 2.6% respectively. Such statistics offer a general snapshot and in view of them it can be reasonably presumed that there is a wide-spread sentiment that Spanish itself is a world language, and perhaps a serious competitor of English, especially within the education sector (Ammon & McConnell, 2002). That said, a significant increase in ETPs at the tertiary level has been observed since the Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture (*Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte*, hereinafter MECED) launched a set of strategies on internationalization in 2014 (Pavón & Ramos-García, 2018). Until the late 1990’s, little importance was attached to learning foreign languages or learning *in* foreign languages in Spain in general (Lasagabaster, 2015). The MECED strategies for internationalization of Spanish universities are four-fold and aim to create an international university system, foster an internationally competitive environment, cooperate with other regions in the world, and make internationally attractive universities (MECD, 2015). The fourth objective is directly linked with teaching in English (*docencia en inglés*) and recommends “increasing the number of studies taught in English and promoting the learning of English for university stakeholders” (Pavón &

Ramos-García, 2018, p. 35). However, while English has reached the status of a second language in many other European countries such as Norway, it still tends to be perceived as a foreign language in Spain (Doiz et al., 2011).

As a result of the MECD's strategies for internationalization, the Board of Rectors of Spanish Universities (*Conferencia de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas*) published a document for the implementation of language policy in Spain in 2017, in which the main objective was to apply a homogenous criterion in order to promote linguistic internationalization (Pavón & Ramos-García, 2018). Pavón & Ramos-García's (2018) study, which aimed to identify the presence and main characteristics of language policies that have evolved in the Spanish universities, found that out of the 76 universities included in the study, only 18 had published an accessible document serving as a language policy. The authors conclude that these language policies, where they exist, have evolved in a bottom-up process or as a matter of individual efforts and initiatives led by the faculties rather than the existence of common regulations or guidelines that apply top-down to the whole institution. In many cases, the language policy is nothing more than a brief statement of mixed intentions. Interestingly, the authors also discovered that the heterogeneous nature of language policies at Spanish universities can be attributed to the specific region in which the university is located. Spain is divided into 17 autonomous regions, some of which are bilingual. HEIs located in monolingual regions have not seen many attempts to implement language policies, however the opposite is true for those located in bilingual regions, like Catalonia (where the University of Barcelona is located), where the application of language policies has been a political and social objective during several decades in order to promote the development and equal status of two official languages (i.e., Castilian Spanish and Catalan). As per the analysis of the study, the universities *with* language policies have developed them according to a criterion that advances their own plans and objectives. When studying the websites of Spanish institutions (Universidad Carlos III, Pompeu Fabra, and Universidad de Navarra), Jenkins (2014) findings support the above notion. There are some programs taught in the English medium, however the information provided was implicit and vague, with most EMI being conducted in more of a bilingual Spanish/English manner. Even though English was regarded as a "working language," Spanish HEIs located in provinces where there is a regional dialect were actually more oriented towards prioritizing the region's local

languages, such as Catalan (Jenkins, 2014). For such universities, internationalization was seen as an opportunity to bring the immediate local language to the forefront. It is only in the last few years that the internationalization process has indirectly forced Spanish universities to look further into the development of languages, namely English (Pavón & Ramos-García, 2018).

2.4 Operationalization of Expectations within the Case Studies

Taking into account the hypotheses developed in section 2.2, there are further expectations that can be developed in accordance with the three cases that have been selected for analysis in the current study. Greater detail about case selection is offered in section 3.3, however to briefly summarize, the countries and the case universities that were selected are contingent upon a set of a few factors. All three countries are located in Europe, but in distinct regions of the continent. Each of the countries has a different language history (as outlined in section 2.3) but share in common that English is not the L1, which implies that different expectations should exist when it comes to (English) language policy. The expectations pertaining to the three cases are outlined in the Table 2.2 below.

Table 2.2 Detailed Expectations for the Country Cases.

<p>Expectations relevant for Norway and Poland, but not for Spain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National level (e.g., Ministry of Education) has a more laissez-faire attitude/approach to national language policy • Promotion of and greater emphasis on European identity • English language policy as a mechanism tied to accessibility, future graduate employability, combating brain drain, and the competition for students • Higher quantity of ETPs and EMI courses offered
<p>Expectations relevant for Poland and Spain, but not for Norway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Path dependency on second languages (e.g., Russian and Castilian Spanish) underpins notions of nationalism • National ideology/identity is stronger and underpins language policy • English language policy more explicitly linked to internationalization strategy

- HEI English language policy evolves in a more bottom-up approach, rather than top-down imposition
- EMI offering as a tool to increase university prestige and international rankings

Expectations relevant for Norway and Spain, but not for Poland

- Explicit promotion and visibility of L1 as per legal, political and social policy
- Language beliefs and language management are most powerful forces
- More emphasis on institutional multilingualism
- Closer link between national language policies and actions universities are taking

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Strategy

This study of institutional English language policy utilizes a qualitative research methodology because the overarching research topic of language has a lexical nature, rather than a numeric one, which makes a quantitative research strategy inapplicable for the purpose of this study. The goal of qualitative research is to seek a deeper understanding of a social phenomenon. Therefore, qualitative research is based on the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds and embodies the view that social reality is constantly shifting and emerges as a property of individuals' creation (Snyder, 2015; Bryman, 2015).

Just as social reality is in a constant flux, so too can be the research process. While qualitative research generally emphasizes a preference for treating theory as something that emerges out of the collection and analysis of data, there is also an opportunity to allow qualitative data to play a role in the testing of theories as well. According to Silverman (2003, as cited in Bryman, 2015), in more recent times qualitative researchers have become increasingly more interested in the testing of theories which reflects the growing maturity of the qualitative research strategy. There is no reason why qualitative research cannot be employed in order to test theories that are specified in advance of or amidst data collection (Bryman, 2012). The oscillation between the tandem testing of emerging theories and the collection of further data is therefore a distinctive feature of the qualitative research paradigm.

3.2 Research Design

The research design for this thesis is a comparative case study that aims to better understand the greater social phenomenon of internationalization through the perspective of language, namely through English language policy. As mentioned in earlier sections, there has been little previous research on the particular theme of institutional English language policies in relation to internationalization. With regards to the proposed research questions and theoretical framework, a qualitative methodology is further justified because both are concerned with language *policy*. A

policy can be defined as a statement of intent, by which the mere definition implies a textual character, and the qualitative research paradigm is concerned with text over numbers. A comparative case study has been chosen to address this thesis' research questions because comparative studies are useful in telling why and how particular outcomes are produced. Comparative research design also incorporates the logic of comparison, in that it implies that social phenomena can be better understood when they are compared in relation to two or more meaningfully contrasting cases or situations (Bryman, 2012). Furthermore, when qualitative researchers "set out to examine particular issues or phenomena in two or more countries with the express intention of comparing their manifestations in different socio-cultural settings (institutions, customs, traditions, value systems, life styles, language, thought patterns) by using the same research instruments... the aim may be to seek explanations for similarities and differences or to gain a greater awareness and a deeper understanding of social reality in different national contexts" (Bryman, 2012, p. 72). In the case of this thesis, this can be regarded as the extent to which English language policies and practices are influenced by national conditions, and how individual universities respond to a common European language issue. Additionally, previous studies on English language policies and practices (i.e., EMI) have been rather limited to a particular national context or university environment, so the field can be enhanced by conducting a cross-national, comparative study (Dimova et al., 2015). The findings from the document analysis in each case will create the basis to compare the three countries with each other.

3.3 Selection of Cases and Sampling

A 'case' may be an organization, nation, community, person, program, etc. (Bryman, 2015). Norway, Poland and Spain were selected as the countries to be studied due to their linguistic, cultural and geographic attributes. The focus of this study, however, is on HEI English language policies at three universities - University of Oslo, Norway (UiO), University of Warsaw, Poland (UW) and University of Barcelona, Spain (UB). The rationale for selecting these case universities is that they represent most different cases, at least in the context of the European continent. Despite their inherent geographical, cultural and linguistic differences, each country's HE sector faces the same dilemma with regards to the incorporation of English language (via EMI/ETP) into university offerings as a component of internationalization strategy. In order to

ensure cross-case comparability, a purposeful selection strategy was used, which allowed for a set of descriptive characteristics to be developed prior to the sample selection. UiO, UW and UB were chosen because each institution is listed as the top public university within the respective country, according to the '4 International Colleges and Universities' database and search engine (4icu.org). Additionally, the case universities are located in large urban settings, enroll a comparable student population, are research-oriented and, perhaps most importantly for the aim of this thesis, offer a sufficient portion of teaching in the English medium across the graduate level. Another important aspect of the qualitative research paradigm is that selection of cases need not be representative of other cases. Rather, it focuses on selecting information-rich cases from which one can learn a great deal about the issues central to the purpose of inquiry, yielding insights and in-depth understanding (Patton, 2002).

A common concern of case studies is that they are not scientifically generalizable. A unique problem arises from this concern because case studies are typically about a single case, or multiple cases, which "consist of a specific set of persons or a specific set of events in a specific place and at a specific period of time" (Yin, 2010, p. 21). Initially, the aim of this study was not to present a report that can be generalized to the wider HE sector, but rather to investigate how and in what way the English language policies and practices of the three case universities vary in light of the same language issues, and the similarities they share despite being most different cases. However, qualitative case studies can in fact be generalizable to the theoretical propositions they offer, by expanding and generalizing *theories*. When case studies become theory building, this is known as analytical generalization. Analytical generalization is defined by a two-step process, which first involves "a conceptual claim whereby investigators show how their case study findings bear upon a particular theory" (Yin, 2010, p. 21). The second step consists of "applying the same theory to implicate other, similar situations where analogous events might also occur... The findings from the case study should then show how the empirical results supported or challenged the theory. If supported, the investigators then need to show how the theoretical advances can pertain (be generalized) to situations other than those examined as part of the single case study" (Yin, 2010, pp. 21-22). Therefore, Spolsky's theory of language policy serves as the underlying foundation, and the institutional English language policy and subsequent expectations presented intend to advance Spolsky's theory by looking at it in a

comparative dimension. The theoretical framework taken and tested in this thesis could be further advanced to countries and HEIs not included in this current tripartite case study.

3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

Given the nature of this study as described in preceding sections, the main data was collected through document analysis. The key documents used were official documents derived from the state, as well as private sources, like the higher education institutions themselves. The state is a source of a great deal of information and textual material which has potential significance and interest to social researchers (Bryman, 2012). Private sources, such as companies, or organizations generally, produce many documents. The university, as a public institution, could be considered as a hybrid of a public and private source per Bryman's definition, because certain institutional documents are accessible in the public domain, whereas others are available only for internal, private use. Generally, documents such as annual reports, mission statements, press releases, advertisements and public relations material are accessible on a university's corresponding internet webpage. In this study, official documents from the three universities and corresponding national ministries, including strategic plans and language policy guidelines, were obtained from the official websites and analyzed (see Appendices for complete list of documents).

The method employed for interpreting the data collected from the documents was qualitative content analysis. This approach comprises a search for underlying themes in the documents being analyzed (Bryman, 2012). The collection of qualitative data frequently results in the accumulation of a large volume of information (Bryman, 2012). Qualitative content analysis is useful in that it helps reduce the vast amount of data faced, by allowing the researcher to be able to gather important information about a particular theme, while also allowing for the elimination of data that is not relevant to the study. In this study, predefined themes, which were outlined through the literature and theoretical framework in the preceding chapter, were applied to the sources. Furthermore, qualitative content analysis can be used not only to determine the presence of themes, concepts and phrases, but also to interpret and systematically evaluate the presence of singular words. Therefore, data analysis also involved lexical analysis. Lexical analysis, which is

generally employed in computer science programming, is a process by which meanings are associated with specific words, i.e., ‘lexical terms’ (Paice, 2016). Such lexical terms were extracted during the coding of the documents and analyzed independently, focusing on how their meaning and use may influence the scope of English policies and practices, and other strategic documents.

3.5 Other Considerations and Limitations

The three most prominent criteria for the evaluation of social research are reliability, replication and validity. However, these criteria tend to apply to quantitative research. For qualitative research, Lincoln and Guba (1985, as referenced in Bryman, 2012) proposed alternative terms for assessing qualitative research. They establish ‘trustworthiness’ as a criterion comprising four aspects, which parallel the criteria for quantitative research listed above. The four aspects include credibility, which parallels validity; transferability, which parallels replicability; dependability, which parallels reliability; and confirmability which parallels objectivity and the notion of researcher bias. According to LeCompte and Goetz (1982, as referenced in Bryman, 2012), the degree to which a study can be replicated is a difficult criterion to meet in qualitative research because it is impossible to ‘freeze’ a social setting. However, when it comes to document analysis, replication is not outright impossible if the same methods and framework are employed. Furthermore, because the documents that were sourced are official, their validity and reliability should be strong.

In addition to the four aspects of ‘trustworthiness’, Lincoln and Guba also suggest the criterion of ‘authenticity’. The authenticity criterion, while not as influential, is thought-provoking and raises a wider set of issues concerning the wider impact of research (Bryman, 2012). When it comes to content analysis, Scott (1990, as cited in Bryman, 2012) claims that the content analysis can only be as good as the documents on which the researcher works. Thus, Scott recommends assessing documents in terms of the authenticity, credibility and representativeness criteria. Representativeness is concerned with “whether the documents examined are representative of all possible relevant documents, as, if certain kinds of documents are unavailable or no longer exist, generalizability will be jeopardized” (Bryman, 2012, p. 306). While it was expected that *identical* documents would not be sourced due to the nature of the study which spans three

different country contexts, the documents that were collected are comparable and representative of English language policies and practices across the three cases. Moreover, as stated in section 3.3, the intent of this study is not to generalize the results of this study to the wider HE sector, but rather it is to generalize *theory*. That said, Spolsky's theory of language policy focuses on the nation-state exclusively. So, while his theory can be generalized to the national level, it is limited in application to HE. This limitation was therefore mitigated by expanding certain dimensions of his theory to suit the HE context, as mentioned in section 2.1.

The authenticity criterion can be defined as whether the document is what it purports to be. In this study, the documents are what they appear to be due to the fact that all documents were collected from official sources. The criterion of credibility refers to the degree to which the researcher has managed to convey a trustworthy account of the findings. It is possible that there can be several accounts of an aspect of social reality, and thus it is the credibility of the account that the researcher arrives at that determines its acceptability to others (Bryman, 2012). When paired with qualitative content analysis, the credibility criteria can be identified in whether there are grounds for thinking that the contents of the document have been or are distorted in some way. Credibility was a significant factor in the analysis of the Spanish documents, in particular the 'Strategy for the Internationalization of Spanish Universities 2015-2020' originating from the MECD, in that this document was available only in Spanish. Therefore, the document needed to be translated into English. On account of the fact that certain elements tend to get "lost in translation," this could factor into the data analysis and skew the ability to draw credible conclusions, however painstaking measures were taken to ensure accuracy in the translation and understanding of the Spanish.

Social research is influenced by a variety of factors, and values held by a researcher can have a big impact over the objectivity of the research and findings. Values refer to the personal beliefs or feelings of a researcher (Bryman, 2012). Within social research, it is expected that social scientists be value free and objective, however it is almost impossible to completely eliminate researcher bias as there are numerous points during the course of research where bias and values might intrude. Therefore, it is important to both recognize that research cannot be value free and "ensure that there is no untrammelled incursion of values in the research process and to be self-

reflective” (Bryman, 2012, p. 39). In light of the ‘trustworthiness’ criterion and this above notion of reflexivity, it is necessary to address how my role as the researcher had a bit of a paradoxical nature to it. Even though I possess personal connections to the three countries included in this case study, I am not an ‘insider’. As a researcher, because of my status as an ‘outsider’ to these three HE systems, I ran the risk of misunderstanding or overlooking certain aspects that are taken for granted and embedded in the culture, traditions, etc. of the three countries. On the other hand, my approach as an ‘outsider’ was advantageous because it allowed me to offer a fresh perspective on the topic and carry out an objective comparison, which is presented in the subsequent chapters.

4 Findings

In this chapter, the findings from data collection are presented and compared. As explained in section 3.4, main data collection relied on document analysis. The document analysis was conducted by searching for and coding relevant sets of data into categories, which themselves were structured with help from the literature review and theoretical framework. The findings are presented in three sections, each section pertaining to the respective research questions posed in section 1.3. The first section relates to the first research question and explains the similarities and differences between the English language policies of the three cases. The content of this section is presented thematically in order to outline the main topics of commonality and contrast. The second section addresses how English is positioned in relation to each case country's L1 and how this influences the fulfillment of university objectives as set forth in each case's set of strategic documents. The third section discusses the extent to which English language policies and practices can be linked to HE internationalization strategies.

4.1 Similarities and Differences of English Language Policies and Practices in Norway, Poland and Spain

The most evident difference between the language policies of the Norwegian, Polish and Spanish cases draws from the fact that the University of Barcelona (UB) is situated in the autonomous region of Catalonia, which has two official languages: Spanish and Catalan. The majority of people living in the country of Spain speak Spanish, and in the greater national context Catalan is relegated to a minority language. However, in Catalonia the majority of people speak Catalan, making this “minority” language the main L1. As such, the Statute of the UB defines Catalan as the university's official language and the UB's *Plan for Languages 2017-2020* commits to protecting, using and promoting this language indigenous to Catalonia. The mission of UB is twofold in that it aims to combine its clear international focus with the institution's “special responsibility” towards Catalan. This exact rhetoric is echoed in the University of Oslo's (UiO) *Strategy 2030*, in that UiO “plays an important role in preserving Norway's cultural history and has a *special responsibility* for the renewal and dissemination of knowledge about Norwegian society, *language*, history and nature” (“Strategy 2030 - University of Oslo”, 2020, my italics).

Both UiO and UB are subject to national regulations and have legally mandated responsibilities to uphold the visibility of the L1 (i.e., Catalan and Norwegian), especially at the Bachelor's level. At UiO, whose language policy is based on the recommendations set forth by Språkrådet's *Guide for language choice in the university and university college sector*, Norwegian is the language of instruction for Bachelor's level programs, whereas there is room for both Norwegian and English-medium instruction in Master's and PhD programs. Furthermore, UiO's language policy guidelines state that with regards to research, all doctoral dissertations shall include both an abstract in English (as the international language of research) and an abstract in Norwegian aimed at the general public, regardless of the language the dissertation itself is written in. UB also ensures the preferential use of Catalan as an academic language in Bachelor's degree courses, however it does explicitly promote multilingualism as an integral part of its strategy. Like UiO, UB creates space for EMI at the doctoral level. Data collected from UB's Language Services department, whose role is to promote multilingual training and support for academic, technical and administrative activities, reports that in the 2018/19 academic year, a majority of doctoral theses (40%) were written in English, whereas Spanish and Catalan accounted for 36% and 15% of doctoral theses, respectively. The University of Warsaw (UW) also lists multilingual education as "a priority with a goal to support our students and use the offer of EHEA and also secure employability on the European job market."

While UB and UW promote strategies of multilingualism, UiO specifies that it promotes a parallel-lingualism strategy, where Norwegian is nurtured as the primary academic language, and English as the main foreign language. Students at UiO are expected to know and be able to use either Norwegian or English, but the requirements concerning use of Norwegian do not apply to students who are on international programs. Students are also not obligated to use English (or another foreign language) in teaching or examinations unless it is a part of the subject (e.g., foreign language acquisition courses). Interestingly, Språkrådet's *Guide for language choice* and UiO's *Language policy guidelines* provide some conflicting information. One of the sections of Språkrådet's *Guide for language choice* targets increasing the *bilingual* competence among students and staff and recommends that "institutions should, for example, offer courses in academic reading and writing, subject-specific writing, and training in presentation technique- in both Norwegian and English." UiO's language policy guidelines, which state in the first

paragraph of the document that the UiO will promote so-called parallel-lingualism, later state under the *Teaching* section that “Norwegian, Swedish and Danish are considered equal for teaching purposes.” On account of this attestation to include more than one Nordic language into the teaching repertoire, UiO’s language policy guidelines appear to be more consistent in actuality with a multilingualism strategy, just like UW and UB, rather than a parallel-lingualism strategy.

On account of the variety of documents that were sourced (i.e., web pages, language policies, strategic plans, etc.), finding points of comparability amongst the three case universities was a labyrinthine process. As this was the case, the language practice concept as per Spolsky’s theory of language policy (see 2.1.7) proved useful in determining actual language policy by comparing what HEIs *do* as opposed to what they *say* they do. The quantity of study programs offered in the English medium at the three case universities thus provided a further commensurate snapshot of English language policy and practice. Of the three HEIs, UiO offers the most study programs in English - 72 at the Master’s level and 8 PhD’s. UW offers 27 study programs in English, of which three are offered solely in the first cycle, 13 only in the second cycle, and 5 are offered in both the first and second cycle³. UW also offers one uniform Master’s cycle in Psychology that runs for five years. At both UiO and UW, the ETPs are taught *entirely* in English. By comparison, at UB only a fraction of the total study programs classified as ETPs are taught entirely (i.e., 100%) in English. Out of the 74 total Bachelor’s degrees on offer, only six teach 100% in English. Of the 85 total Master’s degree programs that incorporate EMI, only 22 teach 100% in English. The remaining 63 programs are *partially* taught in English and English usage for teaching purposes ranges anywhere from 2% to 95%. UB also offers 48 doctoral programs, all of which are available in English.

Another area of comparability that offers interesting findings, is not so much in relation to the actual semantic content of the documents, but rather in where the documents are located on respective university websites and how often they are reviewed. UB’s *Plan for Languages 2017-2020* is the third edition of the university’s *Plan for Languages* and offers up a version that is

³ Programs of higher education in the EHEA are offered in three levels – undergraduate, graduate and doctoral studies – which are usually referred to as the three-cycle system.

frequently updated and revamped from the previously approved plans for 2010-2012 and 2013-2015. All three plans are easily accessible from the UB's *Language Policy* webpage, however the text of the two earlier plans along with other documents and regulations is available only in Catalan. The *Plan for Languages 2017-2020* is the first edition published entirely in English. Like UB, UiO's language policy guidelines were also first initially published in 2010 following approval by the university's Rector, with the most recent web page modification in February 2019. However, one major difference between UB and UiO is that UiO's language policy guidelines are located on the *For Employees* side of the website. There is no access point from UiO's homepage to the language policy guidelines that are student and/or general public-facing. The only publicly facing document that incorporates, or rather briefly hints at issues of language choice, is the university's strategic plan, which gets updated every decade. UW, conversely, offers no official document, neither in print nor digital, pertaining to language policy. Although UW does have a web portal dedicated to *Language Courses* which provides various information regarding the number of ETPs, there is little to no mention about its official language policy. Instead, UW's language policy must be inferred from its mission statement and *Strategy* published in December 2008. The concluding remark to be made based upon the similarities and differences that have been identified is that the three universities fall into different parts of the spectrum with regards to their (English) language policy approaches. UB's *Plan for Languages 2017-2020* follows a top-down approach and is strictly affiliated not only with the university's own statutes and language regulations, but also those of the Government of Catalonia. On the contrary, UW's language policy appears to originate from a bottom-up approach as the HEI neither has an official language policy document, nor is it subject to any language regulations at the national level. Lastly, UiO's approach to language policy and practice is somewhat of a hybrid between top-down and bottom-up, as seen in the fact that it draws upon some recommendations from Språkrådet, albeit asymmetrically.

4.2 The Position of English in relation to L1 and the Fulfillment of University Objectives

The fundamental tripartite mission of HEIs around the world is to disseminate knowledge by means of teaching, generate new knowledge through research and uphold a social pact of sorts

through service to society. These critical functions are interwoven in universities' mission statements and strategic plans. As English takes its place as an academic lingua franca, it presents an opportunity to be used as a mechanism for furthering certain institutional objectives. At the same time, English presents a threat on account of the unique challenges it poses with respect to domain loss and the overshadowing of national education obligations for international obligations. In the Norwegian documents that were analyzed, for the most part English was positioned favorably as a mechanism for achieving greater international prestige. UiO's *Language policy guidelines* state that language policy "shall serve to help implement the University's strategic plan and its goal of being a research-intensive university of a high international calibre" ("Language policy guidelines for the University of Oslo - For employees - University of Oslo", 2010). In order to foster this acclaimed international status, UiO's *Strategy 2030* stresses that "it's important to be successful in the competition for talent" and that "the process of recruitment and assessment shall be open and transparent with an emphasis on quality and academic assessments" ("Strategy 2030 - University of Oslo", 2020). Additionally, increased sharing and better accessibility to infrastructure and data resources is prioritized in UiO's "roadmap" as an area that is in need of long-term investments. Therefore, "based on this roadmap, UiO will invest in, develop and maintain infrastructure that helps strengthen [its] international position as a research-intensive university" ("Strategy 2030 - University of Oslo", 2020).

Two of the main objectives of UiO's *Language policy guidelines* are that language policy shall be designed to promote and develop the use of Norwegian and technical terminology, and that English shall be used when appropriate or necessary for academic reasons. Interestingly enough, where UiO's *Strategy 2030* mentions its "international calibre" and "international position" in the same breath as its "research-intensive" orientation at least six times, it fails to mention "English" even once within the whole of the document, and the term "language" appears twice. It is only at the national level that language choice between Norwegian and English is presented as a dilemma. Språkrådet recognizes that a primary function of HE is to reflect the priorities of Norwegian society at large and that the HE sector has a responsibility to uphold and develop Norwegian as an academic language. Therefore, the purpose of Språkrådet's *Guide for language choice* is to provide recommendations for what universities can do "to balance their use of

English versus Norwegian in order to ensure optimum quality in instruction, research dissemination and administrative services" ("Guide for language choice in the university and university college sector", n.d.). Furthermore, Språkrådet lists the purpose of language policy guidelines as being to "promote sound, systematic language choices" and as such, language policy guidelines with principles for language choice at all levels should be drawn up and "reflected in the institution's internal strategies." Needless to say, UiO's strategic plan fails to explicitly mention this aspect. The lack of mention of language choice leaves an aperture in understanding just how the university aims to fulfill its internationally oriented objectives and goal of developing cooperation across academic, institutional and national boundaries in order to strengthen UiO's position as a leader in the upper echelon of European universities.

In the Polish documents that were analyzed, English is positioned as a tool available at UW's disposal to implement its specific objective of improvement of teaching and curricula. The *Strategy of the UW* acknowledges that the university has got weaknesses, including "few interdisciplinary programmes and courses taught in foreign languages (in this English)" (p. 6), and outlines its aims for the introduction of study programs in foreign languages and the international status of studies. In 2008, UW only had 12 programs conducted in English. By increasing the number of ETPs, UW aims not only to improve teaching and curricula, but also to resolve the important issue of extending the educational offer and providing (future) education to a considerably larger number of foreign students, in this candidates from neighboring countries. Maintaining the attractiveness of the educational offer further plays into competition for talent and the urgency of UW's role in combating the intellectual exodus of academic students and staff away from Poland for more favorable posts elsewhere. "Brain drain" is a very real threat that is recognized both by UW as an HE provider and at the national level by the Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange (*Narodowa Agencja Wymiany Akademickiej*, hereinafter NAWA). NAWA's *Outline of the 2018-2025 Strategy* aims to address issues of brain drain by elevating the international prestige of Polish universities' by enhancing the potential of Polish HE and science through international exchange and cooperation. NAWA outlines its plan to reinforce scientific excellence through international mobility programs which offer research stays in Poland for employees and students from foreign institutions, as well as return programs for Polish scientists who originally left Poland to pursue their scientific careers due to limited

research infrastructure. Between these two documents, it is observable that the priority objectives are concerned with decreasing the brain drain of students and staff by increasing the international educational and research attractiveness of Polish HEIs, and English plays a critical role in enabling such objectives. That said, perhaps one of the more intriguing findings with regards to UW and NAWA's strategic objectives, is that in UW's strategic plan a greater emphasis is placed on the English language as a tool to achieve university objectives. No reference is given to the role that the Polish language plays in fulfilling UW's objectives. The opposite is true for NAWA's strategy which mentions the English language not once and instead promotes the Polish language as being a functioning language present in academic reality, particularly among Poland's Eastern-European partners.

In the Spanish documents analyzed, English takes on a dual position in relation to the L1 and university objectives. At the institutional level English is positioned as a menacing agent which threatens UB's commitment to promoting the use of Catalan in HE. However, at the national level, the low number of EMI programs is established as a weakness with regards to how English language policy can be capitalized upon to increase the international prestige and ranking of Spanish HEIs. UB's *Plan for Languages 2017-2020* lists as part of its mission that it "must ensure the linguistic rights of students" and accordingly affirms that "teaching staff must have sufficient knowledge of the official languages - Catalan and Spanish (both oral and written) - and be able to use these languages in teaching and academic activities" (p. 5). Therefore, training and certification of the language skills of teaching staff are critical elements of UB's language policy to help it achieve this outlined mission. Catalan and Spanish are given a clear priority in UB's linguistic hierarchy, however as part of its commitment to its multilingualism strategy, English is positioned as the subsequent language with priority of knowledge above French and German, due to its recognized status as "the main lingua franca in most academic disciplines and in many fields of international relations" (p. 6). This prioritization is further reflected in UB's three-part vision statement where one of its aspirations is to be "an institution committed to the use, development, study and promotion of Catalan as an academic language, based on functional distribution of languages in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity⁴" (p. 7). Consequently,

⁴ Subsidiarity: (n.) a principle of social organization that holds that social and political issues should be dealt with at the most immediate level that is consistent with their resolution.

English is situated as a language aiding in UB's fulfillment of the other two components of its vision: to be an outstanding institution at the international level in teaching, research and knowledge transfer that also promotes multilingualism within academic activities and plurilingualism of members of the UB community; so long as UB's openness to other languages does not contradict the language regulations set forth by UB or those of the Government of Catalonia. While UB's institutional objectives are closely linked to the promotion of Catalan, the MECD's objectives are closely linked to promoting the international attractiveness and competition of all Spanish universities under its purview. The MECD's *Strategy for the Internationalization of Spanish Universities 2015-2020* lists its general objective as being to consolidate a strong and internationally attractive university system that promotes inward and outward mobility of the best students, professors, researchers and administrative personnel, educational quality, the potential of Spanish as a language for higher education, and the internationalization of training programs and activities, which contribute to the improvement of the attractiveness and international competitiveness of Spain, as well as to the socio-economic development of its immediate surroundings based on knowledge (MECD, 2015, p. 7). The interesting component of this objective is in the fact that while it refers to internationalization, mobility and the improvement of international prestige, it does not explicitly mention English, which commonly gets associated with the achievement of such tasks, as found in the Polish case. Instead, the Spanish language is mentioned as having a potential capability to rival English as an academic lingua franca especially on account of the fact that the MECD views Spain as a bridge between the European and Latin American continents. In the MECD's diagnostic SWOT⁵ analysis, the growing global interest in Spanish-medium instruction is listed as an opportunity, but the low rate of ETPs is still seen as a weakness to be addressed. While the MECD recognizes the necessity of a balancing act between Spanish and English with respect to institutional internationalization strategies, there is no reference of how minority languages like Catalan are positioned. Since Catalan is technically recognized as the L1 of Catalonia, the absence of mention of "minority" languages in the MECD's *Strategy for Internationalization* is significant, when the role of Catalan is so visibly and highly valued by Spain's top public university, UB.

⁵ Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats (SWOT)

4.3 The Relationship between Internationalization and English Language Policies and Practices

English as a global language is said to be a critical mechanism for the globalization process. HEIs respond to the forces of globalization in a multitude of ways, most notably by developing strategic plans of action to integrate an international, intercultural and global dimension into HE. Thus, English as the established academic lingua franca becomes a de facto component of university internationalization strategies. However, the extent to which internationalization is unequivocally linked to the incorporation of English language policies and practices varies among the three cases. Student (and staff) mobility programs are one of the more identifiable facets of HE internationalization strategies where English language policies and practices and EMI get addressed. In the case of UiO, English is mentioned more implicitly in association with internationalization and mobility schemes. According to UiO's *Language policy guidelines* "Students are expected to know and be able to use technical terminology in Norwegian and English or another foreign language." Therefore, for further clarification purposes of the rhetoric, students must know either Norwegian *and* English, or Norwegian *and* another foreign language. However, the requirements concerning the use of Norwegian "do not apply to foreign-language students on international programmes" ("Language policy guidelines for the University of Oslo - For employees - University of Oslo", 2010). While the latter sentence directly mentions that international exchange students do not need to know Norwegian, it does not explicitly state that students need to know English. The former sentence on the other hand, does mention English by name, and when paired with the latter, one can assume that if exchange students do not know Norwegian, English will suffice for their study abroad, because the university simply cannot cater to instruction in all foreign languages that students may know, as the former sentence would indicate. UiO's *Strategy 2030* similarly mentions both mobility and English language in the same stride. Upon reference to its aim of educating students with the knowledge, ability and willingness to create a better world, the Strategy simply states that "Together with other research-intensive universities, UiO will facilitate integrated courses of study across *languages*, national borders and subjects" ("Strategy 2030 - University of Oslo", 2020, my italics). If UiO aims to integrate courses of study across national boundaries via international cooperation with

universities elsewhere in Europe and across the globe, then there ought to be a common, global language to facilitate such an internationalization strategy.

UW makes a more explicit link between internationalization and English in its *Strategy*. As outlined in the previous section 4.2, a primary objective of UW is to provide education to a considerably larger number of foreign students. The obstacle in achieving this aspect of UW's strategy is that there exists an "insufficient number of courses and full educational programmes offered in foreign languages, including English." Thus, EMI is mentioned as being a mechanism for internationalization for increased inward mobility and attraction of international students. The following sentence also makes reference to the UW's plan to overcome this obstacle where it will try to "introduce financial incentive points giving more profit to courses conducted in English" ("Strategy of the University of Warsaw" - University of Warsaw, 2008). Although UW's orientation towards internationalization in association with EMI is more explicit, at the national level, this link has to be deduced. As presented in section 4.2, NAWA's strategy makes no mention of English at all, however this institution's very existence was established by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education as a measure to appreciate the importance of internationalization. NAWA lists short-term mobility programs as one of the measures to be implemented to fulfill its aim of internationalizing Polish HEIs. In spite of the fact that English is not explicitly mentioned, it can be inferred that in order for such programs to be operationalized EMI is necessary with regards to the short-term mobility programs in particular because students studying abroad in Poland for a single semester cannot reasonably be expected to complete their coursework entirely in Polish. NAWA also includes international mobility programs for students as a way in which to fulfill the aim of promoting Poland as a country offering interesting educational and research opportunities. The attractiveness of Poland as a destination country for international exchange stems from lower costs of living (in comparison with other EU countries) and a high security level. To further enhance these factors which undoubtedly play a role in students' decision of where to go abroad, NAWA launched a scholarship scheme for talented individuals wishing to study in the second cycle in Poland from Eastern Partnership member states, chosen developing countries and Asian markets who "then return to their countries of origin in order to use there the acquired knowledge and to develop cooperation with Poland" ("Outline of the 2018-2015 Strategy – NAWA, n.d., p. 3). If the intent is for such students to

return to their home countries following the completion of studies, then it could be understood that because there is no definitive mention of language requirements for this mobility program (neither English nor Polish), students more than likely do not need to complete their studies in Polish because English as a global language would be satisfactory to uphold any potential future contracts and international cooperation.

Internationalization is seemingly a topic of utmost importance on the Spanish MECED's agenda, as evidenced in the 54-page document dedicated entirely to outlining the internationalization strategies of Spanish HEIs. In order to achieve the MECED's general objective (as translated from Spanish in section 4.2), the internationalization strategy proposes that it must contribute to the creation of the international branding of Spanish HEIs by focusing on two fundamental axes: quality and *language* (p. 32, my italics). Even though the MECED's *Strategy for Internationalization* recognizes that there currently exists too low of a number of ETPs, it equally recognizes the status of the Spanish language as the second most spoken language in the world and therefore the potential that Spanish has as being the most useful and necessary foreign language to be learned.⁶ On account of this fact, Spanish universities are in a unique position in comparison to their global counterparts because they are able to offer bilingual degrees in Spanish and English, as these are viewed as the two languages which can generate the most opportunities with regards to mobility and future employment. However, because the excellence of Spanish HEIs has poor visibility, especially within international rankings (p. 32), EMI is therefore seen as a strategic stepping stone for promoting the offer of Spanish universities. UB's *Plan for Languages 2017-2020* validates this finding, as it lists its strategic areas and lines of action as being to pursue "training in Catalan, Spanish, English and other languages" (p. 14). With the intention of pursuing this line of action and the simultaneous training of the three languages listed, UB has developed training plans for Catalan, Spanish and English, however only the training plan which incorporates English is explicitly linked to internationalization as expressed in "the Language Training Plan for the Internationalization of Teaching, which focuses primarily on English" (p. 15).

⁶ Based on analysis conducted by the British Council in 2013, as cited in the MECED document.

5 Discussion

This chapter delves into the meaning, importance and relevance of the findings reported in the preceding chapter. The findings from the empirical study are analyzed in relation to the theoretical framework and the expectations developed in sections 2.2. and 2.4. The aim of this chapter is to discuss and reflect upon the main research question proposed regarding the kind of alignment that exists among the English language policies and practices across Norwegian, Polish and Spanish HE sectors. The first three sections of this chapter address the country specific cases and whether the findings meet the expectations as outlined in Table 2.2. The final section discusses the extent to which the globalization vs. glocalization hypothesis is accurate.

5.1 Relevant for Norway and Poland

One of the key questions that Spolsky (2004) poses in his language policy theory is with regards to *who* the language manager is. Like most countries around the world, both Norway and Poland have official language councils which are primarily consultative and regulate mainly on national language (L1) issues. However, with respect to English language policies and practices, both UiO and UW possess greater institutional autonomy in deputizing their own language policy. While Norway's Språkrådet presents recommendations for language choice in the HE sector, these recommendations, as the word indicates, are only proposed measures for implementation. Therefore, HEIs like UiO are not mandated to carry out all of the measures in the exact manner in which they are suggested, rather the expectation is that the proposed recommendations must be adapted to the individual institution. This exemplifies the more relaxed attitude of national level language managers toward HE language policies, in that the language policy of an individual Norwegian HEI is ultimately developed and implemented at its own discretion. Poland similarly demonstrates this laissez-faire approach at the national level. Unlike the Språkrådet, the Polish Language Council does little to address the issues of language choice in the education sector between the L1 and English. Therefore, when paired with UW's explicit lack of an official language policy document or website, this upholds the initial expectation that the Polish Ministry of Education takes on a relaxed attitude with regards to national language policy in the HE sector, consequently allowing for English to secure a presence within teaching and research.

Even though UiO's *Strategy 2030* does not once mention the word "English," if one looks at the strategic plan through a language policy lens and reads between the lines, it is evident that English language policy and EMI underpin how UiO intends to achieve its proposed aims. The overarching systematic goal of UiO's strategy is undoubtedly to strengthen its position as a leader and top-ranked, internationally-oriented, research-intensive and broad-based university. UiO's emphasis on competition for talent and improvement of accessibility to infrastructure arguably rely on English. In order to compete for the best students, staff and researchers, English is necessary for international recruitment practices because the dispersion of Norwegian as a small language is generally limited to the Nordic region. Furthermore, in order to effectively share and access infrastructure and data resources, there must be some aspect of compatibility between the sharer and the person (or unit) with whom said data is shared. In this case, a common language like English would be deemed necessary for knowledge dissemination, because knowledge dissemination is effective when fully understood. This implication is upheld in Språkrådet's recognition that English, as a rule, is the language of international research. UW's *Strategy* also emphasizes the competition for talent as a way to promote institutional prestige and impede high levels of brain drain. In order to achieve these objectives, UW pledges the introduction of more study programs in foreign languages to increase the international status of studies. In this particular section of the document (as referenced in 4.2), the term "foreign" is used as a marker which intends to suggest that study programs are in fact offered in more than one foreign language. However, of the multitude of foreign languages that UW may incorporate into its curricula, only English is listed by name. This supports and parallels previous findings, like those of Dafouz & Smit (2014) and McCambridge & Saarinen (2015) mentioned in section 2.1.6 on language management, where "foreign language" is simply used to camouflage "English" in order to give more validation to an HEI's perceived international (and multilingual) status than may actually be the case.

In the past decade, UW has increased its EMI offering from 12 to 27 ETPs. Despite doubling its EMI offering, UW still trails behind UiO, which offers a total of 80 ETPs. As yet, UiO only offers ETPs in the second and third cycle of studies, whereas all Bachelor's degree programs are offered in Norwegian, as per Språkrådet's recommendation. This inclination towards only Norwegian at the Bachelors level could indicate that perhaps there is a greater hint of national

ideology at play than originally expected, though not as great as in Spain or Poland which will be more avidly addressed in section 5.2. Overall, these metrics support Dimova et al.'s (2015) findings that a continental divide exists on the European continent, but where Dimova et al. focus on the contrast between northern and southern European countries, little is said about Central and Eastern Europe. While Northern European countries like Norway are unquestionably leaders in EMI implementation, UW's growth in ETPs illustrates that Central and Eastern European countries, like Poland, are slowly but surely catching up and gaining a foothold. This implies that in the near future, that which already is a strenuous competition among universities for international talent and prestige could become an even more drastic rivalry. Greater competition could be a result if, for example, UiO were to begin offering ETPs in the first cycle of studies or when combined with the creation of university alliances. University alliances can be defined as a cooperation of universities that are aligned with respect to a set of common goals, such as mutual enrichment through mobility, social cohesion and active citizenship or being leading research-intensive universities. Both UiO and UW are members of international university alliances, Circle U⁷ and 4EU+⁸ respectively, however the strategic plans of the two universities only briefly allude to these alliances when referencing international cooperation and/or European citizenship. Of course, this can partially be attributed to the fact that university alliances are a more novel initiative within HE, and that the creation of university strategic documents precedes them. However, in order to facilitate these inclusive, cross-national alliances between 6-7 universities, English language policy plays a pivotal role in efficient communication and coordination. For example, Circle U aims to build a "European university" by 2025, but due to the fact that its member universities are located in different countries with different national language histories, some universities may be more reluctant to make accommodations for English in place of their national language, like French which has historically played a significant role in shaping scientific communication. Simply put, language policy is something that university alliances ought to be very conscious of when building elaborate European

⁷ Circle U: Aarhus University (Denmark), Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Germany), King's College London (United Kingdom), Université de Paris (France), University of Belgrade (Serbia), University of Louvain (Belgium) and University of Oslo (Norway).

⁸ 4EU+: Charles University (Czech Republic), Heidelberg University (Germany), Sorbonne University (France), University of Copenhagen (Denmark), University of Milan (Italy), and University of Warsaw (Poland).

university networks, for it can impact the success of an alliance, or trigger its disassembly if members cannot see eye to eye about language.

While membership in a university alliance can certainly serve as an indicator for European citizenship and identity, in the context of this study the development of European identity is closely linked to the struggle between the standardization of English and the preservation of a nation's L1 (see 2.1.1.1). In the case of Poland, this struggle is distinguished in UW's commitment to normalizing EMI within teaching and research to meet the demand of the job market, economy and citizen society, and NAWA's explicit promotion of Polish within mobility schemes. By contrast, Norway's emphasis on European identity is somewhat lesser than Poland, as seen in UiO's so-called parallel-lingualism strategy which does not appear to portray so much of a struggle between English and Norwegian. Historically, the collaboration between the Nordic countries goes way back, having created a path dependency of sorts. With regards to mobility, Scandinavian mobility schemes have existed long before European mobility initiatives like Erasmus were institutionalized. Remnants of this path dependency are visible in UiO's language policy guide which explicitly lists Norwegian, Swedish and Danish as *equal* languages for teaching purposes. On account of this, one could speculate that European identity succeeds an already existing Nordic or Scandinavian identity.

5.2 Relevant for Poland and Spain

Spain's 2008-2014 financial crash and high levels of Spanish public spending served as a catalyst of sorts, fueling notions of resentment and separatism among Catalonian locals. The region of Catalonia is one of Spain's wealthiest and most productive regions, contributing about 19% to the country's overall GDP⁹. In recent years, Spanish media headlines have been dominated by Catalonia's bid for independence from Spain, where independence referendums are met not only with heavy policing, but also with Madrid and the central government of Spain imposing direct rule over the autonomous region. Because language can be linked to both culture and political power, one of my initial expectations for the Spanish case on account of the ongoing political strife between the two governments, was that path dependency on the Spanish

⁹ "Catalonia's bid for independence from Spain explained", BBC, 2018.

language would underpin greater notions of Catalanian nationalism. Although the Statute of the UB defines Catalan as the official language of the university, both Catalan and Spanish are the official languages of Catalonia, and thus UB makes according provisions in its language policy to accommodate these two languages equally. Therefore, despite political overtones, UB's protection and promotion of Catalan stems from pride in its cultural customs as opposed to resentment for Spanish.

When it comes to identity, UB seeks to promote "active European citizenship founded on the principles of effective communication, mutual cultural enrichment and cross-comprehension of languages and cultures" ("Plan for Languages 2017-2020" - University of Barcelona, 2018, p. 6). Despite the mention of "active European citizenship," it can be argued that in the case of UB, Catalan identity is more dominant than Spanish national identity and/or the greater European identity because UB's language policy states that it is formed in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity (as cited in 4.2). Subsidiarity can be defined as the idea that a central authority (i.e., MECD) should serve a subsidiary function and perform only those tasks which cannot be performed at a more local level. The very existence of UB's *Plan for Languages* and the fact that it gets updated frequently show that planning for (English) language policy and practice is well within the university's capacity. That being said, at the ministry level, Spanish national ideology and identity is understandably more prevalent, and pride is exhibited in Spanish, particularly as a potential global rival of the English language. This aspect and hence the importance given to the Spanish language illustrates that national identity and ideology (or Catalan regional identity depending on the geographic location of an HEI) do in fact underpin institutional language policy to a degree.

On the contrary, while interwoven in UW's strategic documents, Polish national ideology and identity is not overly influenced by its historical path dependency on Russian as the primary second language in education. UW's strategic plan recognizes that the university has had numerous moments in its history, some glorious and some inglorious (e.g., submission to political pressure), but does not explicitly mention the shift from Russian to English as the country's primary second language. Furthermore, in the face of the monoculturalistic and nationalistic sentiments exhibited in Poland, European identity appears to be more highly

stressed in UW's strategic documents. There is a lot of emphasis on Poland's status as a member of the EU and the unlimited opportunities in research and educational programs brought about by internationalization. In fact, of the three cases, the Polish case study reveals the most straightforward link between institutional internationalization strategies and English language policies and practices. Additionally, the statement in UW's *Strategy* about the financial incentives prescribed to ETPs (see 4.3) supports Lasagabaster's (2015) previous research findings as noted in section 2.1.5 about the belief that more dominant global languages like English are perceived as being more profitable. Therefore, at UW not only is English explicitly linked to internationalization and mobility, but also to the financial benefits that are amassed from attracting foreign fee-paying students. Overall, Polish HEI English language policy appears to evolve in a more bottom-up approach instead of being imposed top-down. As found in 4.1, UW neither has an official language policy document, nor is it subject to any language regulations at the national level. In what Pauwels (2012) terms as 'in-depth negative analysis' (see 2.1.5), the absence of official language policy documents within Polish HE is conspicuous and as such could be said to support Odrowąż-Coates' claim (see 2.3.2) that Polish HE displays elements of sheer chaos, and that English language policy, or lack thereof, simultaneously gets exposed to the chaos and helps permeate it.

With regards to internationalization and English language policy in the Spanish case, UB's training plan for the internationalization of teaching explicitly expresses English as the focus language. However, when paired with UB's paramount commitment of normalizing Catalan as a language of teaching and research, it can be said that English actually serves as a means to an end for accomplishing that exact objective. This reinforces Dimova et al.'s (2015) previous findings in the Spanish context (see 2.1.3.1). For an HEI like UB, which is located in a region where a minority language is actually the native tongue of the majority of the region's population, English is viewed as somewhat of a stumbling block. UB's EMI offering allows it to claim an international and multilingual status, however as UB's *Plan for Languages* indicates, the true linguistic priority is given to Catalan. Therefore, the EMI offering is all but a tool for elevating its prestige and international reputation. These findings are upheld at the national level as well, as reported in section 4.3. The MECD's *Strategy for Internationalization* views the introduction of bilingual English/Spanish degrees as a unique opportunity, where the integration

of EMI is a deliberate tactic to raise the visibility of Spanish universities in the international league tables above all. According to the MECD, improved coordination between universities and administrations is required in order to attain the objective of increased university prestige and position among international rankings. This can be achieved by aligning the national internationalization strategy with both the regional strategies of the autonomous communities and the specific strategies of each university (MECD, 2015, p. 33).

Because a link can be established between internationalization and English language policies and practices as the findings in section 4.3 show, the statement from the MECD document about alignment could be taken to mean that not only does the MECD want to better align internationalization strategies, but also English language policies and practices across all Spanish universities as a result. The findings in section 4.1 concluded that UB's language policy evolved in a more top-down approach because it was subject to institutional and governmental statutes and regulations. Granted that the Spanish case university in this study is situated in an autonomous region with a prominent independent language history, the extent to which the same can be said about a top-down language policy approach existing among all Spanish universities depends on geographic, cultural and socio-political factors. However, the MECD's orientation towards improving the alignment between the macro and meso levels indicates that there is room for the English language policy of Spanish HEIs to evolve in a more hybrid manner by incorporating elements from a top-down *and* bottom-up approach to meet in the middle. For example, if one applies the most basic definition of each approach, in that top-down goes from the general to the specific and bottom-up begins at the specific and moves towards the general, then an HEI like UB could make known its agenda for promoting the region's indigenous language and the Spanish Ministry of Education could take this into account when aiming to capitalize bilingual (e.g. English/Spanish and/or English/Catalan) degrees.

5.3 Relevant for Norway and Spain

According to the country specific expectations developed in section 2.4, the language belief and language management concepts of Spolsky's language policy theory were believed to be the most powerful dimensions influencing English language policies and practices for the Norwegian and Spanish cases. This expectation was grounded in the fact that both UiO and UB

are legally mandated by their respective national or regional governments to uphold the visibility of the L1 as per legal, political and social policies. Språkrådet, as the authoritative body on state language issues, can also be acknowledged as the language manager who influences which languages are official within the HE sector. Språkrådet issues recommendations for the measures that HEIs can implement, however there is no guarantee that these recommendations will be adapted to and observed by individual Norwegian HEIs. The findings from section 4.1 show that even though there is a closer link between national language policies and the actions UiO takes in drafting its language policy guidelines, there still exists some degree of misalignment. Språkrådet provides concrete recommendations for what HEIs can do “to balance their use of English *versus* Norwegian” (“Guide for language choice in the university and university college sector”, n.d., my italics). While at first glance this statement appears to support the balancing act between the development of Norwegian as an academic language and the opportunities that English brings about with regards to knowledge dissemination, research and even international cooperation, the lexical usage of “versus” implies that the language issue is exceedingly prevalent in Norwegian HE. The preposition “versus” carries with it the connotation that positions English and Norwegian directly in *opposition* of one another, rather than as complementary languages. This opposition is countered at the institutional level in that UiO’s language policy guidelines promote so-called parallel-lingualism. If one applies the geometric definition of the term “parallel” (i.e., *two* straight lines in a plane that do not intersect at any point), then it can be said that at UiO Norwegian and English are in fact complementary languages which exist in symbiosis. In reality, UiO’s language policy is more consistent with a multilingualism strategy despite the assertion that it promotes a parallel-lingualism strategy. As found in 4.1, the inclusion of Swedish and Danish, in addition to Norwegian and English, as equal languages for the purposes of teaching emphasizes institutional multilingualism.

Similarly, the findings from the Spanish case show that there is some misalignment in terms of language management despite the MECED’s best efforts to improve alignment between the national, regional and institutional levels. Although UB explicitly mentions that it is subject to certain regulations of the Government of Catalonia, it makes no mention of being subject to any regulations originating from the MECED. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that while the MECED makes reference to the incorporation of EMI and the benefits that Spanish HE can hence

obtain, the mention of regional languages and how these ought to be incorporated into institutional language policy is entirely absent. In Spain, there are eight languages to which the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (as referenced in 2.1.4) applies - Aragonese, Aranese, Asturian, Basque, Catalan, Galician, Leonese and Valencian - and yet all of these are absent in name in the MECED's strategy. Once again Pauwels' conceptualization of in-depth negative analysis is useful because the mere absence of regional languages is significant by nature. What can be inferred from this absence at the national level is that members of the national speech community, like those with certain posts within the MECED, assign more value and prestige to English, which in turn allows it to gain dominance within the HE sector, thus displacing other "foreign" languages (even regional ones).

5.4 Globalization vs. Glocalization

Glocalization can be defined as the simultaneous occurrence of making certain tendencies in contemporary higher education systems both global *and* local. In order for universities to be successful, they need to be able to address forces that originate from the respective international, national and local levels of interest. Based on the findings presented in Chapter 4, the data analysis indicated that all three case universities overwhelmingly orient towards striking a balance between the global and the local. Although the strategic documents of all three universities do not reference glocalization by name, they do allude to glocalization as an important dimension. UiO assesses that its quality and breadth of research and education opportunities places it in a unique national position, while also allowing it to form a part of Europe's upper echelon of research-intensive universities. Moreover, in recognizing the special responsibility that UiO plays in preserving Norwegian culture, society and language (as found in section 4.1), UiO is conscious that it is both a bearer and a steward of culture that is at the intersection between tradition and renewal. This balancing act between the national and global, and the traditional and contemporary, influences UiO's role as a leader for other HEIs, both nationally and internationally. UW also seeks to be the best university nationally in Poland and a leading university in Europe, with a particular regional responsibility toward Central and Eastern Europe. In fact, UW sees itself not only as an institution that combines dissemination of universally significant knowledge with the maintenance of historical and cultural identity of Polish regions and states, but also as a liaison who can assist in the societal integration and

dialogue between Western Europe and its Eastern neighbors. The same glocalization perspective can be identified in UB's twofold commitment in combining its clear international focus with its special responsibility towards the Catalan language and thus Catalan society.

Prior to fully diving into the data analysis, four considerations were developed with regards to the general expectations of the glocalization perspective (see Table 2.1). The first expectation was that the local, regional and/or national levels (i.e., Ministry of Education, national language councils, etc.) would have a greater impact over institutional language policies, as opposed to the supranational level. For both UiO and UB, the influence of these levels was more prominent, as seen in UiO's development of its language policy guidelines in association with Språkrådet's *Guide for language policy*, and in UB's *Plan for Languages* which adheres to statutes and regulations from the Government of Catalonia, the Interuniversity Council of Catalonia, and its own Governing Council. While the MECD's *Strategy for Internationalization* incorporates English as a part of its strategy to raise the international visibility of Spanish universities, it does little to develop coherent English language policy guidelines beyond that. UB's *Plan for Languages* makes little reference to the MECD, however the fact that UB's "Training Plan for the Internationalization of Teaching" explicitly focuses on English indicates the existence of a link between UB and the MECD, in that UB's internationalization strategy is perhaps guided by the MECD's *Strategy for Internationalization* to some degree. Contrastingly, the Polish case could be said to be a bit of an outlier for this first expectation, due to the fact that UW's official language policy is nonexistent, and must be inferred from its *Strategy*. This suggests that 1) neither the local nor supranational level really influence institutional language policy; or 2) that the impact of these two levels is so overwhelming that any attempts on UW's part to accommodate both the local and supranational leads to complete chaos from which it cannot break free.

The second expectation under the glocalization perspective was that national ideology and identity would be stronger than European identity or ideology. Again, both the Norwegian case and the Spanish case are similar in this regard. At UiO and UB, the manner in which the rhetoric of their language policies prioritizes the L1 reflects a greater sense of national identity underpinning said language policies. The Polish case on the other hand, is more welcoming of

European identity. Perhaps, this can be attributed to the third expectation and the consideration that small language countries are more willing to capitalize upon this European identity by homogenizing English language policies and practices, whereas big language countries are thought to be more reluctant. That said, out of the three cases, as a big language country, Spain was actually very open to incorporating English into its language policies and practices because of the advantages English could bring with regards to improving the position of Spanish universities in the global rankings. By combining two big languages in degree programs, Spain has the ability to create a unique educational offer that smaller language countries simply cannot because their small languages are so limited in global dispersion. This initial expectation of big language country reluctance shaped the fourth expectation under the glocalization perspective that the English language policies and practices of the HEIs would be different. Certain elements of the English language policies and practices of the three case universities were distinct for the most part, which is not altogether entirely surprising because the case HEIs are situated in different national contexts, with different linguistic histories. However, the language policies and practices were irrefutably similar in their multilingualism strategies, a similarity which would support the globalization perspective as opposed to the glocalization perspective. A multilingualism strategy, I would argue however, has a paradoxical nature. If one breaks apart the term “multilingual” then it is clear to see that it’s composed of *multi-*, meaning “many” and *lingual*, meaning “languages.” Therefore, on one hand, a “many language” strategy is global, because many of the world’s languages can be incorporated. On the other hand, even if a university’s multilingual strategy includes many languages, one of the languages that will undoubtedly be included, and most likely given linguistic priority, as evidenced in the Norwegian and Spanish cases, is the local language. As a consequence, the inherent nature of a multilingualism strategy is a combination of the global and the local (i.e., glocalization).

While there is more evidence supporting the glocalization hypothesis based on the results of this study, it does not mean that the globalization hypothesis should be entirely disregarded. The globalization hypothesis presented in section 2.2 was contingent upon a few assumptions, most notably that the local level would not have much influence over English language policies and practices and that there would be greater homogenization and standardization of English language policies and practices among HEIs. As the English language gains more dominance

within academia, certain elements of the local are being left out. Traces of this are already visible in the Norwegian case study. Norway is home to two official languages - Norwegian and Sami - however UiO's *Language policy guidelines* and Språkrådet's *Guide for language policy* both leave out any mention of Sami. In addition to these two official spoken languages, the Norwegian variety has two written forms - nynorsk and bokmål - yet UiO's language policy guidelines state without any specification, that information shall be published in the language considered most appropriate for the audience the information is intended for. UiO's website homepage, while it does include both an English and Norwegian version, does not provide an option in the language menu to choose between nynorsk and bokmål. This example, which could be regarded as being a bit of an exaggeration, does display how English language policies and practices, which currently appear to be more in line with the glocalization perspective, may over time start to shift towards more of a globalization perspective, as elements of the local simply become abandoned.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Concluding Remarks

This study was inspired by the increasingly popular implementation of English-medium instruction and English taught programs within the European Higher Education Area, in particular in countries where English is neither the first nor official language. This study adds knowledge to the field with a focus on the alignment of institutional English language policies and practices, in addition to identifying some main implications. Set as a comparative case study, this study offers a valuable contribution in that the presentation of findings is insightful for further language policy development and implementation within the European landscape. Furthermore, this study provides an understanding as to how countries with different linguistic characteristics and language histories respond to the same language problem brought about by the preeminence of English as a lingua franca in higher education.

The first research question revolved around the discovery of the similarities and differences that exist in English language policies among the Norwegian, Polish and Spanish case universities. The empirical study revealed that the main similarity among the English language policies was that all three case universities (UB, UiO, & UW) promote strategies of multilingualism. Even though UiO does not explicitly state that it promotes a multilingualism strategy, opting to affirm its commitment to a parallel-lingualism strategy instead, in actuality its inclusion of Norwegian, English, Swedish and Danish as acceptable mediums of instruction highlights that its language policy does in fact promote multilingualism. Therefore, this similarity concerning multilingualism is not only a reflection of cross-national alignment, but also supranational alignment, in that institutional multilingualism strategies essentially support the EU's "mother tongue plus two other languages" policy.

The second research question aimed to provide insight as to how English, as the growing academic lingua franca, was positioned in relation to Norwegian, Polish and Spanish (and Catalan). For the most part, English was favorably positioned in all three cases, especially with regards to fulfilling university objectives related to achieving greater international prestige and recognition, competing for talented students, and showcasing university attractiveness and

reputation. However, at UB, there was a greater commitment to prioritizing Catalan over both Spanish and English as part of UB's tripartite mission and its social pact with Catalan society, but English was still seen as an integral part of the university's objective to elevate its international excellence in teaching, research and the creation of a plurilingual academic community. These research findings indicate that there is alignment of university objectives pertaining to international visibility and prestige. All three cases acknowledged the opportunity brought about by English to further such agendas. Furthermore, both the Norwegian and Spanish case illustrated how English can be aligned with the L1. Per UiO's language policy guidelines, the functions of English and Norwegian-medium instruction are aligned parallel to each other. In the Spanish case, where it was initially expected that as a big language country Spain would be more reluctant to accommodate English into its language policies and practices, the Spanish Ministry of Education actually sought to use English as a mechanism for furthering its internationalization strategy, as well as profit from creating harmony between English and Spanish in the establishment of bilingual degrees.

The third research question dealt with English language policies and practices in light of the globalization phenomenon, and the extent to which EMI is explicitly associated with internationalization. The link between English language policies and practices and internationalization ranges from being more subtle and implied, as seen in the Norwegian case, to more straightforward and direct, as seen in the Polish case. However, all three case universities are aligned in that their internationalization strategies, and most notably their mobility schemes, are facilitated by English. Of the three cases, the most explicit link between English and internationalization exists in Poland, and UW's internationalization strategy and mobility programs have been developed based upon the view that English is the more economically effective language option by which international, intercultural and global dimensions can be integrated.

6.2 Limitations, Implications and Recommendations

Regarding the literature review and theoretical framework, the arguments were relevant for this study because they addressed language policy, English-medium instruction, internationalization and mobility, in addition to other themes. Nonetheless, Spolsky's theory of language policy was

the guiding theory pivotal to crafting my own set of expectations about English language policies and practices within the context of this study. The seven concepts of Spolsky's language policy theory, as presented in Chapter 2, were beneficial because they offered a concise starting point from which to understand the language variables and non-language variables that impact language policy. Spolsky's theory dates back to 2004, and with the flourishing developments and growing implementation of EMI over the last 17 years, certain aspects may be simply outdated or altogether irrelevant. That said, one of the main limitations and challenges with relying on Spolsky's theory of language policy is that it focuses almost exclusively on language policy at the independent nation-state level, whereas this thesis aimed to focus on the institutional level. The theory's focus on the national level means that it misses certain dimensions that are locally contextualized at the micro and/or meso levels. It also misses aspects at the supranational level because such dimensions impact the realization of language policy in higher education institutions. Language policy is not just established by national government authorities, but also by community groups, education providers, and international organizations. Therefore, Spolsky's theory cannot claim to be an all-encompassing theory of language policy. It is for this reason that certain aspects of Spolsky's theory needed to be elaborated upon and advanced in order to suit the higher education domain at hand. Where Spolsky solely focuses on the individual nations and their national identity, greater regional identity needed to be taken into account to theorize how European cultural identity influences (English) language policy. The development of the regional identity idea has two meanings in that 1) regional identity exists *within* a country, and 2) regional identity *extends past* national borders. Spolsky's theory of language policy takes the nation-state for granted as the speech community; however, regions and regional cultural identities indicate how Spolsky's theory could be advanced because they offer a new internal dynamic, and allow for language policy to be positioned in line with the glocalization perspective. For example, regional identity would play a significant role in a country like Belgium, which is partitioned into French-speaking Wallonia and Dutch-speaking Flanders, and whose capital, Brussels, acts as the central hub for most European diplomacy. All things considered, rather than criticizing Spolsky's theory for being outdated or too focused on the macro level at the expense of the micro or supranational/regional, his theory enabled the findings of this study to be contextualized in a such a manner to see how the strategic documents and language policies originating from the case universities themselves are positioned against or informed by national level policy.

This study offered a comparison of how three case universities approach the European language issues and how they respond in kind by developing strategic plans and language-specific policies. While the findings and subsequent discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 add knowledge to the field of higher education, they also reveal possible language policy implications that ought to be considered at the supranational level (i.e., EHEA). In the EU's attempt to promote a "united Europe," policies surrounding language usage in HE would favor standardization, whereby standardization favors English. However, as noted in the literature review, the EU's slogan is "unity in diversity" which signifies that the diversity of individual nations is important. With respect to the implications this has over language policy, it would be pertinent for the EHEA to take into consideration the continental divide that exists within Europe when it comes to EMI and the fabrication of a supranational English language policy. Rather than strictly focusing on "one Europe", English language policy at the EHEA should focus on the distinct, smaller geographical regions within Europe that share similarities with regards to English language policies and practices. Northern Europe, which includes the Nordics and the Netherlands, leads the way in EMI so the approach that universities based in these countries take would be justified in being differentiated from an approach the Central/Eastern European countries, like Poland, or the Southern/Mediterranean countries, like Spain, France and Portugal, could implement. Spain is a bridge between Europe and Latin America, France between Europe and Africa, and Portugal between Europe and Brazil, which indicates that these countries play a far greater role not only in "uniting" European HE, but also in uniting some facet of HE across the globe, through the creation of bilingual degrees, for example. The wider implication of this with respect to policy is that a "one-size fits all" language policy approach may not be the most effective and the EU's current "mother tongue plus two" language policy may need to be reevaluated and perhaps specified, because it is often assumed that one of the "other" languages directly equates to English; an assumption which can deliberately influence the multilingual orientation of university English language policies, though it might not be the most practical option.

Another possible policy implication for which this study can be used to inform, is university alliances. The "European University" is built upon a foundation of flexibility, creativity and the ability to compromise traditional leadership and management. As many of these university alliances crop up, the EHEA must concern itself with language issues, especially if university

alliance members are located in different countries, as they commonly are. Each university has a stake in representing both its national identity within the alliance, as well as its commitment to promoting the European identity. Agreement upon a common language to conduct university business can then become problematic if certain universities feel that “English” must not be equated with “European”, or if they feel strongly that the national language of their country ought to be promoted within inter-alliance communication in place of others. While these inferences are thought-provoking and raise many questions, this thesis is limited in its ability to respond to them as university alliances were beyond the scope of the project. Therefore, recommendations for future research include this very topic. It could prove fruitful to further examine English language policies and practices in connection with university alliances. It could also be useful to go more in-depth at the micro level, with a focus on disciplinary issues because EMI is not evenly distributed across the disciplines. Finally, it could be of interest to study how the different knowledge structures and needs of different disciplines impact institutional English language policies and practices.

References

- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K.M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals?. *Higher Education*, 73, 561–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2>
- Albury, N. J. (2016). National language policy theory: Exploring Spolsky’s model in the case of Iceland. *Language Policy*, 15, 355-372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9357-z>
- Altbach, P. (2019, November 19). “The Dilemma of English-Medium Instruction in International Higher Education.” *World Education News + Review*, Global Trends. Retrieved from <https://wenr.wes.org/2019/11/the-dilemma-of-english-medium-instruction-in-international-higher-education>.
- Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 290-305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542>
- Ammon, U., & McConnell, G. (2002). *English as an academic language in Europe: A survey of its use in teaching*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.
- Armenui, M. (2014). Language Policy, National Identity and Politics. *European Scientific Journal*, 10, 273-277. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2014.v10n7p%p>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carter, B. & Sealey, A. (2007) Languages, Nations and Identities. *Methodological Innovations Online*, 2, 20-31. DOI:10.4256/mio.2007.0009
- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39, 1-14. DOI:10.1017/S026144480600320X
- Council of Europe (Language Policy Programme, Strasbourg), & Ministry of National Education, Poland. (2007). *Language Education Policy Profile: Poland*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/list-of-language-education-policy-profiles>
- Council of Europe (Language Policy Division, Strasbourg), & Ministry of Education and Research, Norway. (2004). *Language Education Policy Profile: Norway*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/list-of-language-education-policy-profiles>

- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2014). Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 37, 397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu034>
- Dearden, J. & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers' attitudes towards English medium instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6, 455–486. DOI:10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.3.5
- Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca and globalization: an interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 332–354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00177.x>
- Dimova, S., Hultgren, A., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). (2015). *English-medium instruction in European higher education*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- European Higher Education Area and Bologna Process. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/>
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2011). Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes*, 30, 345-359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01718.x>
- Fejes, A. (2008). European Citizens under Construction: The Bologna process analysed from a governmentality perspective. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40, 515-530. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00362.x
- Greenall, A.K. (2012). Attracting international students by means of the web: transadaptation, domestication, and cultural suppression. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 75-85. DOI:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0040
- Hatakenaka, S. (2004). *Internationalism in Higher Education: A Review*. Higher Education Policy Institute Report, 1 July. <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2004/07/01/internationalism-in-higher-education-a-review/>
- Haugen, E. (1966). *Language conflict and language planning: the case of modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Hellekjaer, G. O. & Hellekjaer, A. (2015). From tool to target language: arguing the need to enhance language learning in EMI programs. In Dimova, S., Hultgren, A., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*. (pp. 223-244). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1515/9781614515272-012>
- Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of Higher Education and Language Policy: Questions of Quality and Equity. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20, 1-18.

- Hultgren, A. K., Jensen, C., & Dimova, S. (2015). English-medium instruction in European higher education: From the north to the south. In Dimova, S., Hultgren, A., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). *English-medium instruction in European higher education*. (pp. 1-16). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1515/9781614515272-002>
- Instituto Cervantes. (2019). *EL ESPAÑOL: UNA LENGUA VIVA INFORME 2019*. Retrieved from https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/espanol_lengua_viva/pdf/espanol_lengua_viva_2019.pdf
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university : The politics of academic English language policy*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2017). Mobility and English Language policies and practices in higher education. In S. Canagarajah. (Ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language*. (pp. 502-518). London: Routledge. DOI:10.4324/9781315754512.
- Kerklaan, V., Moreira, G. & Boersma, K. (2008). The Role of Language in the Internationalisation of Higher Education: An Example from Portugal. *European Journal of Education*, 43, 241-255. DOI:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2008.00349.x.
- Kushnir, I. (2016). The role of the Bologna Process in defining Europe. *European Educational Research Journal EERJ*, 15, 664–675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904116657549>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2015). Language policy and language choice at European Universities: Is there really a ‘choice’?. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 255-276. DOI:10.1515/eujal-2014-0024.
- Llurda, E., Gallego-Balsà, L., Barahona, C., & Martin-Rubió, X. (2016). Erasmus student mobility and the construction of European citizenship. *Language Learning Journal*, 44, 323–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1210911>
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51, 36–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350>
- Madrid, D., & Julius, S. (2020). Profiles of Students in Bilingual University Degree Programs Using English as a Medium of Instruction in Spain. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22, 79-94. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.80735>
- Maiworm, F., Wächter, B., & Academic Cooperation Association. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: the picture in 2007*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- McCambridge, L. & Saarinen, T. (2015). “I know that the natives must suffer every now and then”: Native/non-native indexing language ideologies in Finnish higher education. In S. Dimova, A. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Ed.). *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher*

- Education*. (pp. 291-316). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1515/9781614515272-015_
- Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. (2015). *Estrategia para la internacionalización de las universidades españolas 2015-2020*. Secretaría General de Universidades. Retrieved from <https://sede.educacion.gob.es/publiventa/estrategia-para-la-internacionalizacion-de-las-universidades-espanolas-2015-2020/universidad/21475>
- Ministry of National Education. (2005). *Country Report: Poland*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/list-of-language-education-policy-profiles>
- Mureşan, I. & Pop, R. (2020). SKAM – The Language Terminator (Språkterminatoren)? Norwegian, English and Global Success. *The Romanian Journal for Baltic and Nordic Studies*, 12, 117–135. <https://balticnordic.hypotheses.org/files/2020/12/09.-Muresan-Pop.pdf>
- Norway - Education and Training - European Commission. (2021). Retrieved 15 February 2021, from https://ec.europa.eu/education/study-in-europe/country-profiles/norway_en
- Norway - OECD Data. (2021). Retrieved 15 February 2021, from <https://data.oecd.org/norway.htm#profile-education>
- Odrowąż-Coates, A. (2020). Chaos Theory and the Neoliberal English-Based Dimension of the Polish Higher Education Reforms 2018/2019. *Education as Change*, 24, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1947-9417/5913>
- OECD (2015), *Education at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD (2018), *Education at a Glance 2018: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD (2019), *Education at a Glance 2019: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD (2020), *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Paice C.D. (2016) Lexical Analysis of Textual Data. In L. Liu, M. Özsu. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Database Systems*. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7993-3_941-2
- Patton, Michael Quinn (2002): *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Pauwels, L. (2012). A Multimodal Framework for Analyzing Websites as Cultural Expressions. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17, 247–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01572.x>
- Pavón, V., & Ramos-García, A. (2018). The Linguistic Internationalization of Higher Education: A Study on the Presence of Language Policies and Bilingual Studies in Spanish

- Universities. *Porta Linguarum, Special Issue 3*, 31-46. Granada: Grupo Editorial Universitario.
- Peltier, E. (2020, December 29). Britain Mourns a Cherished Education Exchange Program Ended by Brexit. *The New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/29/world/europe/brexit-erasmus-uk-eu.html>
- Phillipson, R. (2006). English, a cuckoo in the European higher education nest of languages? *European Journal of English Studies*, 10, 13–32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570600590846>
- Phillipson, R. (2015). English as threat or opportunity in European higher education. In Dimova, S., Hultgren, A., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*. (pp. 19-42). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1515/9781614515272-003>
- Poland - National Reforms in Higher Education - Eurydice - European Commission. (2021). Retrieved 29 March 2021, from https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/national-reforms-higher-education-50_en
- Poland - OECD Data. (2021). Retrieved 15 February 2021, from <https://data.oecd.org/poland.htm>
- Pulcini, V., & Campagna, S. (2015). Internationalisation and the EMI controversy in Italian higher education. In S. Dimova, A. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.). *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education* (pp. 65-88). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1515/9781614515272-005>
- Rome Communiqué. (2020). Rome Ministerial Communiqué, Rome, 19 November 2020. Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/Upload/Rome_Ministerial_Communique.pdf
- Scott, P. (2011). The university as a global institution. In R. King, S. Marginson, & R. Naidoo. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Globalisation and Higher Education*. (pp. 59–75). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Soler-Carbonell, J. (2015). Language policy in Estonian Higher Education: Internationalisation and the tension over English. In S. Dimova, A. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.). *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*. (pp. 247-268). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1515/9781614515272-013>
- Snyder, C. (2015). A Case Study of a Case Study: Analysis of a Robust Qualitative Research Methodology. *The Qualitative Report*, 17, 1-21. DOI:10.46743/2160-3715/2012.1791
- Spain - OECD Data. (2021). Retrieved 10 May 2021, from <https://data.oecd.org/spain.htm>
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Spolsky, B. (2007). Towards a Theory of Language Policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 22, 1–14. <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol22/iss1/1>
- Sunde, A.M., & Kristoffersen, M. (2018). Effects of English L2 on Norwegian L1. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 41, 275–307. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586518000070>
- Utdannings-og Forskningsdepartementet. (2003-2004). *Country Report: Norway*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/list-of-language-education-policy-profiles>
- Wächter, B., and F. Maiworm. (2014). *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education: The State of Play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens
- de Wit, H. (2014, October 10). *Erasmus report fuels internationalisation debate*. University World News. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20141008142207417>
- de Wit H., and Hunter, F. (2018.) Internationalization of Higher Education: Evolving Concepts, Approaches, and Definitions. In Teixeira P., Shin J. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions*. (pp. 1-6). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9553-1_567-1
- Wright, S. (2009). The elephant in the room: Language issues in the European Union. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 1, 93–119. <https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2009.2>
- Yin, R. (2010). Analytic generalization. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 21-22). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://www-doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.4135/9781412957397.n8>
- Żuk, P. (2018). Nation, national remembrance, and education — Polish schools as factories of nationalism and prejudice. *Nationalities Papers*, 46, 1046-1062. DOI:10.1080/00905992.2017.1381079

Appendices

A. Document Analysis- Norway

Guide for language choice in the university and university college sector. (n.d.). Språkrådet.

<http://www.sprakradet.no/Sprakarbeid/Forskning-og-hogre-utdanning/guide-for-language-choice-in-the-university-and-university-college-sector/>

Language policy guidelines for the University of Oslo—For employees—University of Oslo. (n.d.).

<https://www.uio.no/english/for-employees/support/profile/language/index.html>

Strategy 2030—University of Oslo. (n.d.). <https://www.uio.no/english/about/strategy/strategy-2030/>

B. Document Analysis- Poland

The Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange. (n.d.). *Outline of the 2018-2025 Strategy*.

<https://nawa.gov.pl/en/nawa>

University of Warsaw. (2008). *Strategy of the University of Warsaw*. [https://en.uw.edu.pl/about-](https://en.uw.edu.pl/about-university/mission-statement-startegy/)

[university/mission-statement-startegy/](https://en.uw.edu.pl/about-university/mission-statement-startegy/)

C. Document Analysis- Spain

Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. (2015). *Estrategia para la internacionalización de las universidades españolas 2015-2020*. Secretaría General de Universidades.

<https://sede.educacion.gob.es/publiventa/estrategia-para-la-internacionalizacion-de-las-universidades-espanolas-2015-2020/universidad/21475>

Universitat de Barcelona, Language Services. (2019). *Llengua de les tesis doctorals a la Universitat de Barcelona*. <http://www.ub.edu/sl/en/socio/dades/tesis.html>

Universitat de Barcelona. Vicerectorat d'Estudiants i Política Lingüística. (2018). *University of Barcelona Plan for Languages 2017-2020*. Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.

<http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/2445/121353>