Chapter 7
English-Medium-Instruction Management: The Missing Piece in the Internationalisation Puzzle of Vietnamese Higher Education

Huong Thu Nguyen

HE Reform, Internationalisation and EMI in Vietnam

Higher education is considered as a key drive to national economic development in Vietnam (General Secretary 2013). However, despite substantial improvement in the primary and secondary education, contemporary HE of Vietnam is grappled with crisis in governance, quality insurance, curriculum, research, etc. (Tran et al. 2014a, b). Well-off families have been sending their children overseas in search of better tertiary education despite the significantly higher cost of studying abroad compared with that of domestic education (see Chap. 8). Within this context, the government of Vietnam mandated Higher Education Reform Agenda (HERA) in 2005 to revamp the sector and to reverse the flows of students and money overseas (Harman et al. 2010).

As delineated in HERA, internationalisation was central to improving the quality of the domestic HE sector, as argued by Tran and Marginson (Chap. 1). However, there are some issues with internationalisation in HERA. In particular, the internationalisation of HE in policy documents was referred to as *international integration* – a term used in the economic globalisation agenda of Vietnam – because *internationalisation of HE* is unavailable in the political lexicon in Vietnam. By *international integration*, the government referred to the following activities:

- involving more international commitments and agreements
- improvements in the teaching and learning of foreign languages (especially English)
- the development of conditions favourable to increased foreign investment in the higher education system (Harman et al. 2010, p. 3).

H. T. Nguyen (✉)
Faculty of English for Specific Purposes -Foreign Trade University, Hanoi, Vietnam
e-mail: huongnt1@ftu.edu.vn

Table 7.1 Types of EMI-Based Programs in Vietnamese HE

Types of EMI-based programs	Program nature	Degree conferred	Program nomenclatures in Vietnamese HE
Foreign programs	In corporation with foreign partner HEIs	Local degree	Advanced programs
		Foreign degree	Joint programs
Domestic programs	Locally-developed with reference to foreign programs	Local degree	High quality programs

As listed in the second point in HERA's *international integration*, underlying the internationalisation agenda is the need to enhance the foreign-language capacity of the Vietnamese population, which is considered essential for pursuing the government's economic and political aims. To support this need, the government has initiated a number of changes in the national language policy and planning. In HE sector, the newly promulgated HE law in 2012 allows a foreign language to be the medium of instruction (MOI) of HEIs (National Assembly of Vietnam 2012, Article 10). With this change in the language policy, Vietnamese HEIs have been establishing linkages with foreign institutions to develop EMI-based programs for quality improvement and internationalisation (The Government of Vietnam 2008b, 2012).

Although EMI was formally approved in 2012, EMI-based programs had been offered at Vietnamese HEIs at the postgraduate level since the 1990s and at the undergraduate level since the 2000s, in collaboration with foreign institutions (Vietnam International Education Department 2015). In more recent developments, EMI programs can be foreign or domestic (see Table 7.1).

As can be seen in Table 7.1, in operating foreign EMI-based programs, or *Chương trình Đào tạo Nước ngoài*, Vietnamese HEIs have input from partner HEIs in terms of curriculum, materials and assessment (T. A. Nguyen 2009). Qualifications in these foreign programs can be awarded by Vietnamese or overseas providers depending on the negotiation between institutions (see Chap. 5 for detailed classification of transnational education types in Vietnam higher education). There are two sub-types of foreign programs, Advanced Programs (APs) or *Chương trình Tiên tiến* and Joint Programs (JPs) or *Chương trình Liên kết*:

- APs are supported by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET)'s project for capacity building in HEIs, which has the aim that by 2020 a Vietnamese HEI will be in the world's 200 leading universities (Marginson et al. 2011, p. 451). Vietnamese HEIs that hope to run APs have to satisfy a number of conditions such as academic staff, library, physical conditions, etc. Most importantly, they have to search for a partner HEIs in the world's 100 top universities to negotiate the cooperation.
- JPs are legalised by the government for Vietnamese HEIs to develop transnational education programs (G. Nguyen and Shillabeer 2013), aiming at attracting Vietnamese students to enrol in foreign style of tertiary programs provided at domestic HEIs. Foreign partner HEIs do not have to be of high ranking as in APs.

As for domestic EMI-based programs, only HEIs coordinating foreign programs (i.e. JPs and APs) can develop their own EMI-based programs because they can use the curriculum, materials and assessment schemes of foreign partner HEIs as reference. These programs are known as High Quality Programs (HQPs) or *Chương trình Đào tạo Chất lượng cao*. Currently, Vietnamese HEIs are coordinating approximately 290 JPs, 34 APs and 55 HQPs.

Similar to many HEIs in other non-English-dominant contexts, the introduction of EMI serves as one internationalisation strategy undertaken by Vietnamese HEIs (Dang et al. 2013; Doiz et al. 2013; Hamid et al. 2013; McKay 2014). With EMI, local HEIs can collaborate with partner institutions in more advanced HE systems such as those in Western countries (Australia, the UK, the US, etc.), enhancing student-academic-program mobility as in the cases of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, etc. (Altbach and Knight 2007). In Europe, EMI programs are offered to internationalise students' study and experiences (Dimova et al. 2015). However, concerns have been raised about the ELP level of local academics and students to function in English in these programs (Hughes 2008). This is a shared concern in non-English-dominant countries such as Hong Kong (Evans and Morrison 2011), Japan (Toh 2014), Korea (Cho 2012) and Vietnam (Duong 2009; Le 2012; Vu and Burns 2014).

In addition, EMI has been regarded as a multi-purpose strategy not only to enable international collaboration but also to improve students' ELP (Hu and McKay 2012; The Government of Vietnam 2008a). This is but a falsification because empirical evidence has shown that EMI does not imply a teaching methodology to contribute to students' ELP development (Coyle et al. 2010) and that in order to achieve such an objective, content teachers need to be well-equipped to deliver the disciplinary knowledge in English and support students' ELP development (Toh 2014; Wilkinson 2013). To fulfil this aim, HEIs that operate EMI programs need to have an organised management of the English-language aspects, including student entry requirements, students' English support, teachers' training, etc. Otherwise EMI establishment would stand the chance of being at the surface or even a failure (Cho 2012; Saarinen and Nikula 2013).

Implementation realities have revealed, however, that such language management is often overlooked and not visible in the national language policy (Ali 2013; Hamid et al. 2013). Taguchi (2014), in reviewing how EMI has been implemented on global scale, states that the management of English in EMI programs/institutions and the development of students' ELP are often taken for granted. The same situation is evident in the context of Vietnam in that national documents do not regulate language aspects in EMI-based programs (MOET 2014; The Government of Vietnam 2008b, 2012) and it depends on institutions to decide how English is used as MOI. In the same vein, institutions' EMI stipulation tends to neglect the importance of an institutional English language management scheme for internationalisation and improving students' ELP. As will be demonstrated through a case study in a Vietnamese university in this chapter, EMI in Vietnamese HEIs is being implemented without the base for sustainable development for its intended purposes.

Towards that end, the study adopted the perspective of Language Management Theory as the framework for discussion.

Language Management Theory

Language Management Theory (LMT) refers to the theory developed mainly by J. V. Neustupný and B.H. Jernudd (1987) in which *management* indicates a wide range of acts attending language problems. Developed alongside classical language planning which mainly focuses on macro language issues of post-colonial nation-states and which claims that language management tasks only rest with governments, LMT postulates that language problems occur at both micro as well as macro levels which require both simple (individual) and organised (institutional) management (Nekvapil and Sherman 2015). While governments might be concerned with the complexity of managing language behaviours of a polity (e.g. mandating national language), on individual levels, speakers may face with a number of language problems in communication such as pronunciation and spelling that requires attention but not entangle an organised mechanism of management. Indeed, Kaplan and Baldauf (2005) point out that LMT implies an ecological approach in that its management takes account of micro, meso and macro levels, regarding individuals, organisations, governments, etc.

In terms of implementation, LMT proposes that the process of management proceeds through certain stages: when a problem occurs, it can be noted, evaluated, and probably adjusted (Nekvapil and Sherman 2015). In the most simple sense, language management acts involve problem identification and implementation strategies (Kaplan and Baldauf 2005), and implementation may involve simple and/or organised adjustment (Marriott 2015).

Previous studies have employed LMT framework to highlight the interplay between levels of management and the importance of having an explicit language policy for EMI enactment (Ali 2013) or the micro - macro level (simple and organised) language support for students from non-English backgrounds studying in English-speaking environment (Marriott 2015). For this particular study, the mandate of EMI and its implementation in Vietnamese HE is problematised as it is not accompanied by systematic planning (including human resources and approaches); therefore, LMT provides a useful tool to investigate the management of EMI in Vietnam HEIs ranging from macro to meso and to micro levels.

The Study

For illustrative purpose, a case study of EMI implementation at a Vietnamese HEI is presented following the framework of LMT. The study was undertaken at Vietnam International University (VIU, a pseudonym). VIU is a reputable university in

Vietnam, providing graduate and postgraduate programs on Business, Business Law, Business Management, Economics and Finance and Banking. VIU institutionalised EMI for graduate level in 2006 while maintaining Vietnamese-medium instruction (VMI) programs. To the date of data collection (for four months in 2012–2013), VIU had eight EMI-based programs in all of its disciplines except for Business Law. These programs were either developed by VIU academics or in cooperation with HEIs from Belgium, Denmark, the UK and the US. In the academic year of 2012–2013, VIU had 2 APs, 4 HQPs and 2 JPs.

Major data source was from interviews with 12 executives, 26 academics (17 Vietnamese, 7 from the US and 2 from Denmark) and 17 student focus groups (66 Vietnamese students across Year 1 to Year 3 and 5 international students, including 3 from the US and 2 from France). The interviews with local academics and students were in Vietnamese, the first language of both the researcher and participants. Necessary quotes were translated into English by the researcher for analysis and discussion. Interviews with foreign academics and students were conducted in English. To protect the confidentiality of the participants, their names are anonymised in the study.

In addition, government policy scripts on EMI in Vietnam HE is referred to as the starting point for the interpretation and implementation at institutions. The main focus of the chapter is the language management for EMI-based programs in Vietnam HE, following LMT, so the analysis will focus on simple and organised management of language problems instigated by the new language policy at micro (class-room), meso (institutional) and macro (national) levels. Government and institutional policies on academics and students' ELP in EMI-based programs

Policies on EMI Academics' ELP

Government documents require that academics teaching in EMI-based programs must (1) hold a postgraduate qualification (master's or doctor degree) in the area that they teach, (2) attain level C1 (proficient user) in ELP scale of European Common Framework of Reference for languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2014) or has accomplished a degree program from abroad and (3) have at least three years experiences teaching the course in VMI (MOET 2014; The Government of Vietnam 2008b, 2012).

At VIU, the requirements were institutionalised to include (1) obtain a postgraduate qualification abroad and (2) have extensive experiences teaching the course in VMI. By way of VIU requirements, it was not necessary to organise English tests to assess academics' proficiency but to take graduation *overseas* as sufficient for teaching in EMI setting. However, the *overseas* criteria was applied rather loosely; for example, academics graduating from universities in Czech Republic and Germany who did not do their degree in English were still considered as eligible to teach in EMI programs by VIU executives. Such selection policy was a short cut to human resources preparation for EMI programs because there was no screening for

academics' ELP. What was done in VIU was not uncommon in other Vietnamese HEIs where *overseas* is often mistaken as Western or English-native countries. In addition, Vietnamese are generally in favour of anything Western or *Tây*, which is also the credence that neighbouring Asian countries have for Western labels (Cho 2012; Toh 2014). It was found that not all EMI academics at VIU were ready to teach in English given the fact that they had graduated from the West or overseas, as will be revealed in what was actually happening in the classroom in later sections.

Policies on EMI Students' ELP

At the national level, there is not consistency in language requirements for student intake to EMI-based programs. In particular, the document regulating APs only mentions that students need to have *sufficient ELP* (The Government of Vietnam 2008b). JP document (The Government of Vietnam 2012) requires students to demonstrate their ELP equivalent to CEFR B2 (Council of Europe 2014). HQP document leaves such decisions at HEIs' discretion (MOET 2014).

At the institutional level, VIU stipulated that student admitted to EMI-based programs to: (1) achieve the National University Entrance Examination (NUEE) benchmark to VIU and (2) obtain Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) (ETS 2014b) result of 500 points. TOEIC result can be substituted by Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOELF) (ETS 2014a) paper-based of 477 points, or internet-based of 53 points, or International English Language Testing System (IELTS) (IELTS 2009–2012) band 4.5.

There are several issues demanding further considerations in these requirements. First, as students will use English for disciplinary study, they need to demonstrate that they possess adequate ELP to handle academic learning. For that purpose, admission tests should be on academic rather than professional English test of TOEIC. The issue has been discussed in Japanese context where TOEIC is also used as the screening method, which causes dilemmas in student learning and outcomes (Toh 2014). In European context, proficiency screening is done through TOEFL or IELTS (Saarinen and Nikula 2013) which is the same requirement to universities in Australia, Canada, the UK and the US. Second, the requirement of TOEIC 500, or TOEFL paper-based 477, internet-based 53, or IELTS 4.5 denotes a low intermediate user of English who can hardly deal with university study (Cots 2013).

Policies on the Use of English in EMI-Based Programs

In government scripts, English is regulated as *the language of instruction* in EMI-based programs. When it comes down to the institutional level, VIU brochures, websites and introductory sessions of EMI-based programs stated the same scripts. Academics shared that EMI policy was then known to them through faculty and

division meetings. In these meetings, the only concern being discussed was what to teach in EMI-based courses. In this regard, the institution neither has specific policy or strategy nor provide preparation or professional development in terms of language and pedagogy for academics. There is also an absence of language development for students including the explanation of requirements and description of English use in lectures, assessment and consultation.

After two years of implementation, VIU reviewed the operation of its EMI-based programs. Academics proposed that it was too difficult for students to listen to lectures in English. A solution was provided:

> The president then announced that academics did not have to teach 100% in English. The proportion could be 80–20 between English and Vietnamese, providing that students understood lectures, as it was the highest program's objective. (Executive 6)

The institutional diversion of EMI policy in classroom showed that implementation reality was more complicated than what executives had expected. The shift from Vietnamese into English demanded a more structured mechanism of institutional management. As will be clearer in the discussion of what was actually happening in the classroom, especially with the presence of international students, the employment of EMI in Vietnamese academic context was premature.

Academics and Students' ELP in EMI-Based Programs

Academics' ELP

Issues relating to academics' proficiency to teach in EMI-based programs in Vietnam HE have been a matter of great concern (Le 2012) but measures are not yet in place in institutional and government policies (Duong 2009). Below is a VIU student's comment on EMI academics' ELP:

> Personally I think all academics are good. They are experts in their fields and they are supportive of students. However, their English is not up to our expectation. Their teaching in English is not good, their language proficiency regarding their field [e.g. terminology] is not satisfactory. (HQP—Business Administration—Year 2)

Information gathered from student focus groups revealed that the most burning issue facing EMI students was their academics' ELP because it directly impacted their learning. The overall impression that students had about Vietnamese academics was that they did not possess sufficient ELP to deliver a good lecture with clear presentation and satisfactory explanation for students to deeply comprehend the content. In fact, in students' observation, many academics were rather confused during lectures. Listening to local academics' teaching in English worn many students out because it was 'more tiring, more difficult to understand and to remember and easier to lose concentration' (HQP—Business Management—Year 3).

When VIU welcomed the first international students to its EMI-based programs, the weakness of academics' ELP revealed itself as telling evidence of institutional

under-preparedness as regard to personnel to implement internationalisation at the classroom level:

> I know what he is saying but just the way he phrases things not as natural as it would be for the English speakers obviously and he tends to talk simpler on tops of words and phrases and a lot of repetition so sometimes I just feel it bad and it's very hard to pay attention when it is very slow. (Foreign student 3)

Obviously, it is too difficult to have the flexibility, creativity and variety in terms of language resources to present an effective and interesting lecture in a foreign language. Even academics from Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands where people's ELP is considered the best in Europe report the challenge to provide nuanced explanations of disciplinary content in English (Jensen and Thøgersen 2011; Klaassen 2008). It was understandable for the language difficulties that Vietnamese academics encountered when teaching through English. However, it also reveals that *overseas* graduation does not guarantee effective teaching in English (Cho 2012) – the handy regulation that VIU stipulated on teaching staff in EMI-based programs as mentioned earlier.

Students' ELP

Students' English competence has presented another entanglement (Le 2012; Vu and Burns 2014). With various and vague policies regulating student admission to EMI-based programs (MOET 2014; The Government of Vietnam 2008b, 2012) together with 'low' requirements set by HEIs (Duong 2009), at VIU students' ELP covered a spectrum. Simply put, AP students possessed highest competence, followed by HQP and JP students. In the observation of US professors in VIU, AP students' English was 'more than enough for academic study.' Some students could amaze the English-native academics with their English skills demonstrated through exams, which was 'even better than my American students.' In the low end was JP students who were often 'lost in translation,' and could not participate in group-discussions or answer the questions in English. As regard with HQP students, the class was rather 'mixed with different proficiency levels.'

In general, only a small number of students in EMI-based programs attained sufficient proficiency to learn in an EMI setting. The rest encountered much difficulty. Part of the reason was the institutional admission policies which required rather low ELP entry and were done through an inappropriate English test. This led to the fact that many English-incompetent students were admitted to the programs, causing tremendous challenges for both students and academics.

English Use in EMI-Based Classroom

The possession of limited proficiency by academics and students prescribed the use of English in classroom. On the part of academics, they tended to resort to translation, code-switching and code-mixing to 'translanguage' when teaching (Shohamy 2013). However, what happened in VIU classroom was:

> Not all lectures are 100% English or Vietnamese but…sometimes they teach in English, sometimes in Vietnamese. The way teachers teach is like a meal of different dishes mixed together…which is very difficult to digest. (HQP—Business Administration—Year 3)

At the individual levels, switches between local language and English in teaching could be considered as academics' strategies to enhance students' comprehension. But as shown through the student's observation in the above extract, it did not sound like a management strategy that academics took to aid students' understanding of the lecture but as the lifebuoy to make up for their own deficiency in English when teaching. Even if it meant to help students, it ended up confusing them.

As regard to students' use of English in class, both local and foreign academics noted that students were rather hesitant to use English:

> Most of them use Vietnamese in class. For example, they may ask me a question in Vietnamese, I answer in English, they ask further questions in Vietnamese, I clarify my explanation in English. Group work is always in Vietnamese but presentation is in English because they have prepared. (Vietnamese academic 13)

Even though academics encouraged students to use more English in class, it seemed that they were not comfortable doing so. The limited use of English in class and outside class by local students really upsets international students:

> Technically, I just work on my own because most groups around us have already been formed, they know their friends, so we currently form a pocket. These people know each other, we just speak in English while others speaking in Vietnamese. I don't know, I feel that I need help sometimes. That's why when I don't know something, I feel worse. Not knowing Vietnamese is a big frustration. (Foreign student 1)

> When I was in France, there was a partnership between French students and foreign students. That's why I was with Nhung, the Vietnamese student. We had to offer help and something like this… Here it is difficult. No one talked with us. I could not invite anyone to our house warming party. (Foreign student 4)

At VIU, Vietnamese was the lingua franca among students. Like many non-English-dominant contexts, such as Hong Kong (Evans and Morrison 2011), Japan (Toh 2014) and Korea (Cho 2012), Vietnamese students and academics do not have a major interest of using English with each other in their own environment because English is the foreign language rather than a second language in Vietnam. The institutionalisation of EMI was taken as a top-down policy change for academics and students. They both felt 'weird, uncomfortable, and ineffective' in English. Therefore, the use of English was very limited among Vietnamese for daily communication:

> When we have group discussions, of course, we speak in Vietnamese. If someone starts speaking in English, others will look at him/her like *Are you trying to show off?* (AP— International Business—Year 3)

Without sufficient government and institutional policies and strategies to increase the effective use of English in EMI-based programs, local academics and students stumbled upon language barrier for both academic and social functions. As illustrated through classroom happenings, it also undermined the internationalisation of students' experience of the institution.

Academics' and Students' Individual Management to Improve their ELP and Performance in EMI Programs

Academics' Strategies

Academics' action toward English management was done on two aspects: to improve their ELP for teaching and to enhance their students' comprehension and ELP. However, more often than not the goal to enhance students' proficiency through EMI is implicit in HEIs' policies (Airey 2012; Coyle et al. 2010), which does not require VIU academics to be attentive to students' language development.

Despite possessing postgraduate qualifications from EMI institutions overseas, most local academics considered the biggest challenge was to teach in a foreign language. Some expressed the wish to join an English course to improve communicative skills to handle academic teaching:

> I really want to learn a course, a kind of training to improve my daily communication in class… I often attend the lectures conducted by foreign academics to observe how they use English in class and I note down some of their expressions. But I want to attend a course. Teaching the content is easy for me but teaching in English is too difficult. Why the institution with many projects [much money] can't organise a training course like that? (Vietnamese academic 2)

As shown through the above extract, an academic tried different ways to improve her ELP through her simple management of her language skills that she needed to improve her EMI teaching. However, as individual effort was not enough to drastically change teaching quality in EMI, she demanded the type of institution's organised management. This example also questioned the policy that even when an academic found teaching in English 'too difficult' they were still eligible to teach in EMI just because of their overseas degree.

To enhance students' comprehension, academics' most useful strategy was to re-teach parts of the lecture in Vietnamese:

> I used to teach everything in English, but after the president's decision in the university conference on teaching in EMI-bases programs, I now switch to Vietnamese when students do not understand the content that I am teaching. But not much, only when they require, or when I see confusion from their facial expression. (Vietnamese academic 14)

Students reckoned that such practice was of great help for them. However, the aim to improve ELP was not attainable for students because of several reasons. First, academics' ELP was not high enough so students could not learn much English from their lecturers. Second, academics' teaching approach did not include the objective to improve students' English, such as:

Do you pay attention to students' English development?

I think students have English courses from Year 1 to Year 4. Each teacher is responsible for one aspect in the courses that they teach. English teachers improve students' English. My main job is to teach the disciplinary content. Of course I want them to improve their English skills by asking questions and encouraging them to answer in English, or giving them English materials. I'm teaching in English as well. So students are emerged in an English environment. (Vietnamese academic 13)

This academic did not consider her role as 'surrogate language teachers' (Toh 2014, p. 314) but a content teacher (Airey 2012). This situation was not managed properly in the absence of government and institutional regulations on EMI pedagogy. For example, when marking assignments, VIU academics tended not to comment on the language aspects of students' work because they were not trained as language teachers and they were not required to do so. There was only one exception of an academic (Vietnamese academic 16) whose background was an English teacher. As she obtained a second degree in International Business, she moved on to teach disciplinary content in EMI. Her teaching practice aimed at both getting students to understand the content and improve their English skills (e.g., she provided extra tutorials for students on how to handle book chapters, do group projects, write reports and prepare for presentations). Two more academics provided detailed guidance and feedback on students' written assignments and presentation. These instances illustrate the need for extra language and pedagogy training provided through institutional organised management for content teachers so that such practices will become the norm for all EMI academics (Klaassen 2008).

Students' Strategies

With all the obstacle of learning in EMI, students' management was to improve their ELP and how to learn best in EMI. The most common strategy was self-study and self-effort, which was mentioned by all interviewed students because 'learning in EMI required double or triple effort to understand and to retain knowledge in long term memory in English' (HQP—Finance and Banking—Year 3). For instance, to better understand the course content, most students read Vietnamese as well as English materials (e.g. textbooks), some connected with senior students for advice (on courses and programs, academics' teaching styles and ELP, future careers, etc.) and materials, some sit in VMI classes of the same content, some Googled for more explanation either in YouTube or websites. Towards the end of the semester, they searched for past exam papers to prepare themselves with the tests. In class,

students often requested their academics to re-teach parts of the lecture in Vietnamese if they felt it was important to understand these parts. Out of class, students helped each other through pair or group learning. To improve ELP, some paid for courses in language centres, some juniors organised group meetings when everyone had to speak in English. In general, they did not attribute their ELP improvement (if any) to EMI-based programs. To sum up, a student said 'We have hundreds of ways, thousands of tactics to deal with our EMI study (trăm phương, nghìn kế)' (HQP—Finance and Banking—Year 3).

What VIU students were doing to improve their ELP and learning outcomes carries some implications. First, their difficulties were not individual instances but it seemed that all EMI students found it much more demanding learning in a foreign language. Therefore, the institution should have plans to support them in improving the academic English skills they need to learn best in EMI education. Second, an institutional support system was not yet in place for these students. For instance, tutorials, consultation and English language support centres should have been available instead of students having to find information relating to their study through their grapevines (e.g. past exams should be accessible).

Institutional Language Management Regarding Academics and Students' ELP

In this section, the type of language management provided by the institution will be scrutinised, including the management for academics' and students' ELP development and language use in EMI-based classroom.

Institutional Language Management for EMI Academics

In most Vietnamese HEIs additional training is not available to the academics even though empirical evidence has revealed the lack of Vietnamese academics equipped with both disciplinary knowledge and ELP to teach in EMI-based programs (Duong 2009). At VIU, additional English training had once been offered through British Council but it failed to attract academics because of two reasons. First, the content they provided was general English skills, for example, presentation skills or English grammar while what the academics needed was to accommodate their EMI teaching and communicating with students (Freeman et al. 2015). The course was offered without needs analysis or consulting the type of English skills that the academics wanted to improve their work. Second, given the dense teaching timetable that academics had to handle at VIU, it was too difficult for them to arrange extra time travelling to British Council. The course was finally abandoned.

There were two other activities at VIU that were considered professional development for EMI academics. First, as some of the core courses of APs were taught by US professors from partner institutions, Vietnamese academics could come and observe these lecturers to learn not only the subject matter but also teaching approaches from a Western academic perspective. Second, with the government funding for APs, VIU could send some of its academics to US partner institutions to audit some of the courses of their discipline. The purpose was for the local academic to be emerged in the English-speaking environment to refresh their English skills and to mingle with foreign colleagues. In general, these activities were appreciated by local academics but these opportunities were only limited to a certain number of staff.

Institutional Language Management for EMI Students

Before analysing the language management intended for students, it is necessary to note that even though VIU made students' ELP development as one of the dual goals of EMI-based programs, reality of practice showed that VIU took it as the by-product of students' studying in EMI rather than a strategic process. In particular, executives at VIU asserted that when students studied in one of EMI programs, they would 'naturally' become fluent speakers of English without academics' specific attention to language aspects. Therefore, VIU academics were not required or trained to attend students' ELP development and it was the responsibility of English teachers as revealed in the previous sections. This belief is also common for academics in other contexts such as in a Sweden university (Airey 2012). In addition, there was not a connection between English faculty and disciplinary faculties when EMI-based programs were developed at VIU. For example:

> I'm not happy with the current English curriculum for JPs because my students' ELP is low. Now I'm in charge of revising JP English curriculum. Problems arose because the curriculum developer [from English Faculty] did not teach in JPs so she couldn't know what English skills that JP students need. I teach JP students so I know [their English weaknesses]. I will include the feedbacks of academics and students into the new English curriculum. My colleagues from Hanoi University, College of Foreign Languages will help comment on the content. (Executive 11)

This executive officer was also an academic and she had a sharp observation of the English curriculum for JP. Her demand was not unreasonable with academics' and students' needs analysis and feedback to incorporate into the revised curriculum. What was regrettable was her distrust of the English Faculty which should have been in charge of the English-subject curriculum to support EMI students' language needs.

As a consequence of the disconnection between English and academic faculties, the English courses available at VIU for EMI-based programs were not appropriate. For HQPs, English teachers continued to use their current syllabus to teach for both VMI and EMI programs. For example, EMI students learned with package business

English books published by MacMillan or Pearson. In these courses, students learnt business content like marketing, organisation and leadership and practised generic English skills for job application and for the potential workplace such as interviews, presentation, telephone, negotiation and correspondences. In addition, students were taught academic writing and presentation skills. A more recent change was a shift to the teaching of IELTS, focusing only on reading and listening. Both students and academics found this change inappropriate because it did not train students with necessary skills for academic learning.

For APs, students were provided with training in academic English skills of reading, writing, listening and note taking. The fact was that many AP students were ready to study the content in English. Therefore, students recommended that English courses should be provided on demand basis in APs, that is only for those in need.

For one JP, the vice director of the centre had the initiative to invite academics with language background to teach academic course in English (e.g. the case of Vietnamese academic 16 mentioned in previous section). In addition, they had a clear direction that in the first year, students would learn the introductory courses in English and academics would use very simple language to teach the course. The main purpose was to get students understand the content, and at the same time develop basic vocabulary of the discipline. The level of complexity would increase in the coming years. The problem of this approach was that many JP students did not even have the basic ELP to deal with the most basic disciplinary learning. In the other JP, students learnt English in the first year and moved on to the academic majors in the second year. The interview extract provided at the beginning of this section was about the ineffective English-subject curriculum of this JP. Students in these programs also said that they did not have the direction in learning English throughout Year 1 and recommended to integrate some disciplinary learning their first year of university.

The diverse pictures of English-subject curriculum for different EMI-based programs at VIU revealed that cooperation between English and disciplinary faculties was needed to devise appropriate English-support programs for EMI students. English support for students should have been provided in a systematic manner after the screening results for first year students. This could be done through needs analysis surveys, interviews and informal communication between students, academics, and administrative staff in the institution.

Concluding Discussion

The chapter is about the mandate of EMI in a Vietnamese HEI for the purpose of quality improvement and internationalisation. Through EMI, the institution could link up with overseas partners to enhance academic-student-program mobility and to upgrade its position in local as well as regional and probably international HE. In this process, ELP of academics and students played a crucial role as it posed direct impacts on teaching and learning outcomes and the internationalisation of HE at the

classroom level. Therefore, it was expected that the institution had thorough preparation in terms of human resources and approaches to implement EMI. However, realities of practice revealed that the institution only took EMI as the measure to achieve its goals without a strategic language management for academics and students. That reflected the comment that internationalisation activities at Vietnamese HEIs are still 'fragmented, inconsistent and ad hoc' (Tran et al. 2014a, b, p. 128).

Using LMT (Jernudd and Neustupný 1987) as the framework of analysis, the study revealed that EMI in Vietnam HE was mandated in a top-down manner without institution's structured management. The reality of insufficient ELP of academics and students as illustrated through the case study at VIU was not a simple deviation from language norms in communication (Nekvapil 2009) but a systematic deficiency in language competence for academic functions, which demanded organised attention from the institution as well as national level of policy formulation. In particular, when the policy of allowing a foreign language to be the MOI was effective (National Assembly of Vietnam 2012, Article 10) regulations and resources should have been provisioned for personnel development, i.e. teacher training and English support for students for EMI programs. Instead, what was actually done was the encouragement that Vietnamese HEIs to mandate EMI and establish linkage with overseas institutions (N. H. Nguyen 2010). How HEIs have undertaken EMI initiatives depended on their own resources and development agenda. Macro and meso levels of policy formulation should pay attention to what is going on in classroom to empower the academics and students rather than cripple their activities. An academic at VIU bluntly stated:

> Obviously the biggest difficulty in EMI-based programs is language barrier. When I teach in English I have the difficulty of speaking in English. When students listen to my teaching, they have difficulty listening to my lecture. So actually students encounter double difficulties learning in EMI. (Vietnamese academic 7)

The academics' struggle of using English in teaching topped up the difficulty for their students, a scenario that has been considered by Hughes (2008). Therefore, institutions and government have to support academics and students in reducing these language difficulties and increasing the quality of their academic performance. Specifically, as found in this study, disciplinary lecturers need to be equipped with both English-for-teaching proficiency (Freeman et al. 2015) and language-teaching skills (Toh 2014; Wilkinson 2013) to perform well in EMI class and to contribute to the goal of developing students' ELP. English teachers and disciplinary lecturers can work together to improve each other's work: English teachers share English-teaching experiences while disciplinary lecturers can comment on the English-subject curriculum to make it more relevant to EMI students. Collaboration between local and foreign academics should be continued. Seminar and workshop should be organised for all academics to share their difficulties and experience. For the students, it is found that only those with good ELP can learn well in EMI programs (Joe and Lee 2013). Therefore, it is suggested that EMI programs should require students to have high ELP, for example, level C in CEFR (Unterberger 2012). Therefore, in the context of Vietnam, HEIs should review their screening policy and

abandon the use of TOEIC test as the language entry test. In addition, more relevant English-subject curriculum should be in place.

Along with globalisation and internationalisation, English is going to be mandated in increasing number of HEIs worldwide (Doiz et al. 2013). In the same vein, Vietnam is going to see a rise rather than a fall in the number of EMI-based programs in HEIs. In this mission, Vietnam HE has some potential with Vietnamese academics well-equipped with both disciplinary knowledge and English:

> The [Vietnamese] professor I have for [course name] …, his English is very clear. He keeps saying pretty slow, very clear, not talk too fast so if there's a kind of pronunciation that I don't understand then I can understand through the context because he keeps paraphrasing so I can fill in the blanks. He can also add more humour to class than other Vietnamese professors. So I like that. (Foreign student 2)

and students with high proficiency:

> Every day, every week, I've been quite impressed. They write in some way even better than my American students. They write quite well. There're a few of them you can see they're struggling but most are good at writing. (Foreign academic 4)

What is needed is institutions' organised language management, attending academics and students' language needs to support their teaching and learning in the new language environment. Of course it is always easier said than done but if such manner of management does not start now the issues mentioned will continue to problematise academics, students and the internationalisation of Vietnamese HE in the future.

References

Airey, J. (2012). I don't teach language: The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden. *AILA Review, 25*(1), 64–79. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.05air.

Ali, N. L. (2013). *Language policy and planning in Malaysia: Managing English-medium instruction at tertiary level.* (PhD thesis, The School of Education, The University of Queensland, Brisbane). Retrieved from http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:290728

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalisation of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3–4), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542.

Cho, J. (2012). Campus in English or campus in shock? *English Today, 28*(02), 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841200020X.

Cots, J. M. (2013). Introducing English-medium instruction at the University of Lleida, Spain: Intervention, beliefs and practices. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instrucion at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 106–127). Canada: Multilingual Matters.

Council of Europe. (2014). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR). Retrieved 15 April, 2014, from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre1_en.asp

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dang, T. K. A., Nguyen, T. M. H., & Le, T. T. T. (2013). The impacts of globalisation on EFL teacher education through English as a medium of instruction: An example from Vietnam. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14*(1), 52–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.780321.

Dimova, S., Hultgren, A. K., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). (2015). *English-medium instruction in European higher education*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

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

Duong, T. H. H. (2009). *The modernization of the national higher education of Vietnam, 1990s – present: American universities - a resource and recourse*. New York: St. John's University. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED513277.

ETS. (2014a). English testing system (ETS) - TOEFL. Retrieved 22 April, 2014, from http://www.ets.org/toefl?WT.ac=toeflhome_faq_121127

ETS. (2014b). English testing system (ETS) - TOEIC. Retrieved 15 April, 2014, from https://www.ets.org/toeic

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). The student experience of English-medium higher education in Hong Kong. *Language and Education, 25*(2), 147–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.553287.

Freeman, D., Katz, A., Gomez, P. G., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 69*(2), 129–139. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074.

General Secretary. (2013). Resolution No. 29/2013-NQ/TW on "Fundamental and comprehensive innovation in education, serving industrialisation and modernization in a socialist-oriented market economy during international integration" ratified in the 8th Central Committee Plenum. Hanoi: Communist Party of Vietnam.

Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, T. M. H., & Baldauf, R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.792130.

Harman, G., Hayden, M., & Pham, T. N. (2010). Higher education in Vietnam: Reform, challenges and priorities. In G. Harman, M. Hayden, & T. N. Pham (Eds.), *Reforming higher education in Vietnam: Challenges and priorities* (Vol. 29, pp. 1–14). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hu, G., & McKay, S. L. (2012). English language education in East Asia: Some recent developments. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(4), 345–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661434.

Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education and language policy: Questions of quality and equity. *Higher education Management and policy, 20*(1), 111–128.

IELTS. (2009–2012). The world speaks IELTS. Retrieved 30 August, 2012, from http://www.ielts.org/

Jensen, C., & Thøgersen, J. (2011). Danish university lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Ibérica, 22*(22), 13–33.

Jernudd, B. H., & Neustupný, J. V. (1987). *Language planning: For whom?* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the International Colloquium on language Planning, Québec.

Joe, Y., & Lee, H.-K. (2013). Does English-medium instruction benefit students in EFL contexts? A case study of medical students in Korea. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 22*(2), 201–207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-012-0003-7.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2005). Editing contributed scholarly articles from a language management perspective. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14(1), 47–62. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.01.001.

Klaassen, R. G. (2008). Preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Realising content and language integration in higher education* (pp. 32–42). Maastricht: Maastricht University Language Centre.

Le, D. M. (2012). English as a medium of instruction at tertiary education system in Vietnam. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(2), 97–122.

Marginson, S., Kaur, S., & Sawir, E. (2011). Regional dynamism and inequality. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawir (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific* (Vol. 36, pp. 433–461). Netherlands: Springer.

Marriott, H. (2015). The management of academic discourse acquisition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2015*(232), 103–119. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2014-0044.

McKay, S. L. (2014). Commentary: English-medium education in the global society – Findings and implications. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 52*(2), 221–228. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2014-0010.

MOET. (2014). *Circular No. 23/2014/TT-BGDĐT on "regulations on high-quality programs in universities"*. Hanoi: Ministry of Education and Training (MOET).

National Assembly of Vietnam. (2012). *Higher education law*. Hanoi: Vietnam National Assembly.

Nekvapil, J. (2009). The integrative potential of language management theory. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (Eds.), *Language management in contact situations: Perspectives from three continents* (pp. 1–14). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Nekvapil, J., & Sherman, T. (2015). An introduction: Language management theory in language policy and planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2015*(232), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2014-0039.

Nguyen, T. A. (2009). *The internationalisation of higher education in Vietnam: National policies and institutional implementation at Vietnam National University*. Hanoi: Waseda University Global COE Program, Global Institute for Asian Regional Integration.

Nguyen, N. H. (2010, 15 September). Innovation in English language education in Vietnam: Challenges, opportunities and solutions. Paper presented at the English for All - International Conference in TESOL, Hue, Vietnam.

Nguyen, G., & Shillabeer, A. (2013). Issues in transnational higher education regulation in Vietnam. In P. Mandal (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Managing the Asian Century* (pp. 637–644). Singapore: Springer.

Saarinen, T., & Nikula, T. (2013). Implicit policy, invisible language: Policies and practices of international degree programmes in Finnish higher education. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 131–150). Canada: Multilingual Matters.

Shohamy, E. (2013). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196–210). Canada: Multilingual Matters.

Taguchi, N. (2014). English-medium education in the global society. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 52*(2), 89–98. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2014-0004.

The Government of Vietnam. (2008a). Decision No. 1400/QD-TTg on "Teaching and learning foreign languages in the national education system, period 2008–2020". Hanoi: The Government.

The Government of Vietnam. (2008b). Decision No. 1505/QD-TTg on "The introduction of advanced programs in some Vietnamese universities in the period of 2008–2015". Hanoi: The Government.

The Government of Vietnam. (2012). Decree no. In *73/2012/ND-CP on "foreign cooperation and investment in education"*. Hanoi: The Government.

Toh, G. (2014). English for content instruction in a Japanese higher education setting: Examining challenges, contradictions and anomalies. *Language and Education, 28*(4), 299–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2013.857348.

Tran, L., Marginson, S., Do, H., Do, Q., Le, T., Nguyen, N., Vu, T., Pham, T., & Nguyen, H. (2014a). *Higher education in Vietnam: Flexibility, mobility and practicality in the global knowledge economy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tran, L., Marginson, S., & Nguyen, N. (2014b). Internationalisation. In L. Tran, S. Marginson, H. Do, Q. Do, T. Le, N. Nguyen, T. Vu, T. Pham, & H. Nguyen (Eds.), *Higher education in Vietnam: Flexibility, mobility and practicality in the global knowledge economy* (pp. 127–151). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Unterberger, B. (2012). English-medium programmes at Austrian business faculties: A status quo survey on national trends and a case study on programme design and delivery. *AILA Review, 25*(1), 80–100. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.06unt.

Vietnam International Education Department. (2015, 10/06/2015). List of approved joint education programs. Retrieved 19 January, 2016, from https://vied.vn/images/lien_ket_dao_tao/LKDT%202015%209.6.15.pdf

Vu, T. T. N., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese tertiary lecturers. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 11*(3), 1–31.

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