



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Spotlights on 'practiced' language policy in the internationalised university

Citation for published version:

Chen, Q & Bonacina-Pugh, F 2021, Spotlights on 'practiced' language policy in the internationalised university. in D Dippold & M Heron (eds), *Meaningful Teaching Interaction at the Internationalised University: Moving From Research to Impact*. 1 edn, Routledge, London.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429329692>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.4324/9780429329692](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429329692)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Meaningful Teaching Interaction at the Internationalised University

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in Meaningful Teaching Interaction at the Internationalised University: Moving From Research to Impact on 10 May 2021, available online:
<https://www.routledge.com/Meaningful-Teaching-Interaction-at-the-Internationalised-University-Moving/Dippold-Heron/p/book/9780367350888>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Dippold, D. and Heron, M. (Eds.). 2021. *Meaningful Teaching Interaction at the Internationalised University: From Research to Impact*. Routledge: New York.

Chapter 9:

Spotlights on ‘practiced’ language policy in the internationalised university

Qi Chen

Florence Bonacina-Pugh

Keywords for index:

Practiced language policy, language policy, multilingualism, language choice, participation framework(s), conversation analysis (CA)

Introduction

With a view to responding to globalisation and transnational mobility, Higher Educational Institutions (HEI) are devising a set of internationalisation strategies. At the level of discourses, the internationalisation of HEI often consists of “the integration of an international or intercultural dimension into the tripartite mission of teaching, research and service functions of Higher Education” (Maringe & Foskett, 2010, p. 1). In practice however, it is often thought that HEIs pay lip service toward their strategic undertakings of internationalisation (De Vita & Case, 2003). Internationalisation is often reduced to a few changes such as the introduction of English as a medium of instruction, a high international student and staff ratio, exchange programmes and international partnerships, and new courses with ‘global’ or ‘international’ in their titles (De Wit, 2011; Warwick, 2014). Similarly, in the UK, large-scale surveys (e.g. Koutsantoni, 2006; Maringe, 2008) reveal that internationalisation strategies in HEIs predominantly focus on recruiting fee-paying international students, without engaging in the necessary changes to include the cultural and linguistic diversity brought about by international staff and students. One key aspect of HEIs that needs to be considered in relation to internationalisation processes is language policy. Our study addresses this by looking at language policy at the level of practices (Spolsky, 2004, Bonacina-Pugh, 2012, 2020), that is, the language policies university staff and students orient to in their language practices. More specifically, we conducted the study in a chosen HEI in the under-represented context of

Anglophone countries. In non-Anglophone countries, many international HEIs have changed their language policy to adopt English as a medium of instruction (e.g. Jenkins, 2014). In Anglophone countries such as the UK, the situation is different because a somewhat ‘default’ English monolingual environment is usually taken for granted in HEIs (Liddicoat, 2016). Given that HEIs in Anglophone countries rarely have ‘declared’ language policies (Shohamy, 2006), English continues therefore to be the assumed medium of instruction, perpetuating an English monolingual ethos (see also Preece & Martin, 2009). In this sense, internationalisation processes in HEIs in Anglophone countries rarely lead to apparent changes of language policy at the macro-level of texts and discourses. However, little is known as to whether staff and students abide to the surrounding English monolingual discourses or whether they adopt a more inclusive ‘practiced’ language policy (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012, 2020), where languages other than English become visible and legitimate. In this chapter, we address this exact issue and put the spotlights on the ‘practiced’ language policy adopted in two post-graduate programmes, attended by a high number of international staff and students in a Russell Group university in the UK. We first briefly review research to-date on the topic of language policy and multilingualism in HEIs in both non-Anglophone and Anglophone settings, and introduce the notion of ‘practiced’ language policy. The setting of our study and the methodological approach adopted, namely, Conversation Analysis, are then discussed. A Conversation Analysis of a corpus of interactions audio-recorded in two university workshops shows how the ‘practiced’ language policy adopted by staff and students in their daily teaching and learning activities reflects internationalisation processes.

Language policy, multilingualism and the internationalisation of Higher-Education

Issues of language policy and multilingualism in relation to the internationalisation of HEIs *in non-Anglophone countries* have been the object of many previous studies (e.g. Soler & Gallego-Balsà, 2019). Some researchers have expressed, for instance, concerns over the danger of ‘domain loss’ of national languages due to the introduction of English as a medium of instruction in HEIs in European countries such as Norway and Sweden (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Ljosland, 2007). Others have reported students’ and staffs’ conflicting views on the use of English as a medium of instruction in HEIs in East Asian countries such as Japan (Hashimoto, 2013; Higgins & Brady, 2016) and China (Galloway, Kriukow, & Numajiri, 2017).

Issues of language policy and multilingualism in HEIs *in Anglophone countries* have also been the focus of a few studies, but not often in relation to internationalisation processes. Liddicoat (2016) and Preece and Phan (2016), for instance, have highlighted the need for language policies in HEIs in Anglophone countries to value multilingualism as a resource. Preece (2010, 2019) has further shown how linguistic diversity in Anglophone HEIs stratifies students with an elite/non-elite binary according to social class. Others have illustrated how to protect and revitalise heritage languages such as Gaelic and Welsh in British HEIs (McPake, Tinsley & James, 2007), or how the marginalisation of languages other than English shapes students' and staff's transnational ethnic identities (Li & Zhu, 2013). The articulation of the three issues of multilingualism, the internationalisation of HEIs and language policy has, however, rarely been taken up in Anglophone contexts. This is probably because internationalisation is not seen as affecting language policies in Anglophone contexts in the same way as it is affecting language policies in non-Anglophone contexts where HEIs often adopt a new language policy, namely English as a medium of instruction. This chapter argues that even if there may be no salient changes at the level of language policy texts and discourses in HEIs in Anglophone countries, the 'practiced' language policy that staff and students orient to whilst engaging in an international teaching and learning environment is changing.

The notion of 'practiced' language policy was originally developed by Bonacina-Pugh (2012) and refers to the idea that language policy can be conceptualised 'as practice'. Practices are often studied in language policy research to see the extent to which language policies found at the levels of 'texts' and 'discourses' are implemented or resisted in practice (this is language policy *in practice*). Building on Spolsky's (2004) idea that there is a language policy at the level of practices, Bonacina-Pugh proposed to investigate practices to identify not so much whether a top-down language policy was implemented or not, but rather to see what actual language policy speakers have devised in practice. The notion of 'practiced' language policy posits that speakers refer to a set of interactional norms of language choice to interpret and produce their language choice acts, or in other words, to know when a particular language is appropriate or not. It is this set of norms of language choice that influences speakers' language choice acts, and which can therefore be considered as policy (this is language policy *as practice*). This set of interactional norms of language choice is dynamic and continuously negotiated by interactants.

Data set and methods

This study is part of a larger project (see also Bonacina-Pugh, Barakos and Chen, 2020) that aims to investigate whether internationalisation processes of HEIs in Anglophone countries have an impact on these HEIs' language policies. Whilst it may appear at first sight that the language policies of HEIs in Anglophone countries have not changed because no new language policies have been put in place as a result of internationalisation (unlike in non-Anglophone countries where HEIs have explicitly changed their language policy to adopt English as a medium of instruction), we argue that the 'practiced' language policy adopted by staff and students is responsive to the changing linguistic and cultural landscape of HEIs generated by internationalisation. This larger project includes the study of language policy as 'texts', 'discourses' and 'practices' – as conceptualised by Bonacina-Pugh (2012, building on Ball's 1993 notions of policy as text and discourse) in a UK HEI. It includes a corpus of language policy texts and discourses, as well as a corpus of audio-recordings of classroom talk. The present chapter focuses on the latter corpus only and sheds light on the 'practiced' language policy that staff and students orient to in their teaching and learning activities.

This study was conducted in the academic year 2017-2018 in a Russell Group University in the UK portrayed as a 'global' and 'one of the most international' universities on its website, with a quarter of its student population and three tenths of its staff population being from overseas. We focused on two taught Masters programmes in the field of Language Education that recruited a total of 170 students, including 140 students from overseas. Data was collected during one course in Semester 2 that was attended by 40 students. Two groups of students were audio-recorded during their pre-workshop (without the tutor) and workshop activities (with the tutor) for a total of 12 hours over a period of eight weeks. Group 1 consisted of three Chinese students, one Taiwanese student, and one Mexican student. Group 2 consisted of one Singaporean student, one Taiwanese student, and four Chinese students. Together with the French and English bilingual tutor, these groups presented a linguistic repertoire that included English, Mandarin-Chinese, varieties of Chinese (such as Singaporean Hokkien, and Taiwanese Hokkien), Spanish and French. In Group 1, students only had English as a shared language, whereas in Group 2, students shared English as well as Mandarin-Chinese.

As previously argued (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012), Conversation Analysis (CA) has proven to be a useful methodological tool and theoretical lens to identify 'practiced' language policies. To put

it briefly, Spolsky and Shohamy (2000, p. 9) have shown how the language policy found at the level of practices consists of a set of “descriptive and explanatory rules” that can be deduced from the observation of a speech community’s “habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire”. To rephrase in Conversation Analytic terms, the language policy found at the level of practices consists of a set of interactional *norms* that can be deduced from the observation of a speech community’s language choice *practices*. This set of language choice norms is what constitutes a ‘practiced’ language policy. These language choice norms are best identified by adopting an emic perspective to interaction, that is, by “studying behaviors as from inside the system” (Pike, 1967: 37). In our case, this means focusing on speakers’ reactions to particular language choice acts. Any repair or translation sequences, for instance, would indicate that a particular language choice act is seen as deviant, which in turn points to what speakers would have considered as normative. In this sense, deviant cases analyses (e.g. ten Have, 2007) are helpful to uncover the implicit norms of language choice, that is, the ‘practiced’ language policy.

We use the term *medium of classroom interaction* to describe the “ ‘linguistic code’ that classroom participants actually orient-to while talking” (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011, pp. 330–331; see also Torras & Gafaranga, 2002), and the sub-categories of *monolingual medium*, *bilingual medium* (including *the mixed mode*, *the parallel mode* and *the half-way between mode*) to describe the language choice acts observed in our corpus. Investigating the ‘practiced’ language policy in the two workshops under study involves understanding the norms of language choice that participants orient to when choosing a medium of classroom of interaction.

Another CA concept that proved to be helpful in the analysis of the ‘practiced’ language policy in our corpus is that of ‘participation framework’ (Goodwin, 2007a). We understand ‘participation’ here as being a ‘communion of mutual engagement’ (Goffman 1957), that is, when people engage in conversations, they also engage in the enterprises of maintaining shared attention and achieving mutual understanding with one another. Therefore, people in a multilingual speech community can draw upon multilingual resources in constructing such enterprises. Further, from a CA-perspective, participation is a matter of participants’ situated actions that are “temporally unfolding” on a moment-by-moment basis (Goodwin, 2007b, p. 12). During this process, participants “demonstrate to each other their ongoing understanding of the events they are engaged in by building actions that contribute to the further progression of these very same events” (Goodwin, 2007b, p. 12). A turn-by-turn CA analysis enables us to

look into this temporally unfolding process by examining how participants (re)negotiate and reconfigure their engagement with on-going *participation frameworks*. As we shall see in the analysis of our data below, the notion of ‘participation framework’ is closely intertwined with the way in which the classroom participants under study manage the ‘practiced’ language policy at hand.

In brief, an ethnomethodological CA approach enables us to not only unravel a locally-operated ‘practiced’ language policy, but also to unpack the nuances of how such a practiced language policy is negotiated, mutually-understood and operated by conversational participants. Data was thus transcribed following the Jeffersonian conventions (Jefferson, 2004) in the ethnomethodological CA tradition (see full set of transcription conventions in Appendix). To ensure intelligibility, we adopted a two-line transcription with the second-line-English-translation vertically aligned to the first-line-original-Mandarin, and closely representing the original Mandarin word order with syntactic annotations (i.e., provided in brackets) (cf. Hepburn & Bolden, 2013).

The ‘practiced’ language policy in two university workshops

We now present four cases, two from each group¹, to show the ways in which the internationalisation of this HEI has shaped the ‘practiced’ language policy oriented to by classroom participants in both teacher-led and peer-led participation frameworks. Especially, we aim to show how this ‘practiced’ language policy is mutually-understood, jointly-interpreted and collaboratively operated through an interplay between shifts of participation frameworks and switch of medium on a moment-by-moment basis.

The first case below in *Extract 1* shows an episode of interaction in a teacher-led participation framework during a workshop session (with the tutor). English is the shared language between the teacher and students, and French and Mandarin are in their linguistic repertoire. Prior to this extract, the teacher asked S2 to describe the online resource she found earlier, which is to be used as a language learning tool (with the use of cartoons, games and songs). In this extract, S2 presents her tool to the teacher.

¹ Not all students in the groups are talking in every extract.

Extract 1 – Group 1 - “It’s like a karaoke.”

- T: English and French bilingual teacher
- S2: Mandarin and English bilingual student

1 S2: (.) and there is all those different kinds of
2 (.) uhh (.) theme songs
3 (.) and short video clips and games
4 (.)
5 T: uhuh=
6 S2: =from the (.) famous (.) [cartoon] characters
7 T: [characters]
8 T: [uhm]
9 S2: [like] peppa pig (.) like dora and whatever=
10 T: =mhm=
11 S2: =and then you can click on each of the games and songs
12 (.)
13 T: u[hm]
-->14 S2: [and] someti- and there is- (.) uh- uh- the-the-the
15 (.) there is a (.) sing along (.) uh- function?
16 (.)
17 T: [mhm]
18 S2: [for the] theme song (.) so they can read
-->19 (.) the- (.) uh the words?
-->20 (.) it’s like a karaoke (.)
-->21 T: ahhhhh okay so (.)
22 that’s to develop what of the four skills I asked=

Here, in lines 1-11, S2 is describing the design of this online resource to the teacher, who, at times, responds with ‘continuers’ (e.g., ‘uhuh’, ‘mhm’) (Gardner, 2001). In line 14, S2 starts a ‘searching for a word’ act (Hayashi, Raymond & Sidnell, 2013). She first displays uncertainties and hesitations with restarts (‘and someti- and there is-’, ‘there is a’) and repetitions (‘uh-uh-’, ‘the-the-the’) in formulating the sentence ‘there is a (.) sing along (.) uh-function?’, which ends with a rising intonation that further shows uncertainty of her word-choice here. She then extends her turn in line 18-19 with a further word search on ‘the words?’, for which she possibly means ‘lyrics of the songs’. She finally reaches the searched-for item in line 20, ‘it’s like a karaoke’, therefore establishing mutual understanding with the teacher responding ‘ahhhhh okay’. In this word search, it is interesting to see that S2 sticks to the use of English as a monolingual “medium of classroom interaction” (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011). Despite her difficulties finding the missing word, she does not draw on her Mandarin repertoire nor solicits assistance from her Mandarin-speaking peers. This case therefore indicates S2’s orientation to a ‘practiced’ language policy according to which the shared language (e.g., English) is to be adopted as *medium of classroom interaction* here in a teacher-led participation framework.

We now look at a case of a peer-led participation framework during a pre-workshop session (without the tutor), with a view to see whether the norm(s) of language choice that students orient to in that framework are the same as in the teacher-led one described above. *Extract 2*

below shows interactions among Group 2, a linguistically homogeneous group where all students share English and Mandarin. Here, the two students are talking about the children books they brought in class with them for one of the workshop activities.

Extract 2 – Group 2 – “So this is your own book?”

- S1, S2: English and Mandarin bilingual students

1 S1: ()小孩子的书就 ()一大堆 (.) 哈哈哈哈哈
children books lots of them hahahaha
 2 S2: hahahaha
 3 S1: 我拿几个不同类型的=
I took various types
 -->4 S2: =so- (.) so this i[s your own book?
 5 S1: [拿过来借一下
(I) borrowed them
 6 (.)
 -->7 S1: [呢 (.) 有些是借
uh some of them are borrowed
 8 S2: [or how do you-
 9 S1: (.) 有些是 (.) 自己的
some of them are my own

As can be seen, S1 consistently uses Mandarin (lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 9) while S2 consistently uses English (lines 2, 4, 6, 8). We can see that their talk-in-interaction is conducted smoothly without any signs of repair or needs for translation; neither the use of Mandarin nor the use of English is oriented to as being problematic or deviant by students. Therefore, it can be told that a *parallel mode of the bilingual medium of classroom interaction* is adopted here (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011), where each speaker uses their preferred language. Thus both S1 and S2 seem to orient to a local norm of language choice according to which the shared preferred language(s) can be used in peer-led participation frameworks.

So far, we have seen how the ‘practiced’ language policy in the two workshops under study consists of the following norm of language choice: when there is a shared language(s) among participants, that language(s) is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction. In the next two cases, we show the importance of participation frameworks in agreeing on a shared preferred language(s). *Extract 3* below is also a case in Group 2, however in a teacher-led participation framework during the workshop session (with the tutor). All students in Group 2 share English and Mandarin in their repertoire. In this extract, the teacher is explaining to students that the game ‘scrabble’ could be a useful language learning tool.

Extract 3 – Group 2 – “Does it have a Chinese equivalent?”

- T: English and French bilingual teacher
- S3, S4, S5: English and Mandarin bilingual students

1 T: scrabble (.) yeah (.) it's a good game
 ((a few lines omitted))
 -->13 T: does it have a Chinese equivalent?
 14 (.)
 15 T: a name
 -->16 S3: °yeah°
 17 (.)
 18 S3: °so-° (.) °um°
 19 (.)
 -->20 S5: [°拼字游戏吗?°
 (is it) word puzzle game
 21 S3: [°我每天都玩这个游戏°=
 I everyday play this game
 22 S4: =°怪不得°
 no wonder

In lines 13-15, the teacher conducts a 'translation quest' (Bonacina-Pugh, 2013) and asks students whether there is a Mandarin equivalent to the English 'scrabble'. In doing so, the teacher legitimises the use of Mandarin in a teacher-led participation framework despite the fact that Mandarin is not in her linguistic repertoire (see also Bonacina-Pugh, 2020 for more detail on how 'practiced' language policies legitimise multilingual classroom talk). Interestingly, however, this invitation to use a language other than English is not taken upon by the Mandarin-speaking students in the class, who prefer to switch to a peer-led participation framework to use Mandarin. This is evidenced by the fact that S3's response in line 16 is in English and shows hesitation markers such as pauses, self-interruptions and a soft voice (°yeah° (.) °so-° (.) °um°). In line 20, S5 switches to Mandarin and offers a candidate answer for a translation of 'scrabble' in Mandarin (°拼字游戏吗°(is it) word puzzle game). In the meantime, S3 also switches to Mandarin, commenting on his experience of playing this game, and is responded to by S4 in Mandarin (lines 21-22). Here, S5, S3 and S4's turns-at-talk show that in responding to the teacher's translation quest, they progressively move away from the teacher-led participation framework to talk among themselves, at which point Mandarin is used. This extract therefore confirms that students seem to orient to a norm of language choice according to which 'only the shared language can be adopted as *medium of classroom interaction*'. Since Mandarin is not shared by the teacher, they feel it cannot be used in a teacher-led participation framework. For that reason, they respond to the teacher's invitation to use Mandarin by switching to a peer-led participation framework. It further shows that despite the teacher's invitation to use a language other than the shared language (i.e. English) in a teacher-led framework, it is not taken upon by students. In this extract, students uphold the teacher-led participation framework as a monolingual space and prefer switching to a peer-led participation framework to use Mandarin.

Similarly, *Extract 4* below shows how a request for explanation conducted by a student initiates a (re)negotiation of the medium through a shift of participation framework. As can be seen, talk is conducted within a linguistically heterogeneous group in a peer-led participation framework in a pre-workshop session (without the tutor), in which S1, S2, S4 and S5 are Mandarin-speaking students, and S3 is a Spanish-speaking student, which means English is the only shared language.

Extract 4 – Group 1 – “How do you describe it?”

- S1, 2, 4, 5: Mandarin and English bilingual students
- S3: Spanish and English bilingual student

```

1  S3: so (0.2) do you know what 'tracing' is right=
2  S2: =yeah=
3  S3: =yeah so (0.2) it gives you different worksheets
4          (0.2) with di[fferent themes]
5  S2:          [ ohhh ]
6  S2: ohh=
7  S1: =ah[ hh]
8  S3: [for] 'tracing'
9  S3: (0.2) but I cannot open them
10         (0.3)
-->11 S5: 'tracing' 该怎么描述呢?
          how (do you) describe it
12         (0.3)
13  S2: 嗯=
          umm
14  S4: =嗯?
          um
15  S5: (.) 是- (0.3) 描
          is- (0.3) trace
16         (0.2)
17  S3: maybe I can send [it to ] your [email]=
18  S2:          [ 嗯 ]
          um
19  S4:          [ 描 ]
          trace
20  S5: =描
          trace
21  S4: [嗯]
          um
22  S2: [嗯]
          um
23         (0.5)
24  S3: a[nd you can see] it
25  S4: [ 怎么 了? ]
          what's the matter
26         (0.2)
-->27 S2: like
28         (1.7)
29  S2: learning to write with [proper gui]dance
30  S3:          [ yes ]

```

The talk starts when students are discussing the notion of ‘tracing’, and the *medium of classroom interaction* adopted here is English starting in line 1. S3 asks S2 a question in line

1, checking her understanding of ‘tracing’. S2 and S1 are verbally engaging in the discussion whereas S4 and S5 take on a more receptive role (lines 2-10). In line 11, S5 asks a question in Mandarin, ‘‘tracing’ 该怎么描述呢 (*how (do you) describe it*)’, which is clearly a request for explanation on the meaning of ‘tracing’ directed to her Mandarin-speaking peers, as well as a switch of medium from English to Mandarin. Similar to *Extract 2*, this switch of medium to Mandarin by S5 initiates a *schisming* away from the on-going participation framework. This *schisming* is evidenced by S2 and S4 soon responding to S5 in Mandarin (lines 13-14). Meanwhile, S3 builds upon her previous turn in line 9 and continues her talk in lines 17 and 24; here her talk is directed to S1, who previously responded to her talk in line 7. The *schisming* is then continued in lines 18-22, when the candidate answer for explanation for ‘tracing’, that is, ‘描(*trace*)’, is accepted by all participants. The two parallel turn-taking systems therefore continue until lines 27 and 29 when S2 switches back to English, and gives a statement of her understanding of ‘tracing’ (*learning to write with proper guidance*). This is responded to by S3 with ‘yes’ in overlap, signalling the re-establishment of shared attention and mutual understanding amongst all participants. In sum, this extract further shows the reflexive interplay between a switch of medium and a shift of participation framework. In other words, to switch medium of classroom interaction, participants often have to switch participation framework.

Conclusion

Overall, we have shown that the teacher and students adopt a ‘practiced’ language policy, that is made of the following norm: only shared language(s) can be adopted as medium of classroom interaction. When English is the only shared language amongst participants, whether in a teacher-led or a peer-led participation framework, a *monolingual English medium* is adopted (e.g., *Extracts 1, 3 and 4*). When there is more than one shared language, these languages can be adopted in a *bilingual medium* of classroom interaction. For instance, in *Extract 2*, participants used a *parallel mode of the bilingual medium* in a peer-led participation framework where each participant used their preferred language. We have also shown that the classroom participants played with that norm of language choice to suit their interactional needs. They would often initiate *schismings* from one participation framework to another, where a preferred language would become the shared (and therefore legitimate) language among participants. Moving back and forth between different participation frameworks enabled students in particular to check understanding and seek clarification in the language of their choice. These

shifts of participation frameworks meant that different languages were shared at different times in classroom talk. This, in turn, legitimised multilingual practices as they were in line with the local ‘practiced’ language policy according to which any language(s) can be used in classroom interaction as long as it is a shared language. We argue that the notion of ‘participation framework’ is useful to understand the ‘practiced’ language policy in our context. Further research is needed to see its relevance to the study of ‘practiced’ language policy in other contexts.

To conclude, this study provides valuable insights into the intersection of language policy, higher education internationalisation and multilingualism. Our findings are in line with the call for the need to value multilingualism as a resource in language policies in HEIs in Anglophone countries (Liddicoat, 2016; Preece & Phan, 2016). As discussed earlier, the taken-for-granted ‘default’ English monolingual environment is seen as a common phenomenon in HEIs in Anglophone countries such as the UK. What we have shown through our empirical data is, however, that the internationalisation of higher education is, to a certain extent, influencing language policy as practice, insofar as classroom learning is becoming increasingly more multilingual. Languages other than English were used and seen as legitimate by the teacher and students at the local level of the practiced language policy. This was specifically the case of Mandarin, where its use supported students’ learning. Languages other than English and Mandarin, however, remained largely invisible. We therefore argue that further work is needed for the multilingual repertoire of staff and students to be included and visible in internationalisation-at home strategies in UK Higher Education, in order to create more space and opportunities for teaching and learning.

List of references

- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), 10–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203>
- Bolton, K., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). English as an academic language at a Swedish university: Parallel language use and the “threat” of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(5), 429–447.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.670241>
- Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2012). Researching “practiced language policies”: Insights from

- conversation analysis. *Language Policy*, 11(3), 213–234.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-012-9243-x>
- Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2013). Multilingual label quests: A practice for the “asymmetrical” multilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 24(2), 142–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2012.12.006>
- Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2020). Legitimizing multilingual practices in the classroom: the role of the ‘practiced language policy.’ *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(4), 434–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1372359>
- Bonacina-Pugh, F., Barakos, E. and Chen, Q. (2020). Language policy in the internationalisation of Higher Education in Anglophone countries: The interplay between language policy as ‘text’, ‘discourse’ and ‘practice’. *Applied Linguistics Review*. (published online ahead of print 2020), 000010151520190148. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0148>
- Bonacina, F., & Gafaranga, J. (2011). “Medium of instruction” vs. “Medium of classroom interaction”: Language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 319–334.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.502222>
- De Vita, G., & Case, P. (2003). Rethinking the internationalisation agenda in UK higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(4), 383–398.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877032000128082>
- De Wit, H. (2011). *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education*.
- Galloway, N., Kriukow, J., & Numajiri, T. (2017). Internationalisation, higher education and the growing demand for English: an investigation into the English medium of instruction (EMI) movement in China and Japan. In *British Council ELT Research Papers* (Vol. 17).
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When Listeners Talk: Response Tokens and Listener Stance*. J. Benjamins Pub.
- Goffman, E. (1957). Alienation from Interaction. *Human Relations*, 10(1), 47–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675701000103>
- Goodwin, C. (2007a). Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507069457>
- Goodwin, C. (2007b). Interactive Footing. In E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.), *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction* (pp. 16–46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hashimoto, K. (2013). “English-only”, but not a medium-of-instruction policy: The Japanese way of internationalising education for both domestic and overseas students. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 16–33.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.789956>
- Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., & Sidnell, J. (2013). *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The Conversation Analytic Approach to Transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford, Boston: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Higgins, R. M., & Brady, A. (2016). Language policy, planning, and enactment: the necessity and empowering potential at the local level. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(3–4), 242–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1212650>
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of*

- academic English language policy*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge
- Koutsantoni, D. (2006). "Internationalisation in the UK". in Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (etd). *Leadership Summit 2006: The Leadership and Development Challenges of Globalisation and Internationalisation*.
- Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2013). Translanguaging Identities and Ideologies: Creating Transnational Space Through Flexible Multilingual Practices Amongst Chinese University Students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 516–535. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt022>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Language planning in universities: teaching, research and administration. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(3–4), 231–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1216351>
- Ljosland, R. (2007). English in Norwegian academia: A step towards diglossia? *World Englishes*, 26(4), 395–410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2007.00519.x>
- Maringe, F. (2008). 'Globalisation and internationalisation in HE', a paper presented at *the ICHM conference at University of Minho, Portugal, 1–3 April*.
- Maringe, F., & Foskett, N. (2010). *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management Perspectives* (F. Maringe & N. Foskett, eds.). London & New York: Continuum International Publishing.
- McPake, J., Tinsley, T., & James, C. (2007). Making provision for community languages: Issues for teacher education in the UK. *Language Learning Journal*, 35(1), 99–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701317705>
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Preece, S. (2010). Multilingual identities in higher education: Negotiating the "mother tongue", "posh" and "slang." *Language and Education*, 24(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780903194036>
- Preece, S. (2019). Elite bilingual identities in higher education in the Anglophone world: the stratification of linguistic diversity and reproduction of socio-economic inequalities in the multilingual student population. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(5), 404–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1543692>
- Preece, S., & Martin, P. (2009). Imagining higher education as a multilingual space. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780903343070>
- Preece, S., & Phan, L.-H. (2016). BAAL/CUP Seminar 2014: The Multilingual University: Linguistic diversity in higher education in English-dominant settings and English-medium instructional contexts. *Language Teaching*, 49(1), 141–145. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000361>
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Soler, J., & Gallego-Balsà, L. (2019). *The Sociolinguistics of Higher Education: Language Policy and Internationalisation in Catalonia*. Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B., & Shohamy, E. (2000). Language Practice, Language Ideology, and Language Policy. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 1–41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Torras, M. C., & Gafaranga, J. (2002). Social identities and language alternation in non-formal institutional bilingual talk: Trilingual service encounters in Barcelona. *Language in Society*, 31(4), 527–548.
- Warwick, P. (2014). The international business of higher education - A managerial

perspective on the internationalisation of UK universities. *International Journal of Management Education*, 12(2), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2014.02.003>

Appendix – CA transcription conventions

(.)	pause less than 0.2 second
[]	overlapping talk
=	latching utterance
()	unidentifiable talk
°talk°	softer than surrounding talk
-	cut-off talk
:	extended syllable
?	rising intonation
'talk'	quoted talk
哈哈	original talk in Mandarin-Chinese
<i>haha</i>	English translation