When English just is not enough: 'Multilingualism with English' in contemporary European higher education

Clive. W. Earls *National University of Ireland, Maynooth*

English proficiency is viewed across societal levels as a necessary commodity for accessing the best educational and professional prospects. The high value associated with English as symbolic capital may be seen to impact negatively upon the promotion of individual and societal multilingualism beyond an emergent dominant pattern of L1+English. To date, few empirical studies have been conducted into the ecology and ideologies that prevail within European English-medium degree programmes regarding English and the concomitant acquisition of additional languages. On the basis of empirical data generated from questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, this paper explores the experiences of students and lecturers within English-medium degree programmes in Germany as they negotiate their English-speaking environments and explores their practices of multilingualism beyond their L1 and English.

Keywords: English as a lingua franca, second and foreign language acquisition, language and ecology, language and education in multilingual contexts, attitudes to language

Wegen ihrer positiven Auswirkungen auf Berufs- und Bildungschancen werden Englischsprachkenntnisse in jeder Sozialschicht als notwendiges Gut aufgefasst. Der hohe Wert, der mit Englisch als symbolischem Kapital assoziiert wird, könnte eine negative Auswirkung auf die Förderung der gesellschaftlichen und individuellen Mehrsprachigkeit, d.h. Sprachkenntnisse über die dominante Form Muttersprache + Englisch hinaus, haben. Bisher sind wenige empirische Studien durchgeführt worden, die sich auf die Ökologie und Ideologien innerhalb europäischer englischsprachiger Studiengänge in Bezug auf Englisch und das gleichzeitige Erlernen von zusätzlichen Fremdsprachen konzentrieren. Aufgrund empirischer Daten, die aus Fragebögen und semistrukturierten Interviews generiert wurden, erkundet dieser Artikel die Erfahrungen von Studierenden und Dozenten in englischsprachigen Studiengängen in Deutschland. Ein Schwerpunkt dieser Untersuchung liegt auf ihrer mehrsprachigen Praxis über ihre Muttersprache und Englisch hinaus.

Schlüsselwörter: Englisch als Lingua Franca, Zweit- und Fremdsprachenerwerb, Sprache und Ökologie, Sprache und Bildung in mehrsprachigen Kontexten, Einstellungen zu Sprache.

Bridging the divide: English and multilingualism in contemporary Europe

Higher education in 21st century Europe is characterised by a range of competing internal and external agendas impelling higher education institutions (HEIs) to diversify in response to imperatives such as internationalisation and globalisation. This diversification process permeates all aspects of modern-day HEIs. Student and staff bodies are being broadened to grant access to all levels of society. HEIs are proactively recruiting and encouraging a greater number of permanent and exchange international students to pursue their degree programmes. Undergraduate and postgraduate programmes are being broadened to improve the attractiveness of institutions' programme offerings. In European countries where English is not an official or national language, this diversification process is strongly anchored in the provision of degree programmes partially or entirely in English. Such programmes provide a powerful means of redressing a competitive disadvantage that non-English-native-speaking countries suffer in the market for international students, where the US and UK are the undisputed leaders by a significant margin (Maiworm and Wächter 2008). Such moves towards an "Englishization"[1] (McArthur 1992: 335) of higher education in Europe reflect global sociolinguistic changes favouring the development of English as the most used language of international communication (De Swaan 1999, 2001; Crystal 2003, 2004; Graddol 2004) and a dominant lingua franca of science. This global linguistic arrangement has led to the emergence of an ideology in multiple scientific communities across disciplines of "publish in English or perish" (Viereck 1996: 20). HEIs in 21st-century Europe have a dual function and orientation as research and teaching institutions (Coleman 2006: 5; Gnutzmann and Bruns 2008: 9), and there is a strong correlation between economic power, English and the share of global literature (Ammon and McConnell 2002: 11–20). Consequently, with English increasingly being used as a medium of instruction and the dominant language of academic publication, English has become the language of higher education *par excellence* (Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra 2012: 1). Equally, while English's grounding as a dominant international language in prestigious domains has impelled its increasing centrality within higher education, the globalisation of higher education institutions has become one of the major drivers and reinforcers of English's global status and growth (Graddol 2006).

While English gathers pace as an important language in key higher-level domains (i.e. education, work, academia) in modern society, there are concerns that this development has undermined interest in foreign language

learning amongst English native speakers (Brumfit 2004). It is also proposed that this could also impact similarly negatively upon non-native speakers of English (Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh 2006). Equally however, a counter development is also noted where there is growing awareness that, for individuals or institutions to be successful in a globalising world, multilingual competences beyond English are increasingly necessary (Franceschini 2009: 44). This is reinforced by the European Union which continues to champion multilingualism and multiculturalism as means to safeguard an appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity across the continent. The question then arises to what extent is multilingualism reconcilable with the growth and dominance of English? Should additional languages be promoted as the preferred institutionally taught L2s for European citizens as English already enjoys such a strong draw and has sociolinguistic critical mass in contemporary Europe? (cf. Hufeisen 2003: 9) Or indeed, as there are indications that much of Western Europe is moving towards a situation of diglossia with English in multiple societal domains, can and/or should a form of additive (Blackledge and Creese 2010: 42) 'multilingualism with English' (Hoffmann 2000; Jessner 2006) be pursued? English-medium degree programmes offered at European HEIs provide a useful focal point for the exploration of how English and multilingualism can coexist and be reconciled, considering their evolution from the forces that have contributed to English's current status.

"The real meaning of globalisation [internationalisation] is [or ought to be] multilingualism" (Shohamy 2007: 132). This statement exemplifies that, while growing levels of globalisation result in an correspondingly increased use of English (Sonntag 2003: 117; Dor 2004: 97; Hüppauf 2004), English's dominance and permeation is not absolute with many other national, regional and minority languages fulfilling important functions in today's world, increasingly characterised by individual and societal multilingualism (Trudgill and Chesire 1998; Romaine 2000; Herdina and Jessner 2002). Tonkin (2003: 326) highlights that "globalization has essentially eliminated the possibility of planning for social bilingualism alone" so that a minimum of trilingualism is now needed to deal with global-local arrangements, creating a "Dominant Language Constellation" (Aronin & Ó Laoire 2004: 19) comprising minimally a home language (heritage, ethnic or minority), the official national or regional language and a language of international communication, most often English. Practices within educational institutions have the potential to influence the level of, attitudes towards and acceptance of multilingualism in society as the relationship between educational institutions and the areas it serves are bidirectional (Cenoz and Gorter 2010: 38). This explains why the EU identifies universities in particular as having a responsibility and playing a key role to play in promoting language learning and linguistic diversity (European Commission 2004: 20), and thus have the potential to make a significant contribution to the integration of multilingualism in society (Benedictus-van den Berg and Riemersma 2011:

136). Martin (2010: 3) asserts, however, that "there is a mismatch between the monolingual ethos and ideology of English-medium tertiary education and the needs and identities of multilingual students". Equally, Gnutzmann and Lipski-Buchholz (2008: 154) pose the question to what extent English-medium degree programmes can foster multilingualism alongside English.

The subsequent discussion aims to shed light on the questions raised hitherto by exploring the experiences of student and lecturers involved in English-only degree programmes, the most extreme form of English-medium degree programmes in Europe which account for 77% of all international degree programmes in Germany (DAAD 2014). Before proceeding to discuss the patterns of multilingual practices and associated rationales within the English-medium degree programmes studied, it is necessary to outline the research context and the methodology employed.

Research context and methodological framework

The data discussed herein was gathered in June 2011, employing a comparative multi-site case study research design at three German universities of applied sciences. These three universities were chosen by utilising "criterion-sampling" (Patton 2002: 238) which reduced the pool of potential study sites from 76 to 4. A number of sampling criteria were applied: the programmes must be English-only, certified by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), offered at Bachelor level, by a publicly-funded higher education institution (HEI). These criteria were chosen to improve comparability across the sites and to ensure greater representativeness of the findings. In particular, the DAAD certification was a key criterion as the DAAD has more rigorous criteria for a programme to be classified as an official English-medium degree programme (EMDP) than other monitoring organisations. Additionally, the DAAD was the organisation charged with piloting, evaluating and introducing EMDPs system-wide. Their catalogue of programmes was, therefore, deemed to be the most suitable for study. The criterion sampling process produced an unexpected outcome where each of the four degree programmes meeting the study criteria was located within the discipline of business studies. While the study of degree programmes from one discipline was not an intended aim of the research, the findings must reflect this potential limitation.

A case study was undertaken at each of the four chosen institutions, with one site being used for pre-piloting and piloting of the research instruments, and the remaining three comprising the final study which produced the data herein. Study Site 1 was located in Northern Germany and offered an array of degree programmes across disciplines ranging from the hard sciences, to IT, business studies and agriculture and forestry. The programme studied was the only DAAD-accredited English-only degree programme offered at the institution and had received multiple awards for its quality from the DAAD.

The student population within the programme studied was less heterogeneous than elsewhere, with only a limited number of international students enrolled (25%). Study Site 2 was located in Berlin and offered degree programmes in the disciplines of business studies, law, modern languages and politics. Again, the degree programme studied was the only DAAD-accredited English-only degree programme at the institution. Equally however, the university offered a large number of modules on multiple degree programmes through the medium of English, and intended to continue broadening their offering. The student body within the programme studied was highly heterogeneous with almost 50% of students enrolled being international. Study Site 3 was located in Southern Germany in a more provincial setting, and like Study Site 1 offered a large number of programmes across a wide array of disciplines from the hard sciences, IT and business studies to the humanities. The programme studied was also the only English-only degree programme at the institution. Interestingly however, this institution was reducing its provision of English-medium modules across its degree programmes from a much larger provision as their experience indicated that the English-medium was unsuitable to certain degree programmes in view of their target segments of the labour market. Student demographics at Study Site 3 with a significant proportion of international students enrolled, accounting for approximately 40% of the total matriculated student population within the English-only programme.

Having received permission from course directors to conduct the study, questionnaires were administered to students and lecturers (involved in the second and fourth semesters of study), and courses directors as the first stage of the data collection. These questionnaires were developed following both pre-piloting (focus group item generation) and piloting on representative populations. Students were administered the paper-based questionnaire during class time; this format, therefore, provided the researcher with a captive audience which produced an average response rate across study sites of 97%. Lecturers were administered a questionnaire containing a similar battery of questions tailored to that respondent audience via an online questionnaire in order to facilitate their busy schedules, and thus improve response rates, which was high at 76%. Course directors were also administered a questionnaire tailored to their perspectives via the online questionnaire format and a response rate of 100% was recorded. Questionnaires contained between 21 and 31 questions depending on the target audience and were composed of a combination of closed and open questions, including semi-open Likert items. The language of the questionnaires was English, considering the English-only orientation of the programmes studied and the fact that English was the only common language to all study participants. The questionnaires aimed to gather demographic data on the students enrolled in the criterion-sampled English-only programmes in addition to their motivations for pursuing their higher education through the medium of English, their attitudes towards, and

opinions on English, German and other languages, their linguistic practices and their view on support services assisting them in their programme. All closed questions were analysed in SPSS to produce statistical data. In total, 179 questionnaires were completed and analysed.

The second phase of data collection comprised of one-to-one semi-structured interviews with students, lecturers and course directors. All students who completed the questionnaires were subsequently invited for interview resulting in 68 students agreeing to participate. Stratified random sampling was applied to this pool of willing participants in order to ensure greater balance and representativeness. The strata comprising this sample were: male vs female, 2nd semester vs 4th semester, German vs international students, and Study Site 1 vs Study Site 2 vs Study Site 3. In total, 41 interviews were conducted. All interviews were transcribed using discourse analysis tenets and input into NVivo for thematic and discursive analysis. Owing to the divergent ways Grounded Theory has been interpreted and applied by both its original developers and subsequent grounded theorists (Dey 2004: 81), it is no longer possible or prudent to speak of a unified Grounded Theory approach. There are, therefore, a number of ways in which to employ Grounded Theory. A synthesis approach to Grounded Theory, based on that proposed by Eaves (2001), was adopted in this research to analyse qualitative data in NVivo as the detailed procedures, moving in 11 steps from open coding through axial coding to selective coding (Strauss and Corbin 1998: 143), provided the researcher with a rigorous framework which ensured a balance between grounded data emergence and the need for literature review. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the total numbers of questionnaires completed and interviews conducted subdivided into participatory groups.

The data underlying the discussion herein was generated from the reported practices, and the opinions, attitudes and ideologies uncovered through case studies at the three study sites. Due to restricted time and economic resources, it was not possible to integrate participant observation as an additional research instrument at the case study sites. While this may be viewed as a possible limitation, the data nonetheless provides important insights into the environments studied which may serve as a useful impetus

Table 1. Research project data divided into research instruments and participatory cohorts

Research instrument	German students	Intl students	German faculty	Intl faculty	Course directors	
					German	Intl
Questionnaires	119	43	11	3	2	1
One-to-one semi-structured Interviews	24	6	7	2	1	1

for further study within such programmes, utilising participant observation to supplement the data and findings outlined herein.

Patterns of multilingual practices within English-medium degree programmes

Owing to a high degree of linguistic and cultural diversity within the EMDPs studied due to the presence of students from four continents interacting on a daily basis, a form of enmeshed multilingualism emerges within German EMDPs. The spread of multilingualism, therefore, generates a wide variety of languages, significant cultural diversity and a range of linguistic repertoire arrangements and patterns of language usage. The coexistence and interaction of multiple languages in space and time is, however, fraught with controversies, sensitivities and emotions (Aronin and Singleton 2010: 106). Across the three study sites, a wide variety of languages are documented. These range from large national languages of international importance such as German, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Russian and Chinese, to small national languages such as Estonian, Bulgarian, Swedish, Finnish and more regional language varieties that embody strong identification characteristics such as Bavarian German. Equally, significant diversity is also noted in the varieties of English present within the environment, owing to its global language status ranging from native European varieties such as British and Irish to American, Australian and New Zealand Englishes. Additionally, enormous diversity in non-native-speaker varieties of English is noted ranging from German, Spanish, and Portuguese, to Bulgarian and Russian Englishes. Interestingly however, the patterns of language use in spite of such linguistic diversity remains quite restricted, predominantly due to the dominance of the two languages of communication within the environment: English and German.

The restrictiveness of such patterns of language use amongst study participants may be attributable in part to the design of the degree programme and the limited form of multilingualism institutionalised within it. Language proficiency amongst both student groups in the setting at the very least conform to the EU Council's MT+2 target for European citizens (European Council Barcelona Meeting 2002), with many international students' language proficiency reaching an MT+3 or even MT+4 levels. German students within the programme predominantly possess German as their L1 (or MT), English as their L2 and an additional world language such as Spanish, French or Russian as their L3. The range of languages offered to German students on such programmes varies between study sites; the aforementioned three languages are, however, offered at each of the study sites with Chinese being offered at Study Site 2, while Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish are offered at Study Site 1 due to the degree programme's focus. International students possess a wide array of L1s (MTs), English in a large number of cases occupies

L2 or L3 status (and in a small minority of cases L1 status) with German being an additional foreign language alongside English at L3/L4/L5 status amongst international students as it is positioned as a compulsory component in EMDPs in Germany. While this position boosts the profile of German as a foreign language, it may also be seen, however, to reduce international students' freedom to pursue additional languages. It must be noted that international students are permitted to pursue additional languages alongside German; such an option, however, is elective and unaccredited within the programme. Evidence from the three study sites indicates that the overwhelming majority of international students do not pursue such an option and instead opt to concentrate their efforts on German, principally due to a desire to develop proficiency in the language. The opportunity of studying in Germany is perceived as the period to devote a major part of their time and resources to improving German proficiency, as international students believe English and additional language acquisition are likely to continue in their professional lives as circumstances dictate. Such findings indicate that both German and international students within the environment reflect and actively pursue an MT + English + additional foreign language model rather than the more generic, undifferentiated MT + 2 model suggested by the EU Commission. Arguably, this is a result of their participation in primary and secondary education where the importance of English is foregrounded, and their personal choice to pursue their higher education through the medium of English.

Data relating to the lecturers participating in the study is broadly in line with the linguistic repertoires noted amongst students. The large majority of lecturers currently teaching on the programmes studied are German L1 speakers, while only 20% are categorised international i.e. individuals who do not speak German as their L1, nor have they completed any part of their compulsory education in a German-speaking country. The form of multilingualism noted amongst German lecturers very much correlates to the MT (German) + English + additional foreign language model, with such lecturers admitting that their L3 (e.g. French, Spanish, Italian, Russian) proficiency suffers significantly as a result of teaching through the medium of English and the lack of opportunities to maintain their spoken repertoires in these languages in their daily lives. International lecturers, like international students, possess linguistic repertoires in the form of MT + English + German. In all instances, international lecturers' MT or L1 was a large world language (i.e. two Spanish speakers, one Russian speaker and one English speaker) with German occupying the position of L3 predominantly due to their choice to learn the language in their compulsory education systems and/or on pragmatic grounds for working at German higher education level.

In the questionnaires, German and international students and lecturers were posed six questions regarding their choice of language use with a range of German and international interlocutors in their environments, and the rationale underlying such language choice in addition to a further 12

questions to gain insights into programme demographics and respondents' motivations to become involved in English-medium degree programmes. This data was then elaborated upon significantly within the one-to-one semi-structured interviews to delve fully into the factors coalescing to influence practices and the opinions, attitudes and ideologies underlying such practices. Table 2 outlines German students' reported language use with a range of interlocutors with whom they have daily and/or weekly interaction. Each percentage relates to the proportion of German students who speak a particular language or languages with the identified type of interlocutor. Such patterns of language use suggest a limited form of multilingualism restricted to their L1 and English. International students' patterns of language use suggest a wider form of multilingualism than their German counterparts, albeit still at low levels. Table 2 provides the data on German students' patterns of language use, while Table 3 offers comparative data for international students' with the same range of interlocutors.

From the data contained in Table 2, a number of deductions can be made about German students' multilingual practices. First, in analysing the use of languages other than English and German in the environment, institutionally and in everyday life, it emerges that a very small minority of German students communicate with international students on (1.7%) and outside (2.5%) the

Table 2. German students' general patterns of communication with various interlocutors

Type of interlocutor	German only (%)	English only (%)	German and English (%)	Other languages (%)
With international students on the programme	2.5	94.1	1.7	1.7
With international students outside the programme	4.2	91.5	1.8	2.5
With fellow German students on the programme	88.2	8.4	3.4	0
With fellow German students outside the programme	94.1	4.2	1.7	0
With teaching faculty on the programme	22.9	61.9	15.2	0
With administration staff on the programme	84.7	11.9	3.4	0
With administration staff outside the programme	94.8	2.6	2.6	0
With members of the general public	93.9	2.6	3.5	0

Table 3. International students' general patterns of communication with various interlocutors

Type of interlocutor	German only (%)	English only (%)	German and English (%)	Other languages (%)
With fellow international students on the programme	0	84.6	8.7	6.7
With fellow international students outside the programme	2.6	81.6	5.2	7.9
With German students on the programme	10.8	73	16.2	0
With German students outside the programme	31.5	55.3	13.2	0
With teaching faculty on the programme	5.3	89.5	5.2	0
With administration staff on the programme	23.7	68.4	7.9	0
With administration staff outside the programme	36.8	55.3	7.9	0
With members of the general public	44.7	34.2	18.5	2.6

programme through media other than English and German. Possible explanations for this are offered in the qualitative data. German students are clear in their reasoning for favouring predominantly English to communicate with international students following the principle of communicative parsimony i.e. the least effort possible to ensure maximum communication. Equally, a strong correlation between a person's L1 and the chosen medium of communication emerges with German students predominantly communicating with fellow German students on (88.2%) and outside (94.1%) the programme, and administration staff (84.7%) through the medium of German as it is viewed as more appropriate, comfortable and natural than utilising another language, including English. This finding is also corroborated without solicitation by one lecturer:

Male German Faculty Member 7: . . . naturally students will <pause> talk German <pause> especially amongst each other if they are Germans <pause> though this you cannot help. This is not bad as long as <pause> the working <rephrase> the official working language in class remains English.

Female German Student 1: . . . with the other classmates we speak amm <pause> German because <pause> it's more natural but if there are international students with us we speak English.

Female German Student 3: . . . if you have group work and the group consists only of <rising intonation> Germans <rising intonation> then they talk German of course. And <pause> sometimes if the group is very large and you oversee one international student and you keep talking in German and then after like <pause> a half an hour you realise "oh there's one who does not understand us at all".

Female German Student 11: . . . inside the class we do talk if there's like a group discussion we always talk in English <pause> if we are only Germans <pause> usually we talk in German. <pause> But if there is one person who is not German <pause> we usually talk automatically in English and also to each other <pause> but it's more like if we're with ourself it's German usually.

Interestingly, with teaching faculty, English (61.9%) or a combination of English and German (15.2%) are favoured as the media of communication. Such practices are accounted for in many instances by the presence of international students, which in almost all cases triggers the use of English as the medium of communication. Furthermore, interaction between, and integration of German and international student groups constitutes a significant challenge within the environments studied with minimal levels of both noted across the three study sites. German students are, therefore, arguably not provided with the necessary social affordances in which to use languages beyond English and German. Arguably, a desire on the part of German students to support international students in learning German while studying in Germany may serve as a reason to restrict communication to English (for maximum intelligibility) and German (to boost interest in the language amongst international students). This is particularly salient in view of the strong positivity that German students exhibit towards members of the international student group that actively pursue proficiency in German and the effect that such an endeavour has on interaction and integration potential. A final important consideration that may constrain multilingual practices within the environment is "societal affordances" (Aronin & Singleton 2010: 114–15) in the form of a restricted provision of fully accredited additional languages alongside German and English, and indeed the mismatch between international student L1s and those languages provided within the programme. Each of the programmes studied integrates an additional language as a compulsory component of each degree programme. For international students, German as a foreign language is the compulsory language to be learned, while German students can choose from a range of what may be categorised as world languages (i.e. French, Spanish, Russian) and, in the case of one study site, languages with more regional European importance (e.g. Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish). As a significant proportion of international students come from countries with L1s different to those supported institutionally through the additional foreign language component

(57.5%), individual and societal affordances are not provided to German students to facilitate multilingual practices beyond the use of German and English and perhaps the use of stock expressions that German students may learn out of politeness towards certain international student groups.

Comparatively speaking, international students are marginally more multilingual in their practices. As Table 3 illustrates, international students are almost exclusively multilingual beyond their use of English and German in their practices with other international students on (6.7%) and outside (7.9%) their programme of study. It is, however, important to note that the use of German amongst international students is an important element of their multilingualism as German constitutes an L3 or L4 for a large proportion of the international student population across the three study sites (75%). Small but significant proportions of international students utilise German in their interactions with German students outside of their degree programme (31.5%), and administration staff on (23.7%) and outside (36.8%) the programme.

Table 4 outlines the reported patterns of language use amongst German lecturers within the programmes studied. It emerges within this data that German lecturers are similar to their student counterparts with high levels of English and German, and low levels of additional languages being utilised in interactions with various interlocutors.

The higher levels of German use can be accounted for by lecturers' clear separation in the role of English as the instructional language from its role

Table 4. German lecturers' general patterns of communication with various interlocutors

Type of interlocutor	German only (%)	English only (%)	German and English (%)	Other languages (%)
With international students on the programme	15.4	46.1	23.1	15.4
With international students outside the programme	23.1	38.4	23.1	15.4
With German students on the programme	84.6	7.7	7.7	0
With German students outside the programme	92.3	0	7.7	0
With fellow teaching faculty on the programme	84.6	7.7	7.7	0
With administration staff on the programme	84.6	0	15.4	0
With administration staff outside the programme	100	0	0	0
With members of the general public	84.6	7.7	0	7.7

outside the classroom. In the questionnaire, 84.6% of German lecturers agree or strongly agree that English is the medium of instruction within the classroom, highlighting in the qualitative data that their choice to use English-only is clearly only associated with guidelines laid out about such programmes. As no guidelines exist on the use of English outside the classroom, it stands to reason, from German lecturers' perspectives, that the natural language in this setting is German, particularly considering programme demographics:

Female German Faculty Member 2: We teach in English <pause> amm because that's what we've signed up for. That is what the programme says it is <pause> so English is the classroom language. <pause> But when I am outside the classroom <pause> then <pause> well of course then it's German. <pause> It would be unnatural <pause> to use English in a German-speaking university.

Male German Faculty Member 5: Yes <pause> yes English inside the classroom and German outside <pause> unless I'm speaking to an international student <pause> but even then I think it's important they try <pause> to speak in German <pause> it's good practice for them. So <pause> I'll use German outside the classroom whenever I can <pause> and it really necessary <pause> then I will speak English.

Additionally, a clear division is noted in their linguistic practices in dealing with the two primary populations with whom they interact most frequently i.e. German and international students. German lecturers (84.6%) report they speak German only within German students on the programme, with the remaining 15.4% favouring English only or a combination of German and English. With international students, German lecturers' linguistic practices are somewhat more heterogeneous. While the largest percentage of lecturers favour English-only to communicate with international students on (46.1%) and outside (38.4%) the programme, German and other languages are only utilised in limited capacity, predominantly in interactions with international students on and outside the EMDP. With fellow teaching faculty, the questionnaire data indicates that German only is the preferred medium of communication for a majority of lecturers (84.6%) with a small proportion of German lecturers (15.4%) speaking either English-only or a combination of English and German with fellow teaching faculty. The rationale underlying these language choices is elaborated upon to a limited extent within the qualitative data. While two members of German teaching faculty admit that their use of additional languages beyond their L1 is limited entirely to their teaching on the EMDP, and almost exclusively to using English, the remaining seven members of faculty make no reference to their language use with students. This would suggest that German and English also dominate their linguistic practices within the environment, speaking English with

international students and German with German students for communi-
cativeness. While all teaching faculty possess proficiency in foreign languages
in addition to English (predominantly other world languages such as
French, Spanish and Russian), it appears that their use of such languages is
limited:

Female German Faculty Member 2: I do find it a little hilarious. So you
see that <pause> in the first semester I do find it a little hilarious if people
outside of class use English with me but some do and deliberately so to
improve their English. So I get emails well sometimes it's German
sometimes it's English and I then reply in the language <pause> that is
chosen originally.

Male German Faculty Member 5: Yes outside the classroom I do speak
German with them. And then they come into my <pause> office hours and
<pause> even if we have an English topic there <pause> for example the
girl that writes her Bachelor thesis this morning we talked in German all
the time . . . But as soon as there's international student there we switch to
English.

Table 5 outlines the patterns of language use reported by international
lecturers who participated in the study. The data on international lecturers

Table 5. International lecturers' general patterns of communication with various
interlocutors

Type of interlocutor	German only (%)	English only (%)	German and English (%)	Other languages (%)
With international students on the programme	0	75	0	25
With international students outside the programme	0	50	0	50
With German students on the programme	0	50	25	25
With German students outside the programme	25	25	50	0
With fellow teaching faculty on the programme	25	25	25	25
With administration staff on the programme	25	25	50	0
With administration staff outside the programme	50	0	50	0
With members of the general public	25	0	25	50

within this study is limited first, due to the low total numbers of international lecturers teaching on the programmes studied, and second, due to the participation of only four international lecturers in study. Unsurprisingly, international lecturers note that they activate their L1s in interactions with international students with linguistic and cultural commonalities e.g. Spanish-speaking international lecturers frequently communicate with Spanish-speaking international students through Spanish on the grounds of communicative parsimony. International lecturers are more multilingual beyond the use of English in their practices than their German counterparts as they activate their L3 or L4 (German) more frequently. This is attributable to the existence of sufficient societal affordance, and indeed a necessity to be communicative in German considering the environment in which they are active. A high level of heterogeneity is recorded in interactions with German students on and outside the EMDP, indicating preferences for speaking English or a combination of English and German in communicating with such students.

The qualitative data provides clarification on when English, a combination of English and German, or even German only, is used to communicate with students on or outside the programme. Communication with fellow teaching faculty shows high levels of disparity with each lecturer surveyed activating different linguistic repertoires for communication.

Female International Faculty Member 2: It's a very unusual <pause> the setting up here in the environment. So <pause> when I have the opportunity to speak my language with others <pause> from my country Russia I do it <pause> I mean it only makes sense to speak to people in the language where you will understand ourselves best. My German is not <pause> that good at the moment <pause> but I must speak German to some students, teachers and <p> secretaries. When I can speak English with them I do <pause> because it's easier mostly than German.

Male International Faculty Member 1: Yes yes <pause> I speak a Spanish with students from a Spain <pause> Latin America <pause> why wouldn't I? But <pause> with colleagues and German a students I speak <pause> English but also German <pause> I will sometimes try in German and switch to a <pause> English if I get problems. Whatever works <pause> easiest and best for me <pause> but also for the other. Some people are <pause> well and others not so <pause> so German is needed.

Synthesising such practices within the EMDPs studied, the "Dominant Language Constellation" (Aronin & Ó Laoire 2004: 19) for study participants can be discerned. It emerges that English is prioritised by all members of the speech community as the *de facto* language of communication across sub-groups and indeed within the international student group, with the national language German following closely as the language of the dominant student

group, authority figures, and the prestige, aspirational language denoting integration and acceptance. Such prioritisations lead a large majority of international students (particularly those whose languages lack world language status) to relegate their L1s to home language status, devaluing its functions and status within the environment. Van Londen and De Ruijter (1999) argue that multilingualism is a means of overcoming hurdles of cultural and linguistic diversity. Considering the multi-cultural and multi-lingual composition of the EMDPs under investigation, ideologies and practices within the settings of EMDPs have the potential to inform such an argument. From this discussion, it emerges that multilingualism certainly does act as a means of overcoming cultural and linguistic diversity, facilitating intercultural communication; the form of multilingualism, however, is characteristic of English and German with multilingualism in a hierarchical fashion due to the dominant roles that both languages play within the environment rather than equitable multilingualism where a number of languages are equally valued and spoken.

Conclusions

Multilingual practices beyond English and German within the environments studied, as discussed, are highly restricted, and predominantly limited to other world languages rather than smaller national, regional and/or minority languages. Such practices are further inhibited by the lack of societal affordances within the programmes studied due to the mismatch between institutionalised additional foreign languages and the backgrounds of permanent and international exchange students. Furthermore, it appears that students' positivity towards, and practices in, multilingualism currently only extend to the upper echelons of a linguistic/cultural hierarchy i.e. with lingua francae and world languages at the top and small national, regional and minority languages at the bottom, mirroring Nic Craith's (2006) constellation of languages within the EU. This suggests that the implicit language policy within EMDPs not only serves to reinforce the status quo dominance of large languages over smaller ones but also to strengthen such a position through perpetuating an ideology of linguistic/cultural hierarchicisation. Such a hierarchy not only benefits English due to its world lingua franca status but also Europe's big languages with world language status i.e. German, French, Spanish and Russian. The learning of English within EMDPs, therefore, runs parallel to the learning of the aforementioned large languages so that the prioritisation of English does not negatively impact on the acquisition of such languages, which suggests calls to downgrade English to L3, L4 or L5 status within compulsory education systems (c.f. Hufeisen 2003: 9) is not necessarily important for the preservation of such languages' statuses.

Note

1. "'Adaptation towards English' – a less value-laden term than 'Anglicisation' and 'Linguistic Imperialism'" (Phillipson 1992, 2003).

References

Ammon, U. and G. McConnell (2002) *English as an academic language in Europe: A survey of its use in teaching*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Aronin, L., and M. Ó Laoire (2004) Exploring multilingualism in cultural contexts: towards a notion of multilinguality. In C. Hoffmann, and J. Ytsma (eds.), *Trilingualism in family, school and community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 11–29.

Aronin, L., and D. Singleton (2010) Affordances and the diversity of multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 205: 105–29.

Benedictus-van den Berg, S., and A. Riemersma (2011) Higher education and research on multilingualism: challenge or opportunity. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 3.2: 135–40.

Blackledge, A., and A. Creese (2010) *Multilingualism*. London: Continuum.

Brumfit, C. J. (2004) Language and higher education: two current challenges. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 3.2: 163–73.

Cenoz, J., and D. Gorter (2010) The diversity of multilingualism in education. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 205: 37–53.

Coleman, J. A. (2006) English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39.1: 1–14.

Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a global language*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2004) *The stories of English*. London: Penguin Books.

DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) (2014) International Programmes in Germany 2014. Retrieved 10 October 2014 from http://www.daad.de/deutschland/studienangebote/international-programs/de/

De Swaan, A. (1999) The constellation of languages. In European Cultural Foundation (ed.), *Which languages for Europe? Report of the conference held in Oegstgeest*. Oegsteest: European Cultural Foundation. 13–24.

De Swaan, A. (2001) A political sociology of the world language system. In E. Ben-Rafal, and Y. Sternberg (eds.), *Identity, culture and globalization*. Cologne: Brill. 205–34.

Dey, I. (2004) Grounded theory. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium and D. Silverman (eds.), *Qualitative research practice*. London: Sage. 80–93.

Doiz, A., D. Lasagabaster and J. Sierra (2012) Globalisation, internationalisation, multilingualism and linguistic strains in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38.9: 1–15.

Dor, D. (2004) From Englishization to imposed multilingualism: globalization, the Internet, and the political economy of the linguistic code. *Public Culture*, 16.1: 97–118.

Dörnyei, Z., K. Csizér, and N. Németh (2006) *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation. A Hungarian perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Eaves, Y. D. (2001) A synthesis technique for grounded theory data analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 35.5: 654–63.

European Commission (2004) Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004–2006, Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved 22 April 2012 from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003 :0449:FIN:EN:PDF

European Council Barcelona Meeting (2002) Presidency conclusions. Retrieved 27 September 2012 from http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/71025.pdf

Franceschini, R. (2009) The genesis and development of research in multilingualism: perspectives for future research. In L. Aronin and B. Hufeisen (eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 27–60.

Gnutzmann, C., and M. Bruns (2008) English in academia – catalyst or barrier? Zur Einführung in eine kontroverse Diskussion. In C. Gnutzmann (ed.), *English in academia. Catalyst or barrier?* Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 9–24.

Gnutzmann, C. and K. Lipski-Buchholz (2008) Englischsprachige Studiengänge: Was können Sie leisten, was geht verloren?. In C. Gnutzmann (ed.), *English in academia. Catalyst or barrier?* Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 147–68.

Graddol, D. (2004) The future of language. *Science* 303.5662: 1329–31.

Graddol, D. (2006) English next. London: British Council. Retrieved 20 May 2012 from http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-english-next .pdf

Herdina, P., and U. Jessner (2002) *A dynamic model of multilingualism: perspectives of change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hoffmann, C. (2000) The spread of English and the growth of multilingualism with English in Europe. In J. Cenoz and U. Jessner (eds.), *English in Europe: the acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1–21.

Hufeisen, B. (2003) Kurze Einführung in die linguistische Basis. In B. Hufeisen, and G. Neuner (eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept – tertiärsprachen – Deutsch nach Englisch*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. 7–34.

Hüppauf, B. (2004) Globalization – threats and opportunities. In A. Gardt and B. Hüppauf (eds.), *Globalization and the future of German*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 3–24.

Jessner, U. (2006) *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Maiworm, F., and B. Wächter (2008) *English-language-taught degree programmes in European higher education*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Martin, P. (2010) They have lost their identity but not gained a British one: Non-traditional multilingual students in higher education in the United Kingdom. *Language and Education* 24.1: 9–20.

McArthur, T. (1992) *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nic Craith, M. (2006) *Europe and the politics of language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patton, M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2003) *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy*. Routledge: London.

Romaine, S. (2000) The impact of language policy on endangered languages. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4.2: 194–212.

Shohamy, E. (2007) Reinterpreting globalisation in multilingual contexts. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 1.2: 127–33.

Sonntag, S. K. (2003) *The local politics of global English: case studies in linguistic globalization*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Strauss, A., and J. Corbin (1998) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oakes, California: Sage.

Tonkin, H. (2003) *Language and society.* New York: American Forum for Global Education.

Trudgill, P., and J. Chesire (1998) *The sociolinguistics reader.* Vol 1 *Multilingualism and variation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Van Londen, S., and A. De Ruijter (1999) Ethnicity and identity. In M. C. Foblets and C. L. Pang (eds.), *Culture, ethnicity and migration.* Leuven: Acco Publisher. 69–79.

Viereck, W. (1996) English in Europe: its nativisation and use as a lingua franca, with special reference to German-speaking countries. In R. Hartmann (ed.), *The English language in Europe.* Exeter: Intellect. 16–24.

email: Clive.Earls@nuim.ie