

Opening up research on English-medium instruction

New interdisciplinary perspectives

Anna Kristina Hultgren, Dogan Yuksel, Beatrice Zuaro,
Marion Nao, and Peter Wingrove
The Open University

The introductory paper to this special issue makes a call for interdisciplinarity in English as a medium of instruction (EMI) on the grounds that EMI can only be properly studied and its challenges addressed by understanding its entanglement with a wider political, economic and social restructuring of higher education. The paper first offers a taxonomy of interdisciplinarity, drawing a distinction between interdisciplinarity *within* and *beyond* applied linguistics, the former of which has been most common within EMI to date. Following a synopsis of each of the five contributions, we evaluate the extent to which the issue has achieved its objectives. While the special issue advocates strongly for interdisciplinarity, it also acknowledges the challenges of engaging in genuine interdisciplinary scholarship and points to the structures that work to uphold disciplinary boundaries. We conclude by offering some ways forward for interdisciplinarity in EMI, arguing particularly for interdisciplinarity that extends *beyond* applied linguistics.

Keywords: interdisciplinarity, English-medium instruction, challenges, opportunities

A call for interdisciplinarity in EMI

English as a medium of instruction — EMI — is an inherently interdisciplinary topic, spanning fields such as language, education, politics, economics and sociology, among others. Yet, while a broad array of perspectives has been added to the EMI literature, it has mainly come from branches *within* applied linguistics. Based on a study showing that 95% of EMI articles published between 2011 and 2020 were authored by applied linguists, Macaro and Aizawa observe: “The EMI

research and development field has been appropriated by academics with an applied linguistics focus” (2022, p. 1). However, there are signs that EMI scholars are beginning to realise the merits of interdisciplinary research to obtain a fuller understanding. For example, Curle et al. (2024) argue, “[w]e need more explicit linkage of EMI research to wider interdisciplinary theories so that our findings contribute to a wider range of research disciplines” and that “we need more EMI research outside of the realm of applied linguistics, which explores the wider impact of EMI on concepts such as socioeconomic status, migration, mobility, employment, and political economy” (p. 9). We agree that the largely monodisciplinary approach within EMI has led to a failure to acknowledge how EMI at the tertiary level is entangled in a wider political, economic and social restructuring of higher education (Bleiklie et al., 2011; Broucker et al., 2016; Canaan & Shumar, 2008). Hence, we posit that EMI is best studied, and its challenges addressed, by understanding it within this wider context of global restructuring.

This special issue paves the way for greater theoretical, methodological, conceptual and collaborative interdisciplinarity in EMI research by showcasing some examples of how working across disciplinary boundaries might look and what it might bring in terms of added understandings. The issue follows from other calls within EMI to engage in interdisciplinary collaboration; however, our own definition of interdisciplinarity goes further. We advocate an approach to interdisciplinarity that ventures outside of one’s own disciplinary comfort zone and into other bodies of literature, engagement with new theories and methodologies, and collaboration with scientists in other disciplines. The overarching questions addressed are:

1. How might interdisciplinary research shed new light on ongoing questions in EMI?
2. How might interdisciplinarity be conceptualised in EMI research, and what are its challenges and opportunities?
3. How might research, theory, policy and practice be opened up through explicit discussions about ideological, epistemological and ontological assumptions that are often left tacit?

The purpose of such interdisciplinary endeavours is to arrive at deeper and broader understandings of EMI that recognise EMI’s situatedness within a dynamic system of a continuous and ongoing restructuring of academic governance and higher education. Our objective resonates with the EMEMUS (English-medium education in multilingual university settings) framework, which similarly views EMI as just one aspect of a plethora of roles, functions and practices that are at play in contemporary multilingual universities and that must be considered alongside it (Dafouz & Smit, 2023). Like Dafouz and Smit,

we argue that situating EMI more firmly within contemporary academic priorities will enhance the likelihood of EMI research being utilised and taken up in the real world while also benefiting EMI itself.

Interdisciplinarity: What is it and why is it important?

It is widely recognised that social phenomena in contemporary societies are so complex that they cannot be understood or tackled within one single discipline. As Klein (1990) puts it: “Interdisciplinarity is a means of solving problems and answering questions that cannot be satisfactorily addressed using single methods or approaches” (p. 196). EMI is certainly complex, intersecting, as already mentioned, with a multitude of other fields and disciplines. Miller (2020) offers a typology of different approaches to interdisciplinarity in the social sciences and suggests that social problems will lend themselves to different approaches:

- *Interdisciplinary approaches* involve, at a minimum, the application of insights and perspectives from more than one conventional discipline to the understanding of social phenomena.
- *Multidisciplinary approaches* involve the simple act of juxtaposing parts of several conventional disciplines in an effort to get a broader understanding of some common theme or problem. No systematic effort is made to combine or integrate across these disciplines.
- *Crossdisciplinary approaches* involve real interaction across the conventional disciplines, though the extent of communication and thus combination, synthesis or integration of concepts and/or methods varies considerably.
- *Transdisciplinary approaches*, according to Jantsch’s (1972) classic essay, involve articulated conceptual frameworks that seek to transcend the more limited world views of the specialised disciplines. These frameworks are holistic in intent.

Notwithstanding longstanding consensus on the benefits of interdisciplinarity, it can be difficult to carry out “genuine” interdisciplinary work in practice as structures such as faculties, departments, conferences, journals, research evaluation regimes, etc. are organised into disciplines, which work against it. As Miller (2020) puts it, “the power structure of the disciplinary academy resists interdisciplinary inroads on its authority and resources” (p. 1). Drawing on Becher (1989), Miller argues that the establishment of specialised disciplines at the beginning of the 20th century has led to “academic enclosure” (2020, p. 9), whereby the disciplines close themselves down to input from the outside while reinforcing themselves from the inside. Certainly, becoming knowledgeable and authoritative in

one's own field depends on the "common socialisation to scientific, scholarly, and university-rooted norms which occurs during graduate training" (Clark, 1987, p. 8). In this way, disciplines become "the eyes through which modern society sees and forms its images about the world, frames its experience, and learns, thus shaping its own future or reconstituting the past" (Weingart & Stehr, 1999, p. xi). Becher and Trowler (2001) argue that disciplines and academic communities are in a co-constitutive relationship where they influence, perpetuate and uphold one another:

In practice, academic cultures and disciplinary epistemology are inseparably intertwined. The flow of causation is not one way, rather the relationship is mutually infused: disciplinary knowledge forms are to a large extent constituted and instantiated socially. Meanwhile, their constitution has a reciprocal effect on the cultures from which they spring. (p. 23)

Thus, as disciplines are both embedded in and constitutive of practices, values, norms, morality and behaviour, it is difficult to break out of them. This is reflected in Becher's (1989) comparison of academic cultures to "academic tribes and territories," connoting an air of antagonism and protectionism.

One clear advantage of interdisciplinarity is that it encourages researcher reflexivity, particularly around the tacit assumptions made in one's own field. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) in their invitation to reflexive sociology highlight the unconscious biases of social scientists with a view to making them more aware of their intellectual positioning and how it shapes the creation of knowledge. Similar calls have been made from within applied linguistics, where reflexivity has been argued to enhance researchers' self-awareness by promoting greater transparency, methodological rigour and trustworthiness to our scholarly inquiries (Consoli & Ganassin, 2023). It is the same concern with meta-awareness that prompts Miller (2020) to distinguish interdisciplinary approaches from interdisciplinarity, the latter of which is "an analytically reflective study of the methodological, theoretical and institutional implications of implementing interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and research" (p. 1). In other words, by working interdisciplinarily, one becomes more aware of the underlying worldview of one's discipline and how that in turn shapes the questions asked and the answers generated, often under the guise of being "unbiased" and "objective." Our vision and hope for the field of EMI, the first step towards which we take with this issue, is precisely for the field to become mindful of its epistemological positioning and how that shapes the construction of knowledge, not only the answers that are found but also the questions that are asked.

Interdisciplinarity in EMI research

In EMI, a distinction can be made between interdisciplinary research *within* and *beyond* applied linguistics. Many branches *within* applied linguistics have contributed to enhancing our understanding of EMI. These include researchers coming from English language teaching, content and language integrated learning, language testing and assessment, language acquisition, teacher education, English as a *lingua franca*, educational linguistics, language policy, educational development, English for academic purposes and others. For example, interdisciplinary collaboration between EMI and EAP/ESP (English for Academic Purposes/English for Specific Purposes) is relatively common within applied linguistics (e.g., Alhassan et al., 2022; Galloway & Rose, 2022; Wingate & Hakim, 2022) probably because of their shared (implicit or explicit) concern with student support. Collaboration between EMI scholars and teacher educators is another example (e.g., Lasagabaster, 2018) as is collaboration between EMI and TESOL (e.g., Pecorari & Malmström, 2018).

As regards interdisciplinarity *beyond* applied linguistics, there are fewer examples, no doubt in part because of the aforementioned challenges that work against interdisciplinarity. Often such interdisciplinarity has a somewhat broader remit than English as a medium of instruction *per se*. To give a few such examples, historians have documented the rise and fall of scientific languages over the centuries, e.g., Latin, French, German, Russian and even Esperanto (Roelli, 2021) while language economists have argued that journal impact factors may covertly drive the use of English for research publication purposes (Gazzola, 2012). Philosophers and political theorists have discussed the normative and moral issues of English as an academic language (Van Parijs, 2020). EMI in higher education has also attracted attention from stakeholders outside of academia, such as the European Association for International Education, the Institute of International Education, Academic Cooperation Association, the British Council and Study Portals (British Council & Study Portals, 2024; Sandström & Carmen, 2017; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). This suggests that EMI has a large and attentive audience outside of the academy and that EMI research therefore has the potential to make a positive difference in the real world by reaching the right people.

Another example of interdisciplinarity *beyond* applied linguistics is the project ELEMENTAL (English as the Language-of-Education Mechanisms in Europe: New Transdisciplinary Approaches in Linguistics), which has made a decisive step in that direction, by drawing extensively from political science, public administration and higher education studies to investigate the causes of EMI policy and implementation. The aim of ELEMENTAL is to challenge prevalent understandings of EMI as resulting from – often vaguely described – processes

of internationalisation in higher education at the turn of the millennium. Instead, the project traces EMI even further back to a set of neoliberally premised governance reforms that have swept across European nation states since the 1980s and granted higher education institutions greater autonomy while also introducing performance-based control mechanisms. The indirect result, we argue, has been the formation of an environment in which EMI has been able to arise and thrive. As the most significant methodological innovation, *ELEMENTAL* adopts the qualitative case-study method of process tracing from political science (Beach & Pedersen, 2019), which operates by identifying causal mechanisms between a given outcome (in our case EMI) and its triggers (governance reforms). As it has been argued (Thomas et al., 2024), the adoption of this method has allowed us to pursue investigations of causality, generally forfeited in applied linguistics research, not only bringing a new methodology to applied linguistics, but promoting a shift in research focus by enabling a more precise identification of the drivers of EMI (Hultgren & Wilkinson, 2022; Hultgren et al., 2023; Nao et al., 2023; Thomas et al., 2024; Yuksel et al., 2024a, 2024b; Zuaro et al., 2024).

Next to its qualitative research, *ELEMENTAL* also features an important quantitative component, which conducts hierarchical regression to model the relationship between university autonomy and EMI across a large dataset of 26 education systems and 1,815 higher education institutions (Wingrove et al., 2024). Whilst multilevel regression has been applied in various disciplinary contexts, the application in *ELEMENTAL* features some novel aspects. For example, although the interaction between macro- (national) and meso- (institutional) levels is often theorised in EMI research, *ELEMENTAL* was the first to model it statistically, placing interacting predictors at the macro- and meso-levels in a hierarchical data structure. This shows how changes in autonomy at the level of education systems affects the provision of EMI within higher education institutions. Similarly, while the possibility of combining process tracing and hierarchical regression has previously been hinted at as good practice (Beach & Pedersen, 2019), *ELEMENTAL* has actualised it, combining detailed case studies within a generalisable context. Theoretically, the project identifies as relevant to EMI research concepts such as steering-at-a-distance, institutional isomorphism, multi-level governance and policy borrowing, whose deployment allows for a significant broadening of the understanding of EMI implementation dynamics that have previously remained opaque or underexplored.

Interdisciplinarity in this special issue

As intimated by the title of his paper, “‘So, you’re speaking Dutch?’: An interdisciplinary analysis of language policy negotiation in the EMI classroom,” Alexander De Soete analyses excerpts of meta-discourse signalling language choice, (re-)alignment and enforcement with the purpose of underscoring the agentic roles inhabited by participants in dynamically situated interactions. These are embedded within a wider ethnography of EMI engineering programs at a Belgian university, from which De Soete extracts four instances of transcribed recordings. In a novel twist, De Soete blends a Goffmanian-inspired frame analysis with a Lipskian approach to street-level bureaucracy, the latter of which he borrows from public administration. This aims towards an interdisciplinary enhancement of our understanding of the intermediary roles and stances assumed by content teachers as institutional representatives on the ground. The interdisciplinary lens allows De Soete to identify liminal moments at which participants transition in collaboration with one another into redefined linguistic spaces, partaking on the ground in what we might know as translanguaging. One such illuminative instance both expertly analyses and beautifully captures a moment of humour in which the language policy is reinforced, hands on hips, by the teacher. While an interactional sociolinguist might approach this instance of performativity as a heightened, reflexive act of bracketing of metalinguistic awareness, De Soete brings to it the added interdisciplinary value of a Lipskian lens (Lipsky, 1980), which allows us to appreciate in a more nuanced way the complex acts of interpersonal negotiation at street level of the teacher as a bureaucrat meeting their mandate on language policy.

The paper “A collaborative autoethnography (CAE) on English as a medium of instruction (EMI): Perspectives across disciplines,” co-authored by an applied linguist (Sarah Hopkyns), an education specialist (Anna Dillon) and a media studies scholar (Danica Cigoja Piper), showcases the benefits of reflexivity enabled by interdisciplinarity. Utilising a collaborative autoethnography, the authors extend previous work by involving content lecturers as *researchers* rather than as *participants* in their study. Set within a higher education institution in the United Arab Emirates, the participating content lecturers discuss similarities and differences across their teaching practices, resulting in the emergence of nine themes, with a key being teacher agency to mitigate against some of the perceived challenges of EMI, such as Westernisation of materials and hampered student learning. Overall, the authors find more similarities than differences between their teaching practices, despite coming from different disciplines. For example, strategies they all draw on to mitigate challenges include scaffolding, translanguaging, critical awareness and a stance as awake watcher, that is, encouraging

students to interact independently but standing ready to intervene as and when required. It may surprise readers that both the lecturers in education and media studies are aware of, and actively encourage, their students to engage in translanguaging, a concept otherwise mostly familiar to socio- and applied linguists. When they engage in teaching, then, these individuals from different disciplines share an identity as pedagogues, concerned first and foremost with facilitating their students' learning. As such, they engage in many of the same practices, which in turn may override the idea of a fixed disciplinary identity. Overall, then, the paper demonstrates that disciplinary identities are not fixed but contextually contingent, thereby also problematising the very concepts of both disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity.

The study "The intersection of human capital and linguistic protectionism: Counteracting English-medium instruction in Türkiye," by Mehmet Altay investigates the reasons behind the limited adoption of EMI in certain subject areas in Türkiye, despite its overall pervasiveness in the Turkish higher education system. A surprising finding is that in contrast to what is the case in other countries, the majority of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programmes in Türkiye are offered in Turkish. Altay sets out to understand why, drawing on interviews with administrative personnel in strategic decision-making roles, and combining human capital theory from socioeconomics and linguistic protectionism from sociolinguistics. Through this interdisciplinary theoretical lens, Altay identifies a lack of demand for EMI graduates in specific sectors as a key reason for the limited provision of EMI programs as well as concerns relating to an ideological and political desire to preserve Turkish as the primary medium of instruction. By drawing on theories and concepts from different disciplines, the research may resonate with a wider readership, highlighting how EMI connects with, among other things, both employability agendas and national needs and identities in Türkiye.

The paper "Beyond EMI: Industry insights on effective communication in a multicultural high-risk industry," by Melanie van den Hoven and Hasan Al Shemeili, is a rare example of both interdisciplinary research and industry/academia collaboration coming together in one study. Conducted in the context of a high-risk work environment, namely a nuclear power plant in the United Arab Emirates, which partners with a Korean company and uses English as a lingua franca to facilitate communication between employees speaking Arabic, Korean and other languages, the study is based on interviews with nine multilingual employees of the facility. Adopting an ethnographic approach to data collection, the study investigates what linguistic and communicative skills are valued by these professionals, discussing them against the backdrop of the EMI higher education typically offered in the country. The authors connect literatures and theoretical

concepts from the fields of sociolinguistics, language education and leadership and organisational studies, and in so doing, they are able to overcome some of the blind spots generated by the siloed working in either of these disciplines. Thus, the authors bring into question EMI's intrinsic advantages in the professional world, the feasibility of translanguaging in high-risk industries, as well as the frequent focus on language(s) rather than on communication strategies. Thanks to their unique positioning as industry insiders, the authors are also able to involve an otherwise hardly accessible professional community thus making a significant contribution to interdisciplinary research and research/industry collaboration, while providing valuable industry insights for educators.

A conceptual piece concludes the issue. The paper "Beyond inter- and trans-disciplinarity: A framework for analysing EMI as an autonomous field of inquiry," by Tom Morton explores the complexities surrounding disciplinarity and identity within the field of EMI. Morton argues that rather than striving for interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary status, it may be more productive to view EMI as an epistemic assemblage, a field that draws on resources from a range of disciplines to address its unique challenges. This sense of flexibility in research methods and theoretical applications enables the field to develop a distinct identity while benefiting from the strengths of adjacent disciplines. The specific approach of the paper involves employing the "autonomy" dimension of Legitimation Code Theory to frame EMI as an independent field of inquiry. Morton argues for a balance: EMI should remain open to intellectual currents from other social sciences, while retaining a focus on its specific goals. This framing moves beyond inter- and trans-disciplinarity and helps shape a unique identity for EMI, focused on its own research problems, but potentially epistemically fragmented due to being open to myriad epistemes.

An evaluation of the special issue against its goals

We set ourselves three overarching questions for this special issue. In this section we discuss how the papers address these questions in turn. Firstly, interdisciplinary research in EMI can bring fresh insights and connect with new readerships by combining theoretical and methodological frameworks from multiple fields. For instance, De Soete's combination of a Goffmanian frame analysis from sociology and street-level bureaucracy from public administration highlights how EMI teachers navigate language policy in classroom interactions. While it might be argued that existing ethnographic applied linguistics approaches to language policy do similar work to reveal on-the-ground policy enactment, the borrowing of concepts from other disciplines serves to highlight affinities between EMI content

lecturers and other front-line public sector staff, be it teachers, police officers, social workers, and the challenges they face when having to enact state or institutional policies in their work. Such insights might inform and strengthen theoretical developments across applied linguistics, public administration and organisational sociology while also forging alliances between employees across public sector institutions who are faced with having to navigate sometimes contradictory policies imposed from above. Similarly, van den Hoven and Al Shemeili's interdisciplinary collaboration between academia and industry provides insights into how EMI aligns (or misaligns) with the communication needs in a nuclear power plant. The interdisciplinarity enables them to highlight practical gaps in EMI education for the workforce. At the same time, the authors' invocation of concepts from outside of applied linguistics, specifically, organisational studies and language education and leadership may be more likely to resonate with other scholars and practitioners, thus facilitating research uptake. In the longer term, enhanced interdisciplinary interaction could galvanise and strengthen collective worker resistance and also improve working conditions in increasingly economically rationalised workplaces, whether inside or beyond educational domains.

We proposed from the outset that interdisciplinarity in EMI research can be conceptualised as drawing from academic fields both *within* and *beyond* applied linguistics in order to understand and tackle the complex challenges posed by EMI. Many of our contributors enact interdisciplinarity by drawing on theories and concepts from outside of linguistics, e.g., de Soete's street-level bureaucracy from public administration, Altay's human capital theory from socioeconomics and Morton's Legitimation Code Theory from the sociology of education. Interdisciplinarity might also be conceptualised as collaboration across disciplinary boundaries, as in Hopkyns, Dillon and Piper's collaboration between an applied linguist, a media scholar and education scholar. A key benefit of interdisciplinary collaboration is that it fosters epistemic reflexivity, encouraging collaborators to question tacit assumptions about their field. This is clear from Hopkyns, Dillon and Piper's paper in which a concept such as translanguaging – now deeply ingrained in socio- and applied linguistic theory – can make inroads into the pedagogical practices of media and education scholars. This can serve to reinforce and theoretically validate their didactic approaches, perhaps reassuring these lecturers that irrespective of any English-only policy, the translanguaging practices in which they are already engaging are legitimate and beneficial for student learning. Engaging content lecturers in a more equitable co-creation of knowledge also facilitates a greater alignment with their concerns and a better capitalisation on their experiences, enhancing the prospects of research uptake.

The papers demonstrate how interdisciplinarity can make explicit the ideological, epistemological and ontological assumptions of EMI, enable new ques-

tions to be raised and answered, forge links with scholars in other disciplines and maximise the chances of EMI research being used in the real world. Each paper illustrates this in different ways. For instance, Altay's combination of human capital theory from socioeconomics and linguistic protectionism from sociolinguistics is reflected also in his data sampling and the inclusion of both private and public universities, which in turn is likely to influence what is found. While it is beyond the scope of Altay's study to address this, public and private universities may have different expectations upon them as regards graduate employability and serving the needs of the nation state. In other words, the interdisciplinarity framing shapes Altay's selection of data and participants as well as his findings. Similarly, despite Morton's paper calling for transcending interdisciplinarity, his drawing on Legitimation Code Theory from the sociology of education makes it into an example of interdisciplinary research itself. This gives the paper somewhat of a paradoxical inception feel, using interdisciplinarity to argue for a move beyond interdisciplinarity. Or perhaps, in line with Morton's framing, the paper draws upon an extrinsic epistemic resource to address its own challenges, which in this case concerns identity formation. We can leave that to the reader to discover and decide for themselves. Does EMI need to transcend interdisciplinarity, or does it thrive in the tension between borrowing external frameworks and addressing its own unique problems?

Conclusion and future research agenda

EMI has gained immense popularity over the past few decades – as a research field and as a policy priority. Because EMI is inextricably embedded in ongoing political, economic, social and educational restructurings at a global scale, it is essential that the field opens up and seeks to engage with other disciplines in order to make itself relevant and useful. This paper has suggested that, to date, interdisciplinarity in EMI has largely been conceptualised as occurring between fields *within* applied linguistics. The contributions in this issue seek to break beyond this by taking the first few steps towards interdisciplinarity *beyond* applied linguistics. We see this is a promising way forward for EMI, one that could significantly enhance understandings of our own field while also contributing to others. While advocating interdisciplinarity *beyond* applied linguistics, we are, at the same time, conscious of the challenges, and that there remain powerful structures that work to uphold and legitimise disciplinary boundaries. However, it is important to recognise that we do not see interdisciplinarity as a doing away with the disciplines. On the contrary, interdisciplinarity is only valuable and meaningful against a backdrop of the disciplines, which harbour in-depth knowledge,

skills and expertise. Rather, what we are advocating for in particular is how inter-disciplinarity can contribute to epistemic reflexivity by making EMI researchers more aware of the ontological and ideological premises that underpin our field and shape the questions asked and the answers found. In this regard, Morton's proposal to view EMI as an epistemic assemblage, a field that draws on resources from a range of disciplines to address its unique challenges seems a fruitful way forward.

Funding

Open Access publication of this article was funded through a Transformative Agreement with The Open University.

References

-  Alhassan, A., Bora, S. F., & Abdalla, Y. A. (2022). Collaboration with EAP teachers in English-medium instruction contexts in higher education: Content lecturer perspectives. *TESOL Journal*, 13(1), 1–15.
-  Beach, D., & Pedersen, R. B. (2019). *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines*. University of Michigan Press.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Open University Press.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bleiklie, I., Enders, J., Lepori, B., & Musselin, C. (2011). New public management, network governance and the university as a changing professional organisation. In T. Christensen & P. Laegreid (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to new public management* (pp. 161–176). Ashgate.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Polity Press.
- British Council, & Study Portals. (2024). *Mapping English-taught programmes in Europe: Europe's rising significance for international education*. British Council.
-  Broucker, B., De Wit, K., & Leisyste, L. (2016). Higher education reform: A systematic comparison of ten countries from a new public management perspective. In R. M. O. Pritchard, A. Pausits & J. Williams (Eds.), *Positioning higher education institutions: From here to there* (pp. 161–176). Springer.
-  Canaan, J. E., & Shumar, W. (2008). Higher education in the era of globalisation and neoliberalism. In J. E. Canaan & W. Shumar (Eds.), *Structure and agency in the neoliberal university* (pp. 1–28). Routledge.
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Consoli, S., & Ganassin, S. (2023). *Reflexivity in applied linguistics: Opportunities, challenges, and suggestions*. Routledge.

- doi Curle, S., Rose, H., & Yuksel, D. (2024). English medium instruction in emerging contexts: An editorial introduction to the special issue. *System*, 122, Article 103262.
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2023). *Researching English-medium higher education*. Routledge.
- doi Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2022). Cross-fertilisation, not bifurcation, of EMI and EAP. *ELT Journal*, 76(4), 538–546.
- doi Gazzola, M. (2012). The linguistic implications of academic performance indicators: General trends and case study. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2012(216), 131–156.
- doi Hultgren, A. K., & Wilkinson, R. (2022). New understandings of the rise of English as a medium of instruction in higher education: The role of key performance indicators and institutional profiling. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2022(277), 47–59.
- doi Hultgren, A. K., Nao, M., Wingrove, P., Yuksel, D., & Zuaro, B. (2023). New insights into the trend towards English as a medium of instruction in European higher education through transdisciplinary participation. In N. Hynninen, I. Herneaho, E. Sippola, J. Isosävi, & M. Yang (Eds.), *AFinLa Yearbook 2023*, 80, 318–331.
- Jantsch, E. (1972). Towards interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity in education and innovation. In L. Apostel (Ed.), *Interdisciplinarity: Problems of teaching and research in universities* (pp. 97–120). CERI/OEC.
- Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice*. Wayne State University Press.
- doi Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Fostering team teaching: Mapping out a research agenda for English-medium instruction at university level. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 400–416.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- doi Macaro, E., & Aizawa, I. (2022). Who owns English medium instruction? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–14. Advance online publication.
- Miller, R. (2020). Interdisciplinarity: Its meaning and consequences. *Oxford research encyclopedia of international studies*. Oxford University Press.
- doi Nao, M., Wingrove, P., Yuksel, D., Zuaro, B., & Hultgren, A. K. (2023). University autonomy and the increasing shift to English in academic programmes at European universities: In dialogue with Liviu Matei. *Sociolinguistica*, 37(2), 1–12.
- doi Pecorari, D., & Malmström, H. (2018). At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 497–515.
- doi Roelli, P. (2021). *Latin as the language of science and learning*. De Gruyter.
- Sandström, A.-M., & Carmen, N. (2017). English-taught bachelor's programmes: Internationalising European higher education. *The European Association for International Education*.
- doi Thomas, N., Hultgren, A. K., Zuaro, B., Yuksel, D., Wingrove, P., Nao, M., & Beach, D. (2024). Process tracing for applied linguistics. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), Article 100118.
- doi Van Parijs, P. (2020). Linguistic injustice for the sake of greater social justice: A response to Anna Kristina Hultgren. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(3), 175–178.

- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Lemmens.
- Weingart, P., & Stehr, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Practicing interdisciplinarity*. University of Toronto Press.
-  Wingate, U., & Hakim, A. (2022). Moving beyond “infancy”: Towards a cross-fertilisation between EMI and EAP scholarship. *ELT Journal*, 76(4), 529–537.
-  Wingrove, P., Zuaro, B., Yuksel, D., Nao, M., Littvay, L., & Hultgren, A. K. (2024). University autonomy is a predictor of English-medium instruction in European higher education. *Higher Education*. Advance online publication.
-  Yuksel, D., Nao, M., Wingrove, P., Zuaro, B., & Hultgren, A. K. (2024a). Systemic level language policy planning to promote and maintain EMI programmes in Turkish HE: A process tracing perspective. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Advance online publication.
- Yuksel, D., Wingrove, P., Nao, M., Zuaro, B., & Hultgren, A. K. (2024b). A critical approach to the rise of EMI: Why, how, and by whom are decisions made? In S. A. Mirhosseini & P. de Costa (Eds.), *Critical English medium instruction in higher education* (pp. 87–104). Cambridge University Press.
-  Zuaro, B., Yuksel, D., Wingrove, P., Nao, M., & Hultgren, A. K. (2024). The (in)justice of EMI: A critical discourse analysis of two key stakeholders’ views on the Polytechnic University of Milan court case. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 13(1), 29–49.

Öz (Turkish abstract)

Bu özel sayıya giriş makalemizde, öğretim dili olarak İngilizce (EMI) kullanılması ile ilgili çalışmalarda disiplinlerarasılığa yönelik bir çağrı yapmaktayız. Bu çalışmamızda ayrıca EMI’nin ancak yükseköğretimdeki daha geniş siyasi, ekonomik ve toplumsal olgularla bağlantısının anlaşılmasıyla doğru bir şekilde incelenebileceği ve karşılaşılan zorlukların üstesinden gelinebileceğini vurguluyoruz. Makalemiz, disiplinlerarasılığın bir sınıflandırmasını sunarak, uygulamalı dilbilim içinde ve ötesinde disiplinlerarasılık arasında bir ayrım yapmaktadır. Alan taramamız, şu ana kadar EMI’da en yaygın olan uygulamanın uygulamalı dilbilim içinde disiplinlerarasılık olduğunu göstermektedir. Özel sayımızdaki beş makalenin her birinin özetinin ardından, özel sayımızdaki hedeflerine ne ölçüde ulaştığını değerlendiriyoruz. Bu özel sayı, disiplinlerarasılığın önemini güçlü bir şekilde vurgularken, aynı zamanda gerçek bir disiplinlerarası çalışmanın zorluklarını kabul etmekte ve disiplin sınırlarını koruyan yapıları işaret etmektedir. Makale, öğretim dili olarak İngilizce alanında disiplinlerarasılığın geleceği için bazı öneriler sunarak, özellikle uygulamalı dilbilimin ötesine geçen disiplinlerarasılığın önemine vurgu yapmaktadır.

Address for correspondence

Dogan Yuksel
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics
Faculty of Wellbeing, Education and Language Studies
The Open University

dogan.yuksel@open.ac.uk

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9131-3907>

Co-author information

Anna Kristina Hultgren
The Open University

kristina.hultgren@open.ac.uk

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2379-1290> 

Beatrice Zuaro
The Open University

beatrice.zuaro@open.ac.uk

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1464-6614> 

Marion Nao

The Open University

marion.nao@open.ac.uk

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6300-4867>

Peter Wingrove

The Open University

peter.wingrove@open.ac.uk

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2733-0213>

Publication history

Date received: 15 November 2024

Date accepted: 27 November 2024

Published online: 7 January 2025