

DOES INTERNATIONALIZATION PROMOTE MULTILINGUALISM? A DUTCH UNIVERSITY STUDY

ROBERT WILKINSON

Maastricht University, Netherlands

Abstract. Internationalization has been a central concept in university strategic policy for several decades. Internationalization is often a key factor in both university rankings and accreditation processes. Many universities have recruited extensively students and staff globally as well as offering an international dimension within programmes. The upshot is that many university campuses are both multilingual and multicultural. However, policies to promote internationalization may lead to a context where the instructional language is English only. It is instructive to investigate how key actors perceive internationalization and its effects. Do they think it promotes monolingualism or multilingualism? This paper reports on a study into the attitudes of key staff in two faculties at a Dutch university as well as members of the central administration towards internationalization and language use. The results show that while most see internationalization as an unavoidable necessity, they subtly distance themselves from institutional policy and practice, implying a discrepancy between private and public attitudes. The internationalization policy does not stimulate multilingualism, but strengthens monolingualism. The study concludes that the educational system is missing out on the rich heteroglossic and cultural context afforded by internationalization, and suggests that a looser language policy may yield more elaborated learning outcomes.

Key words: internationalization, multilingualism, language policies in universities, global English, language in tertiary education

INTRODUCTION

Internationalization has long been a core concept in the strategic planning of universities, even if it has not always been clearly specified. It is in the nature of university scholars to communicate and collaborate with others in different countries, and of the institutions themselves to stimulate students to gather experience abroad. Over the past two or three decades internationalization has become a necessary component of university strategic policy, not least because of its inclusion in accreditation processes and university rankings (Altbach and Teichler, 2001; Qiang, 2003; Knight, 2008; Stromquist, 2007). Universities across the world have established internationalization policies (Callan, 2000; Bartell, 2003; Ritzen, 2004), some more elaborate than others. In her analysis of institutional internationalization policies, Knight (2008) notes that the policies may range from narrow (related to explicit statements of mission, purpose, values

and functions) to broad, which would include all statements and documents addressing ‘the implications *for* or *from* internationalization’ (ibid.: 36; Knight’s emphasis). In this approach, internationalization would permeate policy covering all aspects of the institution’s activities, such as quality assurance, recruitment, funding, admission, curriculum, research, student support, and many more.

An institution that takes a broader approach will inevitably encounter students and staff who speak languages other than the domestic language. In this case the domestic language may be taken to refer to the natural language that the institution uses for teaching and for its administration; in many cases, this will be the national language. It follows that decisions need to be made about the languages in which the teaching, including examinations, and administration may be conducted. Many universities have established language policies, which may be fairly brief or very extensive (e.g. Universitat Jaume I, Castellón, Spain), in order to regulate the functioning of the institution. There are a number of what we may call ‘natural’ bilingual or multilingual universities, where two or more languages co-exist in the local environment (e.g. the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, with German and French; the University of Bolzano, Italy, with Italian and German; or the University of the Basque Country, Spain, with Spanish and Basque). On the other hand, there are many other universities which provide many degree programmes not just in the local language but also in a language of wider dissemination, English, not to mention the conduct of research through English. Such institutions may also be termed ‘bilingual’, and the institution may or may not decide to educate students to become bilingual in both languages. The study of interest in this paper concerns a context where the institution defines itself as bilingual in that two languages function as instructional languages, and languages of administration, but where students are not being trained to be bilingual. As a whole, the study investigates perceptions of the terms ‘bilingual’ and ‘international’ and perceptions of language use in two faculties and in the central administration of a Dutch university. The design of the study and parts of the results were the subject of an earlier paper (Wilkinson, 2014), to which the present paper is complementary. This paper explores attitudes to ‘internationalization’ and ‘multilingualism’ under the research question: Does internationalization promote multilingualism?

BACKGROUND

Universities are not merely influenced by the processes of globalization but are also key protagonists in these same processes. Globalization is concerned with factors such as mobility, trade, migration, harmonization of rules, and rankings. Marginson (2009: 297) highlights five facets that characterize universities and their environments: mobility of people, ideas, messages, money and technologies; new forms of delivery; new strategies to secure global and local advantage; an ‘arms race’ in investments in innovation; and changes in student enrolments and research. At the same time, universities are driven to seek new sources of

funding as central state funding increasingly has limits. Moreover, they have to be accountable not just to the government and its ministries but also to the local and national community. Universities have become more competitive as they seek to attract new groups of students, typically from abroad, and talented academic staff worldwide. These factors and trends suggest that a university education is now a commodity, no different from any other economic activity (Teixeira, 2009).

Partly as a consequence of the changed socio-economic environment in higher education, universities have, in the past quarter of a century, embarked on an overt policy of internationalization, and begun offering programmes in languages other than the local languages, most commonly in English. This provision and the influx of students and staff from other countries have led universities to establish language policies, whether formal or tacit. The reasons for establishing the policies are various. While there are undoubtedly educational reasons too for establishing a language policy, for example examination regulation, it seems that non-educational reasons often predominate. Reasons may be economic (with respect to employability, cost-saving), political (concerning university profile and ranking), or socio-geographic (notably the university location, and migration, transient or otherwise). However, conflict avoidance and resolution may be a dominant reason especially in situations of multilingualism, via the regulation of multiple language use. If there is no language policy, then the resolution of language use may lead to the more powerful dominating, i.e. in simplistic terms languages with the 'bigger army' pushing out less powerful languages (cf. Phillipson, 2015; but compare Mufwene, 2005).

Internationalization at its simplest implies some kind of relation or link between two or more nations (Marginson, 2009). Knight (2008), most notably, has commented at length on internationalization and sees differences between how internationalization has been interpreted in higher education over the past 50–60 years. In the first decade of the 21st century, she observes three groups of factors being prominent in higher education institutions: mobility of students, research, programmes, and providers across borders; commercial and market-driven activities; and the growth of international academic networks (ibid.: 3) (see also the volume edited by Hultgren, Gregerson and Thørgersen, 2014). In addition, Knight (2008) summarizes other dominant characteristics of internationalization: courses and programmes that emphasize comparative and international themes; the development of intercultural and global competencies; extracurricular activities with an international or multicultural component; dedicated recruitment of foreign students and staff; the provision of joint or double degrees; the expansion of partnerships and franchises. Further, Marginson and Van der Wende (2007) detail how the universities have become the 'agents' of globalization. The authors restrict the connotation of 'internationalization' to exchanges between two or more units, where the fundamental national systems do not essentially change. 'Globalization' on the other hand covers a meshing of influences from many sources by which the national system is transformed.

There are many conflicting definitions of multilingualism. It may refer to the individual or the societal level. Individual multilingualism is linked to concepts of language and identity (Aronin and Singleton, 2012). The individual may be rated in terms of competence levels in his or her specific languages (e.g. via the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, Council of Europe, 2001). However, individual multilingual use tends to be pragmatic and it is result of an interaction between the user, the environment, and the languages. Aronin (2006) has referred to the concept of 'dominant language constellation', which has the role of meeting the communication and identity needs of the individual where languages are viewed as being inextricably linked and practically inseparable. Thus the multilingual individual freely 'code-meshes' (Canagarajah, 2006: 598) all the languages possessed without necessarily having to make distinctions between them; the languages merge as it were. In contrast, multilingualism may be seen at the societal level of the institution or the community. In this interpretation, many languages may be spoken, but only a limited number may be shared, but perhaps not by all members of the institution or community. The European Union distinguishes between multilingualism and plurilingualism, whereby the former refers to the societal level and the latter to the individual. With the aim of stimulating every European citizen to acquire 'meaningful competence' in two languages in addition to his or her mother tongue, the EU instigated an Action Plan (Holdsworth, 2004). However, such a stimulation to create a plurilingual Europe is not without criticism: Krzyżanowski and Wodak (2011) have concluded that the EU language and multilingual policy aiming at an additive approach has failed to address the implications and perceptions of multilingualism. Canagarajah (2009) focuses on an integrated approach to plurilingualism. Language competences do not reside in one language, in that proficiency is not conceptualized individually by language. Rather one should look at the complete repertoire of language in the individual; different languages together constitute an integrated competence (see also Wang et al., 2014).

At the institutional level, there are many forces affecting multilingualism in the university, some positively, other negatively. The transient migration of international students and the mix of other cultures and other languages ought to have a positive effect on university multilingualism, but the very transient nature of much mobility may conversely have a negative impact as it can stimulate a monolingual learning context, and even a monolingual social context, as students communicate in the language they share. The university's environment may also have promoting effects, depending on regional and national policies that stimulate mobility and inward investment from international firms. However, as with student mobility, so inward investment and recruitment may lead to functioning in a shared language, typically a widely spoken language like English. The make-up and balance of ethnicities in the local community could also be a positive force for multilingualism. However, prevailing attitudes may lead to the potential for multilingualism being ignored. Thus, despite there being many

factors of internationalization within the institution and the local community that could promote multilingualism, in practice the use of one language may appear to simplify internationalization. A single common language, such as English, can therefore become attractive for a university, and the use of other languages can be downplayed. It would seem to a potential scenario for many areas in Europe, such as the Baltic region.

In theory, a multicultural, multilingual university would, from an educational perspective, offer programmes in several languages and provide conditions for learning in different academic cultures. In practice, such a university is likely to opt for control of potential conflict and offer programmes in only the dominant local language and/or a language of wider dissemination, English. One single academic culture will dominate, usually the local one. Thus, from a politico-economic perspective, multilingual opportunities may be spurned.

However, the notion of a single dominant language – and culture – hides what may actually happen in practice (cf. Cornips, 2013a). Actors in communicative encounters may use a variety of languages and dialects depending on participants. The language used may depend on what Van Parijs (2002, 2004) has called the ‘maximin’ principle. Linguistic asymmetry affects the language used in multilingual contexts. The starting point is unequal linguistic endowment, which makes it easier or more difficult for someone to acquire one or more languages or variants. Somewhat simplified, it might ‘cost’ a speaker of French more to speak Dutch than English, and similarly for a speaker of Dutch to speak French rather than English, even if both speakers can speak the other person’s language. Thus they choose English in their encounter. The larger the group of speakers, the greater the possibilities for variation in language use, but the greater the chance speakers opt for the least worst common language. In Van Parijs’s terms, learning a language involves opportunity costs. For some speakers, the benefits are greater than for others, and the costs may be higher or lower. The linguistic costs are less for a speaker of a ‘dominant’ language (e.g. English) than for a speaker of a ‘dominated’ one. The imbalance between the current globally dominant language, English, and other languages, which are dominated, is seen by many as a real problem of ‘inequality of power’ (Van Hoorde, 2014: 10–11; see also Phillipson, 2003).

From a theoretical perspective, then, we may see internationalization as a process that may promote or hinder multilingualism. An institutional language policy, as an element in internationalization, will regulate language use. In an earlier paper Wilkinson (2014) noted ambivalence in the perception of language policy. It was largely seen as a top-down process, which actors in the institution were obliged to implement, but they could not be considered as having bought into the process or implementation. This paper looks at perceptions of internationalization and multilingualism at a Dutch university with a view to elucidating whether respondents perceive internationalization as promoting or hindering multilingualism.

METHOD

The study investigated perceptions related to internationalization and language use (multilingualism) at a Dutch university, Maastricht University that has officially adopted an institutional bilingual policy. The study was qualitative and comprised interviews with selected matched respondents from two faculties, the Medical School (MS) and the School of Business and Economics (SBE), in addition to three members of the central university administration including a member of the Executive Board. The faculties were selected as representing principally Dutch-medium education (MS) and English-medium (SBE). In effect, the faculties represent the two ends of a continuum of Dutch- and English-medium instruction at the university.

Four participants from the faculties were carefully selected to ensure balanced representation: the faculty director or dean, a senior teacher, an educationalist, and a student officer of the relevant study association. They were approached via email or telephone and asked for their willingness to participate in the interviews. In addition, three officers of the university's central administration were interviewed, a member of the Executive Board, an officer in charge of internationalization policy, and an officer in charge of human resources policy. Six respondents were female. All participants except the students had at least 15 years of experience in higher education, with one member of the central administration having slightly fewer years of experience. Each had held their jobs for a considerable time, the faculty director, dean, and Executive Board member for at least two years, the two central officers for at least six years, the educationalists for at least 15, and the senior teachers (a physiologist and an economist) for at least eight years. The student participants were in their third or fourth year. Eight of the interviewees spoke Dutch as their first language, and the others German. It is assumed that the matched respondents approach enabled a representative balance to be achieved in the small groups of respondents that it was feasible to interview. All respondents consented to the study in the knowledge that information given in the interviews may be disclosed in publications on condition of anonymity. For this reason further demographic details may not be disclosed.

The study adopted a qualitative design (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011), using semi-structured interviews, and has been described elsewhere (Wilkinson, 2014). The approach was similar to that used by Studer, Kreislermaier and Flubacher (2010). However, while they concentrated on the analysis of the attitudes of European Union policy-makers to language policy by analysing in 'detail' two extracts as examples of 'typical policy-making behaviour' (Studer et al., 2010: 261), this paper focuses on gathering a broader spectrum of opinion from the participants. In brief, the participants were interviewed following a semi-structured interview protocol. Each interview lasted between 30 minutes and one hour, and was subsequently transcribed similarly to conventions in Studer et al. (see Appendix). The questions required the interviewees to respond to questions under six topic

areas: bilingualism/multilingualism and internationalization, language policy, strategic policy, language use, quality of education, and personal perceptions. The protocol for the interviews allowed the order of questions to be changed so that a normal conversation could ensue as far as possible, enabling additional follow-up questions to be asked if necessary. All interviews were conducted in English. This paper reports on responses to questions under ‘internationalization’ and ‘language use (multilingualism)’ and contrasts teacher and student responses with those of the Executive Board. As such, it forms a parallel study to that reported in Wilkinson (2014).

RESULTS

1 INTERNATIONALIZATION

The interviewees characterized internationalization at the university by highlighting different aspects. The view from the management (Executive Board, MS dean and SBE faculty director) emphasizes concepts that chime with those mentioned by Marginson and Van der Wende (2007) and Knight (2008): ‘an international classroom’, ‘different nationalities different backgrounds different cultures different religions’, ‘also different languages’, ‘international staff’, ‘native speakers of English’ (Respondent 1, see Appendix for elucidation of respondents’ positions), ‘an international perspective in research and education’, ‘international partners’ (4) ‘an international community’, ‘preparing for an international career’ (8). The teaching staff see internationalization rather differently. The MS teacher is more practical: ‘how to deal with people from other nationalities, so more intercultural aspects and knowledge about international health care systems’ (6), while the SBE teacher does not react favourably: ‘it’s part of the order of the institution’s policy but it’s not something that rings any particular positive bell’ (10). The MS educationalist emphasizes the usefulness of the resources: ‘all kinds of cases literature or inside information about certain regions in the world’ (5). Internationalization thus conveys for the respondents a range of concepts as well as practices.

Respondents in management positions identified themselves closely with the policy of the university. This is most noticeable in their use of ‘we’ or ‘I’. This suggests that the management feels ownership of the policy, such as the representative of the Executive Board:

[...] we strive to create a university with an international classroom [...] consist[ing] of students from different nationalities, different backgrounds, different cultures, different religions, if you want to, and also different languages. And that’s especially in a system of problem-based learning that they can put in all their own experiences and ideas how to solve problems, with their own cultural or other background, which is in my opinion very useful in our system. (1)

Both the MS dean and the SBE faculty director choose 'we': 'we deal with problems that are global' (4). While these respondents occasionally use 'you' in a more general, formulaic way, it is very noticeable that the teaching staff hold divergent perceptions. The SBE senior teacher feels forced into internationalization:

Personally I am the exact opposite of being international. I'm a provincialist. [...] My role in this whole thing is a bit like that of a teetotaler who under pressure of the social services has to work in a bar. (10)

Similarly, the MS teacher comments on the implementation of internationalization in the Medical School: 'that's a painful topic for some. [...] it caused a lot of resistance, [...] it came to us from top-down' (6). It is clear that these respondents feel that their opinions (and perhaps that of their colleagues too) have not been taken into account in the internationalization. Indeed, the SBE teacher goes on to claim: 'this whole idea that international mindset thing we have to think about [...] this is complete nonsense. We are talking about principles here which are not in any way dependent on nationality' (10). What is striking is the difference in the use of 'we' in this instance. The respondent is signalling that the group of teachers share a similar view. This can be seen as a 'we' of resistance, in contrast to the 'we' of ownership among the management respondents. Despite the longevity of internationalization in the SBE, the policy seems interpreted very much as imposed, just as in the MS. However, the MS teacher does recognize that being international entails more than simply presenting 'the Dutch side of the medical systems', and that it requires training the medical students how to deal with people of different nationalities.

The student respondents seem more pragmatic. The MS student perceives the current medical programme as not international, 'it's bilingual but it's not international' (7). The SBE student similarly expects an international university to be one where 'I can meet people from all over the world' (11), but, despite the university's claims, 'forty percent will be Germans, forty percent will be Dutch and twenty percent from another country French Belgian [...] very few will come from really abroad' (11). In the eyes of the students there is a mismatch between the university's external presentation and their experiential perception.

If this sample is representative, it shows that the internationalization policy does not attune with the attitudes of many of the university actors. There is a degree of reluctant commitment but it is accompanied by passive resistance. Students would like clarity.

2 LANGUAGE USE: MULTILINGUALISM

From the management perspective, the policy is bilingual, Dutch and English: 'We use both languages' (1), but the Executive Board representative interprets this at an institutional level. He rejects the idea that students should be competent in Dutch and English, thus excluding the promotion of individual bilingualism among the students as a goal of the educational programmes. Somewhat

similarly, the MS dean argues in favour of having two separate tracks in medicine (in Dutch and in English). He sees it as 'on the one hand our chance for survival, on the other hand our chance to develop a truly unique profile' (4). Although he welcomes a degree of switching between the programmes, it is not an explicit goal that students should become bilingual. It is noticeable that the respondents do not address the fact that many students will have to be functionally competent already in two or more languages (Dutch, English and their mother tongue if it is not either of these). Instead, the SBE faculty director notes a community-building effect of using a single common language, English:

I think it's very convenient to have English as a common language where [...] almost everyone has difficulties to communicate in, and ok that's also a kind of binding factor I guess. It's difficult for the Germans, but also for the French, and also for the Dutch, but ok that the leverage [*sic*] playing field for everybody. (8)

She comments further that the gradual expansion of EMI programmes led to 'a whole stage of implementation that forced us into, well, have an English organization', that is 'an organization where English was also the language of instruction and communication' (8). Thus, the EMI programmes have engendered a largely monolingual faculty.

The SBE teacher is more forthright on this process and emphasizes how the faculty's English monolingualism obliges the staff to be bilingual:

We're no longer bilingual now. We only use English, which means that the institution is monolingual or whatever it might be called, er, and since most employees are obviously not native speakers, the monolinguality of the institution requires bilingualism on the side of the staff members. (10)

Little overt attempt is made to access the knowledge that staff members possess of or in other languages. 'In such conditions the Dutch are, well, quite easy to abandon the use of the Dutch language and, well, of necessity use English' (10).

The MS teacher similarly sees her faculty as monolingual, in this case in Dutch: 'I would think that we are not bilingual, we don't we don't present it like that to the students. Bilingual means that you use two languages' (6). Moreover, she hopes the school will remain monolingual in Dutch: 'I don't think that we will change into an English school' (6).

The students take a more pragmatic view of language usage in and around their studies. For the medical student, it is not practical to have more of the programme in English since medical students in practice and doctors have to communicate mainly in Dutch. Even if all the information is in English, 'you have to explain it in Dutch, so I don't think it's really possible to have more English.' (7) The SBE student, however, recognizes problems among the different language groups in his faculty, and would like to see more mixing, socially as well as professionally:

One of the basic problems that happen everywhere you go that people of the same language stick together, the Dutch stick together, the Germans stick together, the Francophone people stick together, and a few internationals stick together, so it's quite quite tricky to mix those groups which what would be really beneficial for everyone. (11)

He notes that many students prefer to improve their French or their Spanish, rather than learn Dutch. He regrets the negligible attention paid to other languages than English.

Assuming the sample is representative, the study shows that the institution which has an official bilingual policy does not in fact stimulate multilingualism under its internationalization process. The role for language is not foremost in the thinking. The perception is that if a programme is in Dutch, then students will naturally develop their Dutch, although in general most students would be considered native speakers of Dutch or the equivalent. Similarly, if a programme is in English, everything would be expected to be managed in English, and the use of other languages is scarcely taken into account. In the SBE, strong efforts encourage 'maintaining English as the lingua franca in and around the classroom' (Swaan, 2014). This effectively discourages the use of other languages even if it has the laudable goal of preventing the social exclusion of students who do not come from the principal language groups represented in the school. According to its strategic plan, the SBE does oblige most students to spend a semester abroad where they would encounter the opportunity to develop other language skills (Online 1).

Nevertheless, as Cornips (2013b) has noted, there is widespread recognition that people do speak other languages in many practical contexts, including the local dialect (see also Lasagabaster, 2015a). What speakers say they do or would like to do in different contexts may differ from what they actually do in practice. Despite English being perceived as level playing field (according to the SBE director, 8), each participant in the educational encounter will have made different investments, more or less costly, and the costs could be higher for speakers from minoritized groups (Van Parijs, 2004).

DISCUSSION

The respondents in this study reveal differing opinions about internationalization. The management takes ownership of the process and sees it as a necessity for the ongoing development of the university, even for survival reasons (Wilkinson, 2013), while the academic staff interviewed are more circumspect. There is a feeling of coercion into an internationalization policy that they see the merits of, but they do not feel fully consulted about what is to them a top-down decision. Students on the other hand would like to see a more international university. The external presentation of the university as international generates a more intercultural and more multilingual picture than is the case in reality.

The internationalization policy does not promote bilingualism or multilingualism among staff or students, even though in practice both groups may be obliged to function in what is to them a second or additional language, English. There seems to be an inherent risk in an internationalization policy that does not have the full commitment of the staff and students.

The language policy of the university (Maastricht University, 2013), as part of its internationalization strategy, does not aim to develop multilingual competences among the staff and students. It does advocate though that where appropriate, students should have access to training in other languages, in particular in preparation for traineeships. However, as Cornips (2013b) has mentioned, people use the language they feel most suitable for the situation. They may well, albeit without being fully aware of it, assess the context using some approximation of Van Parijs's (2004) 'maximin' principle, and moreover are highly prone to engaging in 'code-meshing'. While institutional language policies may be necessary for regulating certain administrative functions of the university, the language of examination or the linguistic competences specified in recruitment, it seems that too rigidly elaborating a policy may instead preclude actors in the institutional environment from making the best use of their available linguistic resources. Language policies may indeed not take account of the practicalities of day-to-day language use (Kuteeva and Airey, 2014). A flexible approach to practical language use accords with the opinion voiced in Van Hoorde (2014) about the Dutch stance towards languages, especially in higher education. The Dutch on the whole have a relaxed attitude to the dominant use of English, and do not see it as threatening the position of Dutch. However, there is concern about the potential effect of 'English only' (Phillipson, 2003), and that a policy of multiple language use, plurilingualism, is preferred by the Nederlands Taalunie (Dutch Language Union) (Van Hoorde, 2014). The Nederlands Taalunie recommends a policy of language complementarity, Dutch and English, in higher education, where 'no language, not even English, is entitled to replace all other languages in all possible communicative situations' (Van Hoorde, 2015: 255). Nevertheless, detailed institutional language policies may have a similar perverse effect to the European Union's Erasmus programme or the Bologna process in that they all reinforce the strength of a dominant language. They do little to address the inequities of power in communicative transactions. In contrast, it may be more beneficial to view language competences from a broader perspective as being comprised of a plurilingual mesh of all the languages a speaker possesses (cf. Canaragarah, 2009). With such an approach, institutional language policy could be 'loose', to the extent that considerable freedom may be permitted in the languages each participant chooses to use, enabling teaching and learning to evolve in heteroglossic multilingualism (Lasagabaster, 2015b). It may be that heteroglossic multilingualism could stimulate more elaborated learning outcomes, although such a hypothesis requires investigation.

In some respects, the university has recognized aspects of inequity in the present language use in its educational context. For several years the institution

has offered basic Dutch to all incoming full-time bachelor's students for free (Online 2). However, questions have been raised about discrimination against Dutch students who make up about half the university's student population. There has been no equivalent language offer to the local students. Now the Executive Board has authorized the provision of free German courses for Dutch students (L. Soete, personal communication, 2 November 2015; Online 2), and the provision may be extended to other languages. Nevertheless, such a policy does not address the fundamental inequities in a context where English is the principal medium of instruction. If the introduction of 'free Dutch' was intended as a proactive policy to encourage at least some of the incoming students from abroad to seek employment in the Netherlands (a kind of 'brain gain', Stark, Helmenstein and Prskawetz, 1997), the policy of 'free German' may, conceivably, be construed as an incentive to stimulate Dutch students to migrate to Germany, or at least to work with German firms. Unlike the case with the Dutch provision, the level at which free German courses are given is 'advanced', which is clearly aimed at enhancing the chances of employment in a specific discipline in that language. Further free provision of German, and potentially other languages, may be at a low level ('basic'). Although English may be accepted as a necessary competence for not only international but also national employment today, and thus a higher education institution could be considered as remiss if it failed to enhance its graduates' employability, that same institution would also be remiss if it provided its education only in English and failed to open up insights into challenges the world faces that derive from the perceptions of these challenges through other languages and cultures.

This study is naturally subject to limitations in that it comprises a small qualitative survey. Generalizations therefore can only be drawn advisedly. Nevertheless, the implications may well have relevance in other institutions including those in regions like the Baltic. Secondly, it concerns only two faculties, albeit one being largely Dutch-medium, the other almost completely English-medium. It would be interesting to investigate other faculties, especially those with a mix of Dutch- and English-medium programmes. Similarly, it would be instructive to investigate the perceptions of the concepts among staff and students at other institutions. Thirdly, the interviews were conducted in English. It would be enlightening to see if different outcomes ensued if interviews were conducted under a heteroglossic multilingual approach.

CONCLUSIONS

This interview study shows that an internationalization policy leading to the use of a single dominant language does not carry the support of all members at the Dutch university under study. While the academic staff acquiesce to the use of the dominant language, English, and indeed recognize the value of teaching through English, the conclusion is that not everything need be conducted through that language, just as in Dutch programmes not everything is carried out

in Dutch. This presents a dilemma for policymakers regarding the extent to which it is feasible to specify language policy in practice. Hence, this paper concludes with a preference for a 'loose' language policy. It is likely that other institutions in other countries which face similar challenges of internationalization are confronted with the same dilemma.

Yet, if internationalization is limited only to non-transformative exchanges between a university and entities outside, then a rigid bilingual or multilingual language policy may suffice. Essentially the institutional system engages with the international, but it does not undergo any transformative change. If on the other hand the institutional system opts to entertain globalization and is willing to undertake any changes that ensue in its desire to extract benefits from globalization, then that should include a willingness to take a less rigid approach to its linguistic environment. This means that it should be ready to accommodate the diversity of languages and cultures that will come, and dispense with a policy of English-only.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is most grateful to the editor and the reviewers for their most useful comments and insights, which have helped improve this paper.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G. and Teichler, U. (2001) Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5 (1): 5–25.
- Aronin, L. (2006) Dominant language constellations: An approach to multilingualism studies. In M. Ó Laoire (ed.) *Multilingualism in educational settings* (pp. 140–159). Hohengehren: Schneider Publications.
- Aronin, L. and Singleton, D. (2012) *Multilingualism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bartell, H. (2003) Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45: 43–70.
- Callan, H. (2000) Higher education internationalization strategies: Of marginal significance or all pervasive? The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25 (1): 15–23.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006) The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57 (4): 586–619.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2009) The plurilingual tradition and the English in language in South Asia. In L. Lim and E. L. Low (eds.) *Multilingual, Globalizing Asia: Implications for Policy and Education* (pp. 5–22). *AILA Review* 22.
- Cornips, L. (2013a) Taalcultuur: Talen in beweging [Language culture: Languages in motion]. *Taal en Tongval*, 65 (2): 125–147.
- Cornips, L. (2013b, 16 March) 'English unless ...' Column: Taalcultuur [Language culture]. *De Limburger*.
- Council of Europe (2001) *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hennink, M., Hutter, I. and Bailey, A. (2011) *Qualitative Research Methods*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Holdsworth, P. (2004) EU policy on language learning and linguistic diversity as it relates to content and language integrated learning and higher education. In R. Wilkinson (ed.) *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenge of a multilingual higher education* (pp. 20–27), Maastricht: Universitair Pers Maastricht.
- Hultgren, A. K., Gregersen, F. and Thørgersen, J. (eds.) (2014) *English in Nordic Universities: Ideologies and Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Knight, J. (2008) *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Krzyżanowski, M. and Wodak, R. (2011) Political strategies and language policies: The European Union Lisbon strategy and its implications for the EU's language and multilingualism policy. *Language Policy*, 10 (2): 115–136.
- Kuteeva, M. and Airey, J. (2014) Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education*, 67: 533–549.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2015a) Multilingual language policy: Is it becoming a misnomer at university? In S. Dimová, A. K. Hultgren and C. Jensen, (eds.) *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education* (pp. 115–134). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2015b) Language policy and language choice at European universities: Is there really a choice? *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, DOI 10.1515/eujal-2014-0024.
- Maastricht University (2013) Language proficiency at Maastricht University. Policy note on the contribution of languages to functioning in an international environment. [Final report, internal report, 6 September]. Maastricht University, Language Policy Working Party.
- Marginson, S. (2009) The external dimension: Positioning the European higher education area in the global higher education world. In B. M. Kehm, J. Huisman and B. Stensaker (eds.) *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a Moving Target* (pp. 297–321). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Marginson, S. and Van der Wende, M. (2007) *Globalisation and Higher Education*. OECD Education Working Papers No. 8. Paris: OECD.
- Mufwene, S. S. (2005) Globalization and the myth of killer languages: What's really going on? *Perspectives on Endangerment 2*.
- Phillipson, R. (2003) *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (2015) English as a threat or opportunity in European higher education. In S. Dimová, A. K. Hultgren and C. Jensen (eds.) *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education* (pp. 19–42). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Qiang, Z. (2003) Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Higher Education*, 1 (2): 248–270.
- Ritzen, J. (2004) Across the bridge: Towards an international university. In R. Wilkinson (ed.) *Integrating Content and Language: Meeting the Challenge of a Multilingual Higher Education* (pp. 28–40). Maastricht: Universitair Pers Maastricht.
- Stark, O., Helmenstein, C. and Prskawetz, A. (1997) A brain gain with a brain drain. *Economics Letters*, 55: 227–234.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2007) Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, 53: 81–105.
- Studer, P., Kreisellaier, F. and Flubacher, M.-C. (2010) Language planning in the European Union: A micro-level perspective. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 2 (2): 251–270.

- Swaan, W. (2014) International classroom development: Implementation of an integral programme in Maastricht's School of Business and Economics. Maastricht University: School of Business & Economics. [Dutch version published in A. van Gaalen, H. J. Hobbes, S. Roodenburg and R. Gieleesen (2014) *Studenten Internationaliseren in Eigen Land* [*Students Internationalizing in their own Country*] (pp. 35–39). The Hague: Nuffic. Available from <https://www.nuffic.nl/bibliotheek/studenten-internationaliseren-in-eigen-land.pdf>].
- Teixeira, P. (2009) Economic imperialism and the ivory tower: Some reflections upon the funding of higher education in the EHEA (2010–2020). In B. M. Kehm, J. Huisman and B. Stensaker (eds.) *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a Moving Target* (pp. 43–60). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Van Hoorde, J. (2014) Competing, complementary or both? English as a lingua franca, and the position of Dutch. *Sociolinguistica*, 28 (1): 9–24.
- Van Hoorde, J. (2015) Dutch or English? English and Dutch! The language shift in tertiary education and science in the Dutch language area. In G. Stickel and C. Robustelli (eds.) *Language Use in University Teaching and Research* (pp. 245–259). Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.
- Van Parijs, Ph. (2002) Linguistic justice. *Politics, Philosophy and Economics*, 1 (1): 59–74.
- Van Parijs, Ph. (2004) Europe's linguistic challenge. *European Journal of Sociology*, 45 (01): 113–154.
- Wang, X., Spotti, M., Juffermans, K. C. P., Kroon, J. W. M., Cornips, L. and Blommaert, J. M. E. (2014) Globalization in the margins: Toward a re-evaluation of language and mobility. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5 (1): 23–44.
- Wilkinson, R. (2013) English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, and J. M. Sierra (eds.) *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges* (pp. 3–24). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Wilkinson, R. (2014) Contrasting attitudes towards a bilingual language policy under internationalization. *Fachsprache*, 36 (1–2): 11–30.

INTERNET SOURCES

- 1) Available from <http://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/web/Faculties/SBE/Theme/AboutTheSchool/MissionStrategy.htm> [Accessed 6 October 2015].
- 2) Available from <http://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/web/Languages/LanguageCourses.htm> [Accessed 12 November 2015].

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTION GUIDELINES

Spelling:	UK spelling (Oxford)
Punctuation:	Full stops/periods inserted where an utterance marks a sentence end. Commas inserted for reading ease if necessary.
Q	Interviewer
A	Interviewee
(...)	Brief hesitations or silences
[...]	Text omission
[word]	Addition for clarity
([Number])	Interviewee identifier

- 1 Executive Board
- 2 Central University Officer
- 3 Central University Officer
- 4 Medical School Dean
- 5 Medical School Educationalist
- 6 Medical School Teacher
- 7 Medical School Student Representative
- 8 School of Business & Economics Director
- 9 School of Business & Economics Educationalist
- 10 School of Business & Economics Teacher
- 11 School of Business & Economics Student Representative

Robert Wilkinson has now retired from Maastricht University, Netherlands. His research interests include the language of instruction and language policy. Email: bob.wilkinson2010@gmail.com