



A STUDY ON THE FACTORS BEHIND BILINGUAL POLICY PROMOTION WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION IN TAIWAN

Wen-Wen Cheng¹, Yao Tang²

¹*Doctoral Candidate, Institute of Education, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan*

²*Professor, Institute of Education, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan*

Abstract

This paper aims to examine the ongoing bilingual policy promoted in higher education in Taiwan by exploring the important factors that might affect the promotion of the policy. After using literature review method to explore key factors affecting bilingual policy implementation in higher education, a group of 15 distinguished experts in the fields of language education, EMI promotion centers and in bilingual education policy implementation were assembled to form an expert panel. Leveraging the collective expertise and diverse perspectives of the panelists, the study conducted a questionnaire survey to collect the data. The results show five main categories of factors related to the implement of Bilingual Policy, namely “administrative support”, “school environment and resources”, “curriculum and instruction”, “student learning” and “local linkage”. Among the five categories, “administrative support” has the highest expert consensus of importance in terms of promoting Bilingual Policy, followed by “student learning”, “curriculum and instruction”, “school environment and resources” and “local linkage”. Experts’ comments and suggestions are also discussed.

Keywords

Bilingual Policy, EMI, Higher Education, Expert Panel

Introduction

The background of implementing bilingual policy in Taiwan

Globalization has had a tremendous impact on various aspects of the economy, politics, and education. Due to the dramatic changes in international situations such as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and Russia-Ukraine war, the complex relationships between countries, involving both cooperation and competition, have deepened. Language communication ability plays a crucial role in achieving common goals and conducting negotiations and consultations, and language education serves as the medium for developing this ability. Based on the international trends and socio-economic demands, Taiwan formulated *2030 Bilingual Policy* (Executive Yuan, 2018) in 2018 from promoting bilingualism on the nationwide efforts to raise English proficiency level of the public and improve their overall competitiveness. More specifically, *2030 Bilingual Policy* is an “international language policy” or “English language policy” and English is the foreign language promoted in the bilingual policy, while the other language is Mandarin Chinese. Apart from being an important working language in many international organizations, English also plays a significant role in international exchanges and academic achievements (Ardasheva et al., 2012; Rukh, 2014), legitimizing its status in various competitive fields. Considering that universities are not only bastions of academia but also crucial educational stages for most students before they enter the workforce, the language education reform propelled by the bilingual policy in higher education holds profound and far-reaching implications. Since the goal of the bilingual policy in higher education is the internationalization of teaching, namely, using English as a medium of instruction (EMI), the issues related to promoting EMI effectively should be considered.

EMI promoted in higher education in Taiwan

EMI has become increasingly common around the world, especially in higher education institutions and international schools, and it’s an important indicator of the internationalization of higher education. According to

Wachter & Maiworm (2014), EMI courses in both undergraduate and graduate programs at universities in Europe have grown tenfold from 2001 to 2014. Asian countries such as Korea (Williams, 2015), Vietnam (Nguyen et al., 2017) and Thailand (Bolton et al., 2023) also promoted EMI in higher education for internationalization and economic trade. Since 2006, EMI has been promoted in higher education through various projects and policies in Taiwan (Ministry of Education, 2006, 2016, 2021). However, the main purpose of EMI courses promoted in these projects or policies has been to attract foreign students to study in Taiwan, as well as domestic students who intend to become exchange students or pursue studies abroad. Therefore, EMI courses were seldom taken by general students. In light of the trend toward English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), the Ministry of Education (2021) aligned itself with the implementation of the bilingual policy and launched the “Program on Bilingual Education for Students in College” (BEST program) in higher education. The goal of the program is to promote EMI, improve and strengthen students' English proficiency, and enhance the international competitiveness of higher education as a whole. In terms of selected and funded universities and colleges, the expected outcomes of 4 beacon universities and 41 beacon colleges by 2030 would be at least 50% of sophomore students' English Proficiency achieving CEFR B2 (Council of Europe, 2020) and above and at least 50% of credits taken from EMI courses completed by 50% of sophomore students and first-year master's students (Ministry of Education, 2021, p.46). As for generalized enhancement, the expected outcomes of 37 universities would be at least those universities achieving 80% and above of the English courses adopting EMI and at least 10% sophomore students and first-year master's students completing two EMI courses by 2030 (Ministry of Education, 2021, p.47). Under the framework of Bilingual policy, BEST program would gradually transform the language of instruction, curriculum design and teaching and learning environment for universities (Ministry of Education, 2021).

The challenges of Bilingual Policy in higher education in Taiwan

As mentioned above, the objectives of Bilingual Policy in higher education are to promote EMI, improve and strengthen students' English proficiency, and enhance the overall international competitiveness of higher education. However, according to the survey conducted on 15 universities by British Council and the Ministry of Education in Taiwan in 2020, the findings revealed some difficulties for implementing Bilingual Policy in higher education (Ministry of Education, 2021). The first difficulty was that most universities and colleges failed to set precise guidelines for policy implementation and lack more EMI resource inputs and professional consultation from experts. The second difficulty resulted from no dedicated offices for overall planning and proper arrangement. Furthermore, though EMI is the target promoted in the Bilingual Policy, majority of the universities and colleges didn't have any placement test for their students before admission and had no clear idea about their English proficiency level or provide structured language support for students such as basic language proficiency training for speaking and writing, language consulting systems or English for Academic Purposes courses (EAP). The difficulty regarding teacher supply was the limited support for potential EMI teachers and over-dependence on new teachers or foreign teachers for EMI courses. To summarize, the challenges are from administrative support, curriculum planning, student learning, EMI teacher manpower and EMI support system, which would hinder the implementation of the Bilingual Policy in higher education.

The measurement of implementing Bilingual Policy in higher education in Taiwan

Implementing Bilingual Policy comprehensively in Taiwan requires time and effort and it's a complex issue, especially when it comes to higher education. Bilingual Policy has been implemented for three years, the existing conditions such as the resources invested in curriculum, manpower, school environment and equipment differ among universities and the funding is only provided to the selected universities and colleges. Moreover, any issues related to the education stakeholders engaging in bilingual policy such as teachers, students, and school administrators are still discussed and in progress. To explore and measure the factors that might affect the policy implementation during process would be beneficial and necessary. Therefore, to sort out the factors that affect the promotion of language policy from the literature and evaluate the importance of the factors would be the focus of the study.

Literature Review

To implement bilingual policy effectively, it's crucial to understand why, what and how to promote the policy. Bilingual policies are adopted by countries for various reasons, including preserving cultural identity and heritage (Jones, 2017; Cenoz, 2012; Nelde, 1997), accommodating linguistic diversity (Latoomaa & Nuolijärvi, 2002; Nelde, 1997; Norrigård & Nylund, 2022; Saarinen & Rontu, 2018; Singapore Government Agency, n.d.), enhancing communication in an increasingly globalized world (Cifuentes et al., 2017; Singapore Government Agency, n.d.), and trade (Cifuentes et al., 2017; Singapore Government Agency, n.d.). Unlike the preservation of cultural identity or accommodation of linguistic diversity in some countries, the goal of bilingual policy in Taiwan is to enhance English communication ability of the citizens as a whole, especially to help boost young people's global competitiveness (National Development Council, n.d.). According to the goal of BEST program in higher

education under Bilingual Policy in Taiwan, (Ministry of Education, 2021), key performance indicators are classified as seven categories, including overall, organization, teacher manpower, curriculum and instruction, student learning, resource sharing and universities features. For “overall”, promotion strategies, ways of implementation, complementary measures and financial subsidies are covered. “Organization” includes establishing dedicated units, providing assistance for developing EMI, and administrative support. “Teacher manpower” focuses on teacher recruitment for local teachers and foreign teachers, and teaching assistant training. “Curriculum and instruction” contain EMI courses and international courses. “Student learning” includes students’ English ability, EMI course credits, and English proficiency certificate. “Resource sharing” covers the issues of EMI teaching consulting, learning guidance, and online course modules. “Universities features” encompasses the essential characteristics of different universities and colleges and connecting local resources with the universities and colleges. As the bilingual policy in higher education in Taiwan constitutes a comprehensive language education reform, encompassing English language education, EMI promotion, and internationalization, it is essential to investigate not only the performance indicators used to measure expected outcomes but also the key factors associated with these issues both before and during policy implementation.

The factors affecting bilingual policy implementation

The bilingual policy promoted in higher education in Taiwan is an “English language policy” and a language education reform (National Development Council, 2022). As O’Sullivan (2020) mentioned, any reforms to the English language education system should consider three components as a whole: the curriculum, the delivery and the assessment. The curriculum covers the formal and informal teaching and learning activities; the delivery system includes the physical environment (e.g. the classroom, gym, and the surrounding community), school staff (e.g. teachers or administrators in selection, training, and evaluation) and learning materials (e.g. textbooks, social media, and technology software); the assessment contains developmental (e.g. formative and diagnostic) and judgemental (e.g. placement and proficiency) tests (O’Sullivan, 2020). No matter what the reason for promoting bilingual policy is, the top-down national bilingual policy would impact school-level bilingual policy. In Brisk’s (2006) book on the factors affecting school bilingual policy, the main factors including the objective of national language policy, environmental management system, language assessment system, regulation adjustment, local connection, funding, administrators and teachers, textbooks and technology resources, student learning, and opportunities to use the target language were proposed.

The focal point of Taiwan’s education in recent years has been the internationalization of higher education and it’s also emphasized in bilingual policy. In Chen’s study (2009) on internationalization indicators in Taiwan’s higher education, 6 indicators such as internationalization of teachers, students, research, course program, visibility, and administration and campus were proposed. Furthermore, Chin and Ching’s research (2009), discussing the factors affecting the internationalization of Taiwan’s higher education, showed 12 indicators, including institutional policy and guidelines, institutional commitments, strategic planning, funding, organizational infrastructure and resources, academic offerings and curriculum, internet presence, faculty and faculty development, international students and scholars, study abroad, campus life, and performance evaluation and accountability (p.196-198).

To sum up, issues related to dedicated units for policy implementation and evaluation, funding, teacher training, recruitment, teaching and consulting, student learning, administrative staff and support, school environment, learning resources, curriculum, language assessment, and local connection are the main factors considered when implementing bilingual policy.

The factors affecting conducting EMI

EMI courses have become an integral part and an indicator of internationalization of higher education (Chen, 2009; Galloway et al., 2017; Galloway & Ruegg, 2022; Orduna-Nocito & Sánchez-García, 2022; Paige, 2005). EMI refers to the use of English to teach academic subjects in educational settings where English is not the primary language of communication (Dearden, 2015; Macaro et al., 2018). According to the European Commission (TAEC Erasmus + project, 2017-2020), EMI in the classroom means moving from the local language of instruction to English and changing the way of teaching style (e.g. interactive activities or group work) and local classroom characteristics should be considered. Being a focus of the language policy in higher education, EMI has definitely impacted teaching and learning (Orduna-Nocito & Sánchez-García, 2022). In terms of teaching, EMI teachers’ knowledge of the subject, their ability to explain the content knowledge clearly, understanding students’ needs (Galloway & Ruegg, 2022), language proficiency (Williams, 2015) and choice of medium of instruction (Graham & Eslami, 2019) are the most important elements. Moreover, EMI teachers’ quality (Galloway et al., 2017; Graham & Eslami, 2019) and training and support for EMI teachers (Galloway et al., 2017) are also essential. Align with the bilingual language policy on using digital technology to shorten the urban-rural resource gap and self-directed English learning (Executive Yuan, 2018), taking the advantage of technology enhancing learning would be another critical factor for the instructors to assist students in EMI classes (Nuzhat et al., 2022). To balance English-language teaching and content knowledge, multimedia and online teaching, rich EMI resources, and extracurricular tutoring are encouraged (Rose et al., 2020). In terms of learning, students’ motivation to learn English, biased

perspective toward L1 (Graham & Eslami, 2019), students' English proficiency (Williams, 2015), background knowledge, studying abroad experiences and instructor's native language would affect students' attitudes and understanding toward the field-specific knowledge of EMI. (Kym & Kym, 2014). More concern for the successful EMI is the foundation or supportive courses for the students (Williams, 2015).

Methods

This study adopted a mixed method design by using literature review for exploring key factors affecting bilingual policy implementation in higher education and conducting a questionnaire survey to collect data through a group of experts and to evaluate the importance of the factors.

Participants

To evaluate the importance of the factors, a group of 15 esteemed experts in the fields of language education, EMI promotion centers and in bilingual education policy implementation was selected to form an expert panel. The selection criteria for experts and scholars are divided into three categories: (1) EMI dedicated unit: serving as directors, team leaders, or members of university units dedicated to promoting bilingual policy; (2) Bilingual policy implementation: professors or administrative supervisor with experience in promoting bilingual policy projects; (3) English-medium instruction: professors or department chairs with experience in teaching professional subjects in English. To ensure the reliability, 5 experts were invited from northern Taiwan, 4 from central Taiwan, 1 from eastern Taiwan, and 5 from southern Taiwan. For ethical consideration, all the experts were anonymized after collecting, analyzing and reporting data (Audette, et al., 2020). To change the experts' names to an anonymous type, a "region-order-selection criteria" code was created. Take expert N-1-2 in Table 1 as an example, N in here means northern Taiwan, 1 means the first expert from northern Taiwan, and 2 means that the expert belongs to second category in the selection criteria – Bilingual policy implementation. That is, expert N-1-2 was the first expert from northern Taiwan and was a professor or administrative supervisor with experience in promoting bilingual policy projects. Among 5 experts from northern Taiwan, experts N-2-1, N-3-1, N-4-1 and N-5-1 belonged to (1) EMI dedicated unit; expert N-1-2 belonged to (2) Bilingual policy implementation. As for 4 experts from central Taiwan, C-3-1 and C-4-1 belonged to (1) EMI dedicated unit; C-1-2 belonged to (2) Bilingual policy implementation; C-2-3 belonged to (3) English-medium instruction. The expert E-1-1 from eastern Taiwan belonged to (1) EMI dedicated unit. Among 5 experts from southern Taiwan, expert S-4-1 was in (1); expert S-3-2 was in (2); experts S-1-3, S-2-3 and S-5-3 were in (3). Table 1 shows the profile of the 15 experts.

Experts	Services units / Title	Background
N-1-2	National University/ Professor	Global Career Development Facilitator (GCDF)
N-2-1	National University/ Professor	Assistant Director of Center for Bilingual Education
N-3-1	Private University / Professor	Section Chief of EMI Center
N-4-1	Private University / Professor	Director of Global Development Center
N-5-1	Private University of Technology/ Professor	Director of Bilingual Education Center
C-1-2	Private University of Technology/ Vice President	Bilingual policy implementation
C-2-3	Private University / Professor	EMI experience
C-3-1	National University/ Professor	Committeeman of Bilingual Education Center
C-4-1	National University/ Professor	Director of EMI Center
E-1-1	National University/ Professor	Director of Academy of English Empowerment
S-1-3	National University/ Professor	Instructor in EMI Development Center
S-2-3	National University of Technology/ Chair of Department	EMI experience
S-3-2	Private University / Dean of the College	Bilingual policy implementation
S-4-1	Private University / Professor	Director of Bilingual Education and EMI Center
S-5-3	Private University of Technology/ Chair of Department	EMI experience

Table 1: The profile of expert panel

Data collection and analysis

To collect the opinions and perspectives from experts, a questionnaire with blanks for a minimum (Min), a maximum (Max), and a single value (SV) on a scale of 1-10 (Zhang, 2012) for five factors developed from literature was sent to the experts by e-mail. The experts scored each factor on a Min, a Max and S.V to evaluate the importance of the factor. A space column for experts' comments and suggestions was also created.

For data analysis, the mean and standard deviation (SD) of the Min, Max, and SV scored by experts for each factor were calculated. The high mean and low SD show a high degree of consensus on the importance of the factors. The suggestions and comments provided by the experts were analyzed and discussed.

Results and Discussion

As mentioned above, this research is to explore key factors in bilingual policy promotion within higher education in Taiwan and evaluate the importance of the factors by an expert panel. The findings showed that administrative support, school environment and resources, curriculum and instruction, student learning and local linkage are the important categories of factors in bilingual policy promotion. The data analysis of the five categories of factors are discussed as follows.

Administrative Support

As shown in Table 2, the importance of “administrative support” ranges from 6 (Min) to 10 (Max). The mean of Min, Max and SV of “administrative support” are 7.27, 9.8 and 8.87 and the SDs of Min, Max and SV are 0.7, 0.56 and 0.74, respectively. Compared to other factors, the highest mean of Max (9.8) and lowest SDs of Max (0.56) and SV (0.74) indicate the expert consensus on the importance of “administrative support”.

Category	Experts															Mean	SD	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
Administrative Support	SV	7	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	10	8	10	8.87	0.74
	Min	6	7	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	6	8	8	7	8	7.27	0.7
	Max	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	9.8

Table 2: The Min, Max, SV, mean, and SD of the “administrative support”

To further examine experts’ opinions toward “administrative support”, the suggestions from Expert C-4-1 indicated that administrative efforts for promoting Bilingual Policy should focus on communication between administrative units, teachers, and students, rather than on routine administrative tasks. Furthermore, to accommodate students’ willingness to learn, recruiting more EMI teachers is important. In terms of funding, Expert C-4-1 considered the allocation of funding was crucial and the funded program should include rewards for student participation in EMI courses. Expert S-3-2 also emphasized that the financial subsidies from government can effectively incentivize universities to invest in resources that needed for Bilingual Policy and establish a solid foundation for promotion. Experts C-4-1’s and Expert S-3-2’s remarks indicated the important elements such as administrative investment, teacher manpower and financial subsidies related to “administrative support”. The three important elements in “administrative support” are also supported by Brisk’s (2006) and Chin and Ching’s research (2009).

School Environment and Resources

As shown in Table 3, the importance of “school environment and resources” ranges from 4 (Min) to 10 (Max). The means of Min, Max and SV of “School Environment and Resources” are 6.13, 8.93 and 7.73 and the SDs of Min, Max and SV are 1.25, 1.22 and 1.22, respectively. Compared to other factors, the higher SDs of Min, Max and SV indicate the experts’ different opinions on the importance of “school environment and resources”.

Category	Experts															Mean	SD	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
School Environment and Resources	SV	8	9	8	8	7	7	9	7	9	9	6	7	5	8	9	7.73	1.22
	Min	7	7	6	7	5	5	7	5	7	8	4	6	4	7	7	6.13	1.25
	Max	10	10	9	9	8	8	10	8	10	10	8	8	6	10	10	8.93	1.22

Table 3: The Min, Max, SV, mean, and SD of the “school environment and resources”

As for experts’ comments and suggestions on “school environment and resources”, Expert N-2-1 indicated that resource allocation is very important during policy implementation. In terms of school environment, Expert M-3-1 suggested that creating an English communication environment is an essential aspect of English language education and Expert S-3-2 had similar opinion on the establishment of a comprehensive bilingual environment within the schools and considered a bilingual environment and atmosphere in the campus contributed to improving students’ interest and abilities in English learning. Furthermore, the participation of international students can foster a positive learning atmosphere among peers. Expert M-4-1 considered more interaction between international students and domestic students beyond classes (e.g. in dining hall, common areas, school clubs, libraires, etc.) should be encouraged. According to experts’ opinions, creating a school environment or campus life with opportunities for the students to use English and interact with the international students are crucial. This is also supported by Brisk’s (2006) research on the factors affecting school bilingual policy and the factors affecting the internationalization of Taiwan’s higher education by Chen’s (2009) and Chin and Ching’s research (2009).

Curriculum and Instruction

The importance of “curriculum instruction” ranges from 5 (Min) to 10 (Max). The means of Min, Max and SV of “curriculum instruction” are 7.07, 9.73 and 8.53 and the SDs of Min, Max and SV are 0.96, 0.59 and 0.92, respectively. The high mean (9.73) and low SD (0.59) of Max indicate the expert consensus on the importance of “curriculum instruction” (See Table 4).

Category	Experts															Mean	SD	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
Curriculum and Instruction	SV	9	8	8	9	10	6	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	9	8.53	0.92
	Min	7	6	7	8	8	5	8	8	7	8	6	6	8	7	7	7.07	0.96
	Max	10	9	9	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9.73	0.59

Table 4: The Min, Max, SV, mean, and SD of the “curriculum instruction”

Comments from Expert N-2-1 showed that offering EMI courses and supportive English learning programs are equally crucial aspects of bilingual policy. Experts M-3-1 and M-4-1 also indicated the importance of offering a diverse range of elective EMI courses. Expert S-3-2 considered EMI course design should not solely focus on English language specialization but instead aim to increase students’ enthusiasm and interest in learning English. When it comes to the challenges of conducting EMI, Expert-4-1 revealed that teachers often faced the challenge of significant disparities among students’ English proficiency levels, where many complex concepts needed to be explained in Chinese, leading to time wastage and disruptions to the progress. However, if explanations were not provided in Chinese, many students might struggle to keep up, posing considerable difficulties. To sort out the comments from the experts, EMI curriculum design, supportive English learning program and teacher teaching are the core elements of “curriculum instruction”. These elements are also highlighted in Chen’s (2009), and Chin and Ching’s research (2009) discussing factors affecting the internationalization of Taiwan’s higher education, the components that should be considered when taking about reforms to the English language education system in O’Sullivan’s research (2020) and the factors impacting teaching in Orduna-Nocito & Sánchez-García’s study (2022).

Student Learning

The importance of “student learning” ranges from 5 (Min) to 10 (Max). The means of Min, Max and SV of “curriculum instruction” are 7.33, 9.73 and 8.8 and the SDs of Min, Max and SV are 0.98, 0.8 and 0.94, respectively. The second high mean of SV (8.8) among five factors shows the expert consensus on the importance of “student learning” (See Table 2).

Category	Experts															Mean	SD	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
Student Learning	SV	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	10	6	9	10	8.8	0.94
	Min	7	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	6	8	5	8	9	7.33	0.98
	Max	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	10	10	9.73	0.8

Table 5: The Min, Max, SV, mean, and SD of the “student learning”

The comments from Expert N-2-1 and Expert S-3-2 considered the implementation of bilingual education in universities were most crucially dependent on students learning motivation. Expert M-4-1 indicated that boosting student learning motivation was the most challenging task. When students lack motivation, all investments in resources will not get substantial rewarded. As for students’ English proficiency, Expert S-3-2 suggested that international mobility would be a good way to help enhance students’ English proficiency. Expert N-4-1 proposed that the issue of students’ lack of enthusiasm in choosing EMI courses needed to be addressed. In terms of student learning, the experts’ major concerns were student learning motivation, students’ English proficiency, international mobility and EMI course selection, which were also listed in Williams’ (2015) and Kym and Kym’s (2014) research.

Local Linkage

As shown in Table 6, the importance of “local linkage” ranges from 4 (Min) to 10 (Max). The means of Min, Max and SV of “local linkage” are 5.4, 8.07 and 6.6 and the SDs of Min, Max and SV are 0.83, 1.03 and 0.91, respectively. The low means of SV (6.6) and Min (5.4) indicate the expert consensus on the least importance of “local linkage” among five factors and different opinions with a higher SD of Max, compared to SDs of Min and SV.

Category	Experts															Mean	SD	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
Local Linkage	SV	7	8	7	6	6	5	8	6	6	7	6	8	6	6	7	6.6	0.91
	Min	6	7	6	5	5	4	6	5	4	6	5	6	5	5	6	5.4	0.83
	Max	9	9	9	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	7	10	7	7	9	8.07	1.03

Table 6: The Min, Max, SV, mean, and SD of the “local linkage”

According to Expert N-2-1, there was relatively less emphasis on the “local linkage” in the BEST Program in bilingual policy. As Expert N-5-1 mentioned, “Local Linkage is an aspect that our school has yet to consider, and it is also a current concern in Taiwan's bilingual policy on how to integrate it with the University Social Responsibility (USR) program.” In Expert M-3-1’s opinion, in addition to the curriculum in the school, community service should be considered. As Expert M-4-1 proposed, “Currently, the importance of community service and USR is relatively low. Local connections and collaboration between regional universities or partnerships with local high schools could be taken into account, and this would be advantageous for overall policy promotion.” Expert S-3-2 also indicated that “Connecting with the community and remote areas is still in its early stages, given the current EMI framework and the overall English learning environment in Taiwan.” To summarize the main points of experts’ remarks, USR and community service were the important elements included in “local linkage”. The concept of community service is in line with O’Sullivan’s study (2020) on the reforms to the English language education system such as delivery system should cover the surrounding community.

Conclusion

This study examined the ongoing bilingual policy promoted in higher education in Taiwan by exploring the important factors that might affect the promotion of the policy and evaluated the importance of the factors through an expert panel. The results shows that administrative support, school environment and resources, curriculum and instruction, student learning and local linkage are the important factors in bilingual policy promotion. Among the five factors, “administrative support” is the most important factor, followed by “student learning”, “curriculum and instruction”, “school environment and resources” and “local linkage”. Some main components related to each factor were found. The three important components in “administrative support” includes administrative investment, teacher manpower and financial subsidies. In “school environment and resources”, creating a school environment or campus life with opportunities for the students to use English and interact with the international students are crucial elements. In “curriculum and instruction”, EMI curriculum design, supportive English learning program and teacher teaching are the core elements. “Student learning” covers student learning motivation, students’ English proficiency, international mobility and EMI course selection. As for “local linkage”, USR and community service are the important elements included.

To implement a successful bilingual policy on developing a comprehensive bilingual education system needs a lot of efforts and resources and it may take a generation to achieve the goal. The finding of this preliminary study is to provide a reference for policy makers, teachers and administrators when implementing bilingual policy in higher education. More empirical research on investigating the factors on the policy promotion and efficient strategies for the policy promotion needed to be conducted.

References

- Ardasheva, Y., Tretter, T. R., & Kinny, M. (2012). English language learners and academic achievement: Revisiting the threshold hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 62(3), 769-812.
- Audette, L. M., Hammond, M. S., & Rochester, N. K. (2020). Methodological issues with coding participants in anonymous psychological longitudinal studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 80(1), 163-185.
- Bolton, K., Bacon-Shone, J., & Botha, W. (2023). EMI (English-medium instruction) across the Asian region. *World Englishes*, 42(3), 392-404.
- Brisk, M. E. (2006). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Routledge.
- Bryn Jones (2017). Translanguaging in Bilingual Schools in Wales. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 199-215, DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2017. 1328282
- Cenoz, J. (2012). Bilingual educational policy in higher education in the Basque Country. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 25(1), 41-55.
- Chen, C. L. (2009). *A study of the construction of measurement indicators and the internationalized strategies for higher education in Taiwan*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. National Sun Yat Sen University.
- Chin, J. M. C., & Ching, G. S. (2009). Trends and indicators of Taiwan's higher education internationalization. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(2), 185- 203.
- Cifuentes, J. C. A., Mejía, D. M. D., & Nates, D. E. (2017). Achievements of a bilingual policy: The Colombian journey. *Multilingualism and Bilingualism*. IntechOpen.
- Council of Europe (2020), Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, available at www.coe.int/lang-cefr.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction – A growing phenomenon*. London, UK: British Council.
- Executive Yuan (2018). *Blueprint for Developing Taiwan into a Bilingual Nation by 2030*. Taipei City: National Development Council.
- Galloway, N., Kriukow, J., & Numajiri, T. (2017). *Internationalisation, Higher Education and the Growing Demand for English: An Investigation into the English Medium of Instruction (EMI) Movement in China and Japan*. The British Council. https://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/attachments/h035_eltra_internationalisation_he_and_the_growing_demand_for_english_a4_final_web.pdf
- Galloway, N., & Ruegg, R. (2022). English Medium Instruction (EMI) lecturer support needs in Japan and China. *System*, 105, 102728. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102728>
- Graham, K. M., & Eslami, Z. R. (2019). Attitudes toward EMI in East Asia and the Gulf: A systematic review. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 43(1), 8-31.
- Jones, B. (2017). Translanguaging in Bilingual Schools in Wales. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 199-215, DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2017.1328282
- Kym, I., & Kym, M. H. (2014). Students' perceptions of EMI in higher education in Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(2), 35-61.
- Latomaa, S. & Nuolijärvi, P. (2002). The language situation in Finland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 3(2), 95-202.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language teaching*, 51(1), 36-76.
- Ministry of Education (2006). *Stepping Towards Premier University Policy*. Retrieved from http://140.113.40.88/edutop/modules/catalog_1/edutop_about/upload/20111130192552
- Ministry of Education (2016). *Higher Education Sprout Project*. Retrieved from https://www.edu.tw/News_Content.aspx?n=D33B55D537402BAA&s=333F49BA4480CC5B
- Ministry of Education (2021). *The Program on Bilingual Education for Students in College*. Retrieved from <https://best.twaea.org.tw/webm/goodsimg/20210618125441>
- National Development Council (n.d.). *Bilingual 2030*. Retrieved August 15, 2023, from https://www.ndc.gov.tw/en/Content_List.aspx?n=BF21AB4041BB5255
- National Development Council (2022, June 2). *Bilingual policy and national languages are equally important, and both can give next generation a better future*. https://www.ndc.gov.tw/nc_27_35859
- Nelde, P. H. (1997). Language Conflict. In Coulmas, F. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 285-300). Blackwell.
- Norrigård, M. & Nylund, A. (2022). Bilingual Legal Education in Finland. In N. E. Estrázulas (Ed.), *Bilingual Study and Research - The Need and the Challenge* (pp.125-129). Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

- Nuzhat, S., Sehgal, N., Dilshad, M. N., & Khan, Z. (2022). Investigating Students' Perceptions of Technology-Enhanced EMI Classroom. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(7), 5811-5829.
- Orduna-Nocito, E., & Sánchez-García, D. (2022). Aligning higher education language policies with lecturers' views on EMI practices: A comparative study of ten European Universities. *System*, 104, 1-14.
- O'Sullivan, B. (2020). The Comprehensive Learning System. *British Council Perspectives on English Language Policy and Education*. 1-18.
- Paige, R. M. (2005). Internationalization of higher education: Performance assessment and indicators. *Nagoya Journal of Higher Education*, 5(8), 99-122.
- Rose, H., McKinley, J., Xu, X., & Zhou, S. (2020). Investigating policy and implementation of English medium instruction in higher education institutions in China. *London: British Council*. Retrieved October, 14, 2020.
- Rukh, S. A. M. A. R. (2014). Students' attitude towards English language learning and academic achievement: A case of business students in Punjab. *European Academic Research*, 2(4), 5596-5612
- Saarinen, T., & Rontu, H. (2018). University language policies: How does Finnish constitutional bilingualism meet the needs for internationalisation in English?. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 10(1), 97-119.
- Singapore Government Agency (n.d.). *Bilingual Policy*. Singapore Infopedia. Retrieved August 13, 2023, from https://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/infopedia/articles/SIP_2016-09-01_093402.html.
- TAEC Erasmus + project (2017-2020). *EMI Handbook*. The European Commission. https://cip.ku.dk/english/projects-and-collaborations/taec/TAEC_Handbook_FEB_2020_NoEdit.pdf
- Wachter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programs in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.
- Williams, D. G. (2015). A systematic review of English medium instruction (EMI) and implications for the South Korean higher education context. *English language teaching world online*, 2014, 1-23.
- Zhang, S.-X. (2012). Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Evaluation Method and Statistics. Wu Nan.