Translanguaging in a Chinese-English Bilingual Education Programme:

A University-Classroom Ethnography

Weihong WANG:
Associate Professor, School of Foreign Languages, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, China; Email: wangwh@cug.edu.cn

Xiao Lan CURDT-CHRISTIANSEN
Professor, Department of Education, University of Bath, UK. Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK. Email: X.Curdt-Christiansen@bath.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Since 2001, Chinese-English Bilingual Education has been officially promoted in many universities in mainland China. It has, however, recently been criticised for not only failing to improve students' English proficiency, but also impeding subject knowledge learning. Drawing on ethnographic data collected through classroom observations, interviews and fieldwork notes, this study examines the practices of bilingual education in an undergraduate Business Management Programme in one university. The study reveals that translanguaging is a prominent phenomenon in almost all subject courses in the programme. The translanguaging practices can be largely grouped into four categories: *bilingual label quest*, *simultaneous code-mixing*, *cross-language recapping*, and *dual-language substantiation*. The study further identifies supportiveness and freedom of context as two major forces that spurred the practices of translanguaging in the programme. The study concludes by arguing that an ideological reorientation towards flexible bilingualism is emerging in such BE contexts, which might be a favorable move away from the monolingual stereotype manifested in the traditional teaching-English-as-a-foreign-language and content-subject courses that envision English-medium instruction. A translanguaging perspective might give the current practices of BE due recognition.

KEYWORDS: translanguaging; bilingual education; EMI; Chinese universities;

Introduction

The intensified globalization and the rise of English as an international language over the past decades have prompted a growing number of English-as-Foreign-Language (EFL) countries to adopt English Medium Instruction (EMI) in their education systems to teach content knowledge (Lin 2016; Park 2011; Rose and McKinley 2017; Seargeant 2008). While there has been a continuous debate on how to define different types of content-centered learning approaches in a second/foreign language, EMI is under the umbrella approach of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Cenoz, Gennessee and Gorter 2014; Thompson and Mckinley 2018). Although under scrutiny by researchers, CLIL and EMI have gained great popularity because of their “shared endeavor of fostering additive bilingualism through a dual focus on both content and language learning” (Thompson and Mckinley 2018, 2).

In recent years, EMI has become a ‘fashion statement’ in the internationalisation and marketisation of higher education worldwide (Fenton-Smith, Humphries and Walkinshaw 2017). It has been viewed as instrumental in making an institution competitive and increasing its global outlook. In response to this ’fashion’ trend, the Chinese Ministry of Education (MOE 2001) has promulgated a similar educational initiative, the Chinese-English bilingual education (BE), to strengthen its competitiveness in the internationalisation of higher education (HE). This initiative has established English as an additional medium of instruction with the aim of “meeting two goals - subject learning and English proficiency - for the price of one” (Hu 2008, 196) and required 5-10% of university subject courses to be taught in English. With subsequent endorsement of several policies (e.g. MOE 2004, 2007), BE has gained great momentum at Chinese universities in the new millennium.

The implementation of BE is, however, not without controversy. One major concern is students’/instructor’s lack of threshold English proficiency to benefit from BE (Hoare 2010; Gao and Wang 2017). Both empirical studies and anecdotal observations also indicate that the shortage of qualified bilingual instructors and bilingual teaching resources and the frequent code-switching and translation of academic terminologies in BE may seriously impede subject knowledge learning (Fang 2018; He 2011; Lei and Hu 2014). While these observations may reflect the reality of bilingual practices in the classroom, they also reveal strong monolingual ideologies underneath the discussion of language competence and academic literacy.

In this article, we focus on the phenomenon of translanguaging in the BE classrooms of an undergraduate Business Management Programme at a university in China. Through classroom observations and other ethnographic data, we explore how translanguaging as a teaching and communicative tool can enable teachers to explain challenging concepts and complex academic notions, and how consulting Chinese translations and reference books can facilitate students' acquisition of subject knowledge. In particular, we examine the types of translanguaging practices that have emerged in these classroom interactions. In doing so, we argue that the nature of translanguaging provides cross-linguistic connections which may facilitate pedagogical innovations and provide opportunities for language and content learning.

Bilingual Education and Translanguaging Practices

The term *translanguaging* was proposed by Williams (1996) to characterise a purposeful type of language teaching in which the input is given in one language or mode (e.g., spoken), and the output is required in another (e.g., written). García (2009, 140) extended it to refer to "the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential." In recent years, the concept has been widely used as a generalisation of the various cross-language practices in multilingual contexts (Canagarajah 2013; Creese and Blackledge 2010; García and Li 2014).

The core tenets emphasise that languages are not discrete and separate linguistic systems, but integrated linguistic resources available for communicative purposes (Curdt-Christiansen and Sun 2016; García and Li 2014). The bi/multilinguals flexibly adopt these resources to make sense of their worlds (Creese and Blackledge 2015; García and Lin 2017). Such an approach recognises the relationships between languages in more interconnective ways and can better accommodate the dynamic interactions between languages, communities and cultures (Li 2017). In this regard, the act of translanguaging is "transformative in nature; it creates a social space for the multilingual language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experiences and environment" (Li and Zhu 2011, 1223).

Given the transformative nature of translanguaging, proposals to recognise translanguaging as pedagogy are also on the rise. Baker (2011, 288) defined *translanguaging pedagogy* as the process of "making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages". The approach to pedagogy emphasises that students draw on all linguistic resources at their disposal to maximise their learning and understanding potentials. In other words, all languages can be used "in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning" (Lewis, Jones, and Baker 2012, 641). In this way, the multiple communicative repertoires of different students can be maximally recognised and valued by educators (Hornberger and Link 2012). Students' individual agency can also be engaged in using, creating and interpreting communicating signs (ibid.).

The theoretical positions have been supported by empirical studies. Palmer et al. (2014), for example, demonstrated that translanguaging pedagogies opened up spaces for students to engage in sensitive and important topics in the classroom and encouraged students to take risks in expressing themselves. Creese and Blackledge (2010) and Canagarajah (2013) also found in their respective studies that multilingual learners creatively made use of translanguaging practices to establish multiple identities. More recently, studies have demonstrated that translanguaging is a naturally occurring phenomenon in bi/multilingual contexts, which can hardly be prevented by monolingual educational policies (Creese and Blackledge 2015; García and Li 2014). A translanguaging pedagogy offers a new lens to view "the interdependence of skills and knowledge across languages" (Creese and Blackledge 2010, 103).

While these empirical studies shed much light on bilingual/multilingual classroom practices in the UK and US contexts, studies that employed this new lens to examine BE in Chinese universities are scarce. Viewing translanguaging as "the complex and fluid language practices of bilinguals" (García and Lin 2017, 1), this study explores the features and environmental contexts of, and students' engagement in, such practices by examining a BE programme at a Chinese university. To be specific, we address the following questions:

1. What types of translanguaging practices are found in the BE programme of the focal university?

2. What are the political contexts and pedagogical realities that gave rise to the translanguaging practices in the BE programme?

3. How are students as individual agents engaged in the translanguaging practices?

The Study

Research Context

The study was situated in one of the national key universities in central China. The university has 20 faculties and over 100 undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. In response to MOE's Bilingual Education directive (MOE 2001), BE courses have been promoted in the university from 2001 onwards. Whereas some faculties offer several BE courses, others offer none. At faculties offering BE courses, not all students have access to the programmes. Only "elite" students in so-called *Talents Base Class, Experimental Class*, or *Outstanding Engineers Class* are offered to enrol in the BE courses. In general, students may have (at most) one or two subjects taught bilingually over a four-year period. Our study focused on one of the most well-known BE programmes in the university, the Business Management undergraduate programme. Established in 2001, the programme was featured with most subject courses taught bilingually.

Participants and data collection

This ethnographic study was conducted over a two-year period from Dec 2013 to Dec 2015. Following the principles of ethnographic research, the first author immersed herself in the context. In addition to engaging in conversation with a wide range of participants, including teachers, students and management administrators, she also observed the students in class, at conferences, and through activities. Altogether, three sets of data were collected through classroom observations, interviews and collection of documents. Table 1 provides the details of the data inventory.

Table 1 Data inventory

Classroom Observation			**Interview**			**Document**		
Course (Code)		**Recording**	**Staff (Code)**	**N**	**Recording**	**Policy**	**Text-book**	**Student work**
Year 1	Management	4 sessions (180 ns)	• Dean of the Economics & Management faculty: Den • BE Coordinator: Cen • Head of Teaching: Hen	3	195 mins			
Year 2	Marketing	12 sessions (540 mins)						
	Organisational Behaviour	12 sessions (540 mins)	• T1 Management: Ang • T2 Marketing: Bang • T3Organisational Behaviour: Cang • T4Macroeconomics: Dang	4	244 mins			
	Macroeconomics	12 sessions (540 mins)						
Year 3	Strategic Management	8 sessions (360 mins)	Students: S1-29	29	1070 mins			
	Human Resources	8 sessions (360 mins)						
Total	**6 courses**	**56 sesssions (2050 mins)**	**Interview**	**36**	**1509 mins**	**86 pages**	**4 sets**	**67 pages**

* E & M: Economics and Management; L1/L2/L3/L4: Lecturer

1) Classroom observation:

As shown in Table 1, a total of six courses have been observed covering three grade levels. The total observation time amounted to 56 sessions (one session = 45 minutes).

2) Semi-structured interviews:

Three managing administrators, four bilingual course teachers, and 29 students were interviewed. While the language of interview was mainly Chinese, English expressions were used occasionally. The students were from three different programme years. Of them, 18 were from two classes that we had followed for two years and who had been interviewed more than once.

3) Documents:

This set of data included national- and university-level policy documents related to BE, faculty-level curriculum design, student recruitment policies, programme management records, web pages, online learning platforms, and classroom-level data such as textbooks, student assignments, group projects, and lecture slides.

Data analysis

Our objective was to develop a 'thick description' of translanguaging practices in the BE programme. In this respect, a thick description refers to organising and presenting data to create "a rich milieu of interconnected social life" (Holliday 2007, 76). A key feature was to weave together the various data collected and to create an interconnected and holistic understanding of the practices of BE. According to Layder (2006), any social practice is the outcome of negotiating among the four dimensions of social discourses: *context*, *settings*, *situated activities*, and *self*. We adopted this resource map as a guiding framework to examine how the four dimensions of discourse around translanguaging were interconnected. We first identified the different types of translanguaging typical in the BE programme (Q1). Then, we explored the connections of such practices within the broader national, institutional and situational classroom contexts (Q2). Last, we centered on the major participants and direct beneficiaries of the programme — the students, and examined how they as individual agents engaged in the translanguaging practices (Q3). In the following section, we present the findings based on the three lines of analysis.

Findings

Major types of translanguaging in the BE program

Of the six disciplinary courses observed, some courses gave more prominence to English than others. In general, the teachers combined the use of English and Chinese in very flexible ways throughout the process. It was difficult to quantify the respective percentages of English or Chinese used in any one class or course, or to specify the functions of the two languages in BE classes. Sometimes, English was used for content explanation, and Chinese for class management. Sometimes, their roles were reversed. Other times, a lecture would begin in English and then recap in Chinese, while other lectures might begin with an introduction in Chinese, followed by detailed explanations in English. The free choice of languages in BE, thus, spawned a series of translanguaging practices in class which were thematically grouped under the following four categories[1].

Bilingual label quest

Bilingual label quest refers to the teaching of terminologies, concepts or fixed expressions in one language by eliciting corresponding labels from another, allowing "the teaching to be accomplished bilingually" (Martin 2005, 83). This type of teaching practice seemed to appear in almost all courses observed, particularly in the introduction of key disciplinary concepts. For example, in the second session of the Macroeconomics course, the teacher introduced the main structure and key concepts of the course. Whenever she mentioned a key concept or fixed

[1] The distinction of the four translanguaging categories is not that clear-cut. We group the translanguaging practices in our data into different categories according to the most prominent feature each instance reveals. But at the same time we admit that there are overlappings.

expression in Macroeconomics in English, she would elicit from students its corresponding label in Chinese, as shown in Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1 [All excerpts are presented in their original language, Chinese in plain font and English in italics. Translation is provided directly under the original text. T = Teacher, S = student. The number in front of each utterance indicates the turn of speaking by each participant. In the paper, we refer to these as Line1, Line 2 (L1, L2), etc.]

1 T: 首先我们介绍 *The Classical Theory. The Classical Theory*?
First of all, we will introduce *The Classical Theory. The Classical Theory?*
2 S: 经典理论。
The Classical Theory.
3 T: 我们叫做古典理论，它研究什么呢？*In the long run, how the economy works*. 就是你在长期中我们的经济该是一个怎样的表现，对吧？那这个表现实际上是围绕三个变量来的，这三个变量是什么呢？*GDP or the output* 产出然后就是 *the price level* 价格水平 *and the Unemployment Rate* 失业率，所以我们首先是按照时间把它分成了 *the classical theory in the long run,* 对吧？长期中经济运行，它的运行是围绕三个变量来的，我们今天要先把这三个变量进行详细的介绍。
We call it The Classical Theory. What does it investigate? *In the long run, how the economworks*. That is, in the long run, how the economy works, okay? It is, in fact, developed around three variables. What are they? *GDP or the output,* the output, then *the price level*, the price level, *and the unemployment rate*, the unemployment rate. So, we first study *The Classical Theory in the long run,* that is, how the economy works in the long run, the works of which are around three variables. Today, we shall introduce the three variables in detail.
4 T: 接下来是什么，*in the long run, in the very long run*，也就是我们说的超长期。超长期中我们讲宏观经济部分的，也还是围绕 *the output, the price level and the Unemployment Rate* 展开，即?
What is next? *In the long run, in the very long run,* or in our language, in the very long run. In the very long run, for Macroeconomics, we still talk of *the output, the price level and the unemployment rate*. That is?
5 Ss &T: 产出，价格水平，失业率.
The output, the price level, and the unemployment rate.
6 T: 嗯，三方面的变量，然后最后一部分我们要分析 *in the short run*，也就是短期经济是如何 *fluctuates* 波动的，短期的这个 *economic fluctuations*，也是围绕这三个方面的变量的，哪三个方面呢？
Hm, three aspects of variables. In the last section, we shall analyse *in the short run*, that is, in the short run, how economy *fluctuates,* fluctuates. The *economic fluctuations* in the short run are also around the three variables. What are the three?
7 Ss &T: *The output, the price level and the unemployment rate*.

(Macroeconomics-Observation 2, 28/10/2014)

In this excerpt, key macroeconomics concepts, such as *variables*, *output*, *price level*, *unemployment rate*, *economic fluctuations*, *classical theory*, *etc.*, were all introduced in one language, and explained in another. Examples like these were coded under the *Bilingual Label Quest* category in our study. But the repetition of longer sentences was coded as Cross-Language Recapping which will be explained later. In most cases, the teacher made bilingual label quests and answered them herself. Other times, the teacher introduced the concept in one language and expected students to provide the answer in the other, as in *Classical Theory*. In this way, students acquire academic literacy in both languages, as the last two lines of the excerpt demonstrate. After having each of the three variables (*output, price level* and *unemployment*) repeated twice—e.g., in the teacher's self-answered bilingual quests in L2, and the teacher-students' co-constructed bilingual labels in L6—the students gradually internalized the English expressions and could then articulate them spontaneously upon request, as shown in L7.

The teacher of the Macroeconomics course, Dr Dang, argued that she preferred to teach students in Chinese, as "this has been proved to be the best for students to understand the course. However, many terms and concepts in the discipline are directly borrowed from English. Students have to be very familiar with the English expressions. Otherwise, they will get lost in subsequent studies when they come across the many abbreviations and economic models in the course, such as GDP, GNP, Y=C+I+G+NX, NX=EX-IM, etc.[2]" (Dang, 18/11/2014). For these

[2] All interviews of administrators, teachers and students were conducted in Chinese. To save place, only English translations are provided in the paper.

reasons, both Chinese and English expressions of key terms and concepts were highlighted in disciplinary learning, through bilingual label quests.

Simultaneous code-mixing

The second type of oft-used translanguaging practices is *simultaneous code-mixing*, which refers to the simultaneous need for and use of both English and Chinese in the process of meaning-making. In Creese and Blackledge's (2010, 108) words, "each language is used to convey a different informational message, but it is in the bilingualism of the text that the full message is conveyed". In Excerpt 2, the teacher of Management was introducing directions of communication flow, such as downward, upward, lateral and diagonal, in the English textbook.

Except 2 [The section was taught with the assistance of a slide which listed in English four types of formal communication flows and the features of each type in bullet points.]

T: 接下来第三个 *Lateral. Lateral means what? Communication flows at the same organisational level*, 对吧？就是首先这个 *communication* 在同一个级别上。同时呢，你还要注意它们这两个沟通的这个 *sender and receiver* 它们俩是什么呀？*in different departments*, 一定在不同的部门，这个非常重要，在不同的部门。所以它给你解释的是 *take place among employees of the same organisational level. For example, a manager in the financial department wants to communicate with another person, another person in the human resource department*. 那么这样的两个，同样都是 *department*, 那么说明什么呀？*At the same organisational level*, 而且它们俩又在 *different departments.*

Next, we are to talk about the third one, *Lateral*. *Lateral means what? Communication flows at the same organisational level*, okay? That is, first of all, the *communication* is at the same level. At the same time, you need to note that the *sender and receiver* of the communication between the two. What about the two? They are *in different departments*, in different departments. This is very important, that is, they are in different departments. So, the definition of this one is: *take place among employees of the same organisational level. For example, a manager in the financial department wants to communicate with another person, another person in the human resource department*. So, they are both called *department*. What does it mean? *At the same organisational level*，but they are in two *different departments.*

(Management-Observation 1, 08/12/2014)

As shown in the excerpt, the teacher shuttled frequently between English and Chinese in most utterances. If we divide the English and Chinese utterances into two language groups, we may find that each language conveys a different message. The division, thus, makes little sense as the utterances were incomplete. Only by combining the utterances in both languages together did the teacher make sense and the full messages were conveyed. Justifying the simultaneous code-mixing practices, Teacher Ang explained, “Given that most of those international business management practices were theorized in English, it was also necessary for us to offer disciplinary courses in English” (Ang, 12/27/2014). However, due to both teachers’ and students’ lack of English proficiency, which has also been observed in the context of Hu, Li and Lei’ study (2014), it was unrealistic to conduct the class entirely in English. Therefore, they would try their best “to integrate English in our teaching, and at the same time make sure students understand us, and not sacrifice the learning of subject knowledge” (Dang, 18/11/2014). In this regard, simultaneous code-mixing seemed a natural outcome of such practices as the teachers felt a strong professional responsibility to make sure the learning was taking place through code-mixing.

Cross-language recapping

The third type of translanguaging practices is *cross-language recapping*, which involves teaching the same course content in one language, and then repeating it in another. The contents taught in both languages were sometimes identical, and at other times more specific in one language than in the other. This type is different from *the Bilingual Label Quest* as it involves repetitions of entire sentences while the latter involves only concepts, phrases and terminologies. We found that some BE teachers would start the class with abbreviated content teaching in Chinese, then switch to English to deliver detailed explanations. Others delivered a lecture in English first, and then summarised the main points in Chinese. Still others habitually recast every important message they uttered, as illustrated in Excerpt 3 of a lecture in Organisational Behaviour.

Excerpt 3 [The excerpt was from the beginning section of a lecture on Ability and Learning. Three theories of learning, classical conditioning, operant conditioning, and social learning were introduced.]

1 T: *In the following, we shall discuss the three learning theories. The three learning theories are based on the three previously-mentioned learning approaches. The three theories are classical conditioning, operant conditioning and social learning. Let's introduce them now. Classical conditioning is based on the classical, the early classical approach, you know. Operant conditioning is based on the behaviourist theory, okay? And social learning comes from the cognitive theory, okay?*

2 T: 这三个理论，我们今天要讨论的是基于上次介绍的学习理论的三个学派. 第一个，我们首先要介绍的经典条件反射理论是基于早期经典的研究，第二个 *operant conditioning* 操作性条件反射是基于行为主义的理论，第三个社会学习是基于认知学派。这是三个理论，它们的理论基础源于上面的三个主要的 *learning approaches.*

The three theories. Today we are going to discuss the three learning theories which are derived from the three learning approaches. First, the classical conditioning theory which is based on the early classical approach. The second, the *operant conditioning* – it's based on the behaviourist theory. The third one, the social learning, is based on the cognitive theory. These are the three learning theories. And the theoretical concepts are derived from the previously mentioned three *learning approaches*.

3 T: *Now, we will begin to discuss these three theories. The first theory is classical conditioning, classical conditioning. Please turn to p.26, p.26. Just now we described the early classical theory, uh, it described the simple learning situation with some animal learning experiments, uh, experiments. Now please look at the description of classical conditioning.*

4 T: 刚刚我们了解了早期经典研究，它主要是关于简单学习情境的，运用动物试验, 通过动物行为试验研究来获得主要观点, 来解释我们学习的过程。

Just now we introduced the early classical theory, which mainly concerns simple learning situations. It uses animals in experiments, it studies animals' behaviour through experiments to gain insights in our, human beings', learning processes.

5 T: 那下面呢，我们首先关注它的研究者，他的主要研究过程和它最后的结论是什么，又是怎样来诠释我们个人简单的学习过程的。那实际上就是我们这个学习过程有哪些主要的变量，对吧? *Variables*, 有哪些变量?

Next, we will first pay attention to the researcher, his main experiment processes and conclusions, and how (the experiment could be used) to explain our human beings' simple learning processes. That is, it is mainly to identify the major variables involved in our learning, right? *Variables*, what variables are there?

6 T: *Now here, uh, it says that classical conditioning grew out of experiments conducted at the turn of the century by a Russian psychologist, Ivan Pavlov. Ivan Pavlov teach [sic] dogs to salivate in response to the ringing of a bell. Now here, please look at this experiment... teaches dogs to salivate in response to the ringing of the bell, here, this is the key word, salivate. Can you translate, please?*

7Ss: 水。

Saliva.

8 T: 对，这里是一个动词对吧，分泌唾液。他的实验介绍了俄国一位著名的心理学家，实际上他也是一位生理学家啊，生理学家，我们想到生理就会想到我们人的器官和系统是如何来运作的啊。那这个学者他的主要的实验就是教狗怎么样听到铃声，响起的铃声，就会做出反应，反应是什么呢？容易分泌唾液。

Yes, here it is used as a verb, to salivate. In this experiment he is introduced as a Russian psychologist. In fact, he is also a physiologist. When we talk of physiology, we think of how the human organs or physiological systems work. The researcher, his main experiment was to teach a dog to listen to the bell. When the bell rings, it will respond. What is its response? It is easy to salivate.

(Organisational Behaviour- Observation 4, 22/09/2014)

As can be seen from this teacher-fronted excerpt, the teacher recapped most of her lecture content. To be specific, L2 is a recap of L1; L4 is almost an exact repetition of the latter part of L3; L8 is the recasting of L6, with a translation of "salivate" in-between (L7). In our interview, she explained,

> This is a BE course. We are expected to teach subject content and English language at the same time. However, we are not English teachers. It is inappropriate for us to teach students the usage of English. What we can do is to try our best to teach our disciplinary content in English to expose students to an English environment and let them pick up some English in the process. However, the primary objective of academic courses is still disciplinary knowledge acquisition. We have to repeat now and then in Chinese to make sure that students understand the content, in particular the important and difficult parts.
>
> (Dr Cang, 23/09/2014).

Framing her pedagogical position, Dr Cang emphasised her dual role – English teacher and discipline teacher. Her choice of modal verbs, 'can' in "what we can do", and 'have to' in "we have to repeat" showed her strong conviction in her pedagogical philosophy in which only repetition, recapping and recasting can achieve the goals of the BE programme.

Dual-language substantiation

The fourth type of translanguaging practices is *dual-language substantiation,* which refers to the co-construction of disciplinary knowledge with contributions or insights from both languages. The practices were often revealed in teachers' efforts to localize (contextualize) the disciplinary knowledge, originally in English, with concrete examples or cases from a Chinese context. Many Business Management programmes taught in China are based on modern management theories and concepts that were primarily developed in Western contexts. To facilitate students' understanding of Western-led theorisations of disciplinary knowledge, teachers often used examples from Chinese contexts, close to students' experiences, to explain abstract principles or concepts, as illustrated in Excerpt 4.

Excerpt 4

4T: *Markets can be divided into international or local markets. Such as Wuhan's* 热干面 [*Hot Dry Noodles*, a local way to cook noodles], *it is a local market product. Maybe people in Wuhan like to buy it, but other people in our country may know little about Wuhan* 热干面. *So Wuhan* 热干面 *is focused on the local market. We know BMW, okay? B-M-W, the motor cars, Apple's iPhone 6, these are focussed on the international market, okay? They are not only sold in America, but also in HK, England, and other countries around the world. So, this is the global market. More and more companies from China also go to other countries and sell products there, such as Lenovo and Gree. They sell products to other countries. So, this is the global market.* 小米 (*Mi Phones*), *do you know* 小米?

5Ss: 卖手机的/小米。
The one that sells mobile phones/Mi Phones.

6T: 小米 *sells its products such as* 红米 (Redmi Phones) *to India or Taiwan. So that is international market.*

7T: *Okay, next. Non-profit markets, do you know Non-profit?*

8Ss: 不获利。

Non-profit.

9T: *Non-profit marketing is marketing for non-profit organisations. A non-profit organisation or NPO is an organisation that uses its funding to pursue a specific purpose, such as a charitable cause, rather than pursuing profits for its own benefit like the business marketing. Some might not believe that investing in marketing strategies is necessary for non-profits, but it is quite beneficial for an NPO to effectively market itself. NPO need to use marketing strategies to assist with its growth, funding and prosperity. Without these things, the overall mission of it will be diminished.*

10T:非营利性组织的营销比如我们说的红十字会，*The Red Cross* 一样很重要。比如红十字会，它不是郭美美事件以后受到了 *serious reputation damage*。受到了很多的质疑，然后的话呢，研究者开始讨论的话题, 名誉修复，修复这样一个受损的 *reputation*。或者说他的 *damages*。其实红十字会的信誉问题很久以来大家都一直在讨论，但找不到一个出口，正好我们的郭小姐自己送上们来了，所以这也没办法，所以她坐牢是必然的，必然的。这就是我们讲的一个 *non-profit government organisation* 的营销问题。他也是一个 *brand*，也需要经营，这是我们讲的 *marketing*，是这样的理解。

As regards the marketing of non-profit organisations, for example *the Red Cross*. After the Guo Meimei case, it suffers *serious reputation damage*. There are a lot of queries. Then, researchers began discussing the topic, that is, reputation repair, to repair this kind of damaged *reputation*, or the *damages*. In fact, the reputation issue of the Red Cross has long been a topic of discussion, but no starting point could be found. Right at that point, our Ms Guo exposed herself. So, no other way out. She was doomed, doomed to be jailed. This is one example of marketing issues of *non-profit government organisation*. It is also *a brand*, that needs marketing. This is what we mean by *marketing*. It is to be understood in this way.

(Marketing-Observation 1, 16/09/2014)

In this excerpt, the teacher made use of Chinese products and cases to explain four types of markets: global and local markets, non-profit and government markets. Two types of Chinese were used. The first was inserting Chinese terminologies in English utterances. As in L1, Chinese was used when it came to Chinese-specific terms, such as 热干面 and 红米. The second type was to switch directly to Chinese when explaining cases or events particular to the Chinese context. While delivering the four types of market divisions predominantly in English, he switched to Chinese when using the *Guo Meimei* case to explain how marketing was also needed for non-profit organisations. He explained in the interview that the use of Chinese "would not only facilitate the students' understanding but also promote the localisation of the disciplinary knowledge in the Chinese context" (Bang, 12/11/2014).

Contextualising translanguaging in the BE programme

When relating classroom translanguaging practices to the contexts within which they were produced, we identified a strong supportive discourse from both the national policies and the university management administrators.

At the national level, BE has been favorably recognised as cultivating English-knowing professionals who not only have professional knowledge but also a strong competence in English (MOE 2001). BE has also been highly regarded as an innovative pedagogical approach for improving the quality of higher education and, in particular, students' English competence, thus meeting the needs of China's globalisation and economic growth (MOE 2001, 2010). Besides policy directives, practical guidance and financial support have been given to universities for implementing BE. In 2004, a special *University Bilingual Education Cooperation Group* was set up as a MOE initiative to carry out BE research, design new curricula and materials, and develop feasible BE pedagogies (MOE 2004). The MOE has also funded a series of government-led projects to promote the development of BE, such as the four-year project (2007-2010) of developing national BE model courses for universities (MOE 2007). These model courses not only provide useful references for implementing BE, they also motivate universities to increase the provision of BE courses.

It has to be pointed out, however, that BE was initially envisioned as EMI. Predicting that the implementation would be difficult, the government allowed the flexible practices of BE in the beginning and then gradually moved to EMI. The 2001 ministerial directive, for example, states that "in undergraduate education, we should create conditions to use English or another foreign language to teach general education or subject content courses…For those that are temporarily unprepared, it is acceptable to use English textbooks first, and then gradually move from Chinese to English teaching" (MOE 2001). The 2004 policy also explains that, if English is used over half of the course time, the course is recognised as BE (MOE 2004). In short, BE is not only officially supported, but is also allowed great freedom in implementation at the national level.

At the university level, BE was also highly desired but challenging to implement because of the insufficient English proficiency. The Business Management programme accepted the challenge to implement BE for three reasons: 1) There was a practical need for students to develop job-related English competence for future career development as globalisation had increased the international participation of business management professionals (Dr Hen, Head of Teaching, 10/01/2015); 2) Students needed discipline-knowledge in English to understand subject contents, as theories of management had been mainly developed in the West (Dr Cen, the BE Coordinator, 27/12/2013); and 3) To become more attractive and competitive in the higher education market (Prof Den, Dean of the Economics and Management Faculty). To achieve these goals, the faculty began preparing for EMI in the 1990s. The early preparation gave the programme a comparative edge in meeting the national requirement. In addition, the university set up international exchange programmes for academics and students to collaborate with international universities. It also obtained financial support to establish business and management simulation labs (Prof Den, Faculty Dean, 23/12/2014). Bilingual teachers were awarded double or even triple pay for their bilingual teaching workloads, more research funding, and more opportunities for studying abroad or career advancement. Students also enjoyed better education resources in which they could not only work on projects together with visiting students from American universities in summer schools, but also have opportunities to join international exchange programmes (Undergraduate Programme Handbook 2011-2015).

Besides supportive policies, the programme also enjoyed freedom in actual enactment. The programme initially proposed all-English teaching for all courses. After four to five years' experiment, it was found unrealistic to adopt EMI for non-disciplinary courses, such as *Marxist Theories* and *Advanced Mathematics*. It was also too demanding to implement EMI for disciplinary courses that were dense in technical terms, or involved complex computations, such as *Economic Law* and *Operations Research* (Dr Hen, Head of Teaching, 10/01/2015). Thus, some courses were changed back to CMI in 2005. The proposed name of the programme was also changed from All-English to BE. In addition to the flexible inclusion of CMI and EMI courses in the programme, the so-called all-English courses were also allowed the freedom to use Chinese to varied degrees, and thus led to the production of translanguaging as revealed in the previous section. Such practices were, however, not overtly marked out, for the reason that:

> The mixing of Chinese and English was predominantly recognised as English deficiency in both the official and the popular discourse. To protect the practices from unfair negative judgment from the outside, the courses were still labelled as all-English in the University Undergraduate Programme Handbook. Only by doing so, could the programme be evaluated positively as distinct from other similar ones in China, and at the same time gain a safe space for tacit Chinese-English bilingual practices.
>
> (Field note, 09/16/2015).

In sum, it was the supportive and flexible language-in-education policies at both national and university level that created a context conducive to the wide range of Chinese-English mixing practices in classrooms that exist today.

Students' engagement in the BE programme

In order to understand how students were engaged in the BE programme, we interviewed 29 students from different levels who took different courses. Though they were dissatisfied with some practices, the majority evaluated the programme positively in three regards: 1) social recognition; 2) learning both English and the subject-content; 3) open attitudes towards variations of English and translanguaging.

Of the twenty-nine participants, most held a high opinion of the social recognition of the programme (Field note, 19/01/2014). Since relatively fewer undergraduate programmes in Chinese universities had implemented BE, the BE Business Management programme enjoyed its elite education status despite being a non-core discipline at the university. Like other elite education programmes, over 20% of students in the programme were given free postgraduate study opportunities. Students from other programmes often teased them for being "high-end, atmospheric, and classy" (高端，大气，档次, a recent catch phrase in China) (Student Interview 3, 23/12/2013). Such social recognition was also common outside the university. The BE graduates maintained an annual employment rate of over 95%, ranking among the top graduates from the faculty (Hen, Head of Teaching, 10/01/2015).

Besides social recognition, students also credited the programme for facilitating their learning of both English and the discipline. Twenty students acknowledged BE as facilitating their general English ability because of “our increasing exposure to English in everyday studies” (Ling, year 2 student, 09/01/2015). The programme required students to read English textbooks, write English assignments, attend English lectures, and participate in class discussions in English, all of which provided students with a legitimate space to “apply English to practical uses”, something few other programmes could offer (S19, 19/11/2014). Because of these practices, “we do not need extra preparation for CET 4 and 6” (S21, 18/12/2014). In particular, twenty-one students reported that they had acquired a technical English vocabulary through learning subject-knowledge, which distinguished them from most other university students and brought them more personal development opportunities.

Concomitantly, they recognised that learning technical English facilitated their understanding of disciplinary knowledge. Mei, a year 2 student in International Trading, explained,

> For a simple example, these days I have been reviewing Management with my roommate in the library. My textbook is in English and hers in Chinese because she is not in the bilingual programme. I noticed that though the Chinese textbook is thin, it would explain a single point in very dense words over many pages, being very wordy and complex. The piles of explanations seriously affected your willingness to read on. Even worse, you still could not understand the point after reading. Then I went to English. There was only a small section explaining the point. After reading the small section, I found I could understand the point quite well. So even though my book is thicker than hers, my revision went faster. This makes me feel that, for some concepts in Management, it’s easier to understand directly from the English texts than from the Chinese textbooks.
>
> (Mei, 20/12/2013)

For Mei, translation of the original texts may not facilitate her understanding of subject concepts. As she pointed out, ‘wordy and complex’ texts may affect the level of interest in learning. Her perspective was shared by other students who argued that reading the original texts in English made more sense than reading textbooks translated from English into Chinese as disciplinary knowledge in business management had originated in the West. Taking BE courses had been constructive for those students because of the two languages complementing each other in learning, as illustrated below,

> The English expressions of the *4Ps* Theory in Marketing [*Product, Price, Place,* and *Promotion*] look simple, but it is difficult for us to understand the exact meaning they represent in marketing. If we know their Chinese translations 营销的四要素: 产品,定价, 渠道, 促销, we may have much better understanding of them. The Chinese translations contain more information than the English ones. Sometimes, vice versa. Some of the Chinese translations were too vague or confusing to understand, such as the term 多国战略 [Multi-Domestic Strategy] that we have just learnt in Corporate Strategic Planning. I really did not understand it when the teacher first introduced in Chinese. However, when I checked its definition in English, I instantly got the meaning.
>
> (Jun, 23/12/2013)

Framing his argument, Jun made it clear that translation may present difficulties in understanding disciplinary concepts. Meaning can often be ‘lost in translation’ if the reader has no knowledge of the original texts. Therefore, reading in both English and Chinese had enriched their learning experiences and “broadened our horizons, deepened our understanding of theories, and improved our practical application abilities” (S12, 19/01/2015).

Another feature we identified in students’ evaluation of the programme is their high tolerance of both their own and the course teachers’ English. We collected 12 students’ assignments in courses of *Organisational Behaviour, Macro-economics,* and *Marketing*. All had been written in English except English-Chinese translations. As language teachers, we noticed a great many language problems in the assignments. However, few errors had been corrected by either students or teachers. What they were concerned about in the process was “meaning expression, not language errors” (S24, 10/24/2014). The same tolerance was also found in students’ attitudes towards their teachers’ English. When asking when their teachers used Chinese in their courses, most students answered like this:

> It depends. Some courses are difficult to understand, even when taught in Chinese. For these courses, teachers use more Chinese. Some courses are taught mainly in English, but for the key points, teachers would explain in both English and Chinese. Sometimes, if the teacher notices that we are having difficulty in understanding, he will switch to Chinese. Sometimes, if the class time is not enough to complete a lecture, he will teach in Chinese to speed up things. Sometimes the teachers simply slip into Chinese without notice. It is really difficult to say when the teachers use Chinese.
>
> (S3, 12/23/2013)

The reply shows that the students were not particularly concerned about their teachers’ use of Chinese in classrooms. Using Chinese, in their view, was for better learning, not as a result of of teachers’ English deficiency. Speaking of a teacher whose strong accent was recognised by most BE participants, S3 commented that “his English is comprehensible if you listen carefully. Anyhow, you could not deny his expertise in disciplinary knowledge” (S3, 12/23/2013). In short, though most students aimed at “learning both English and a major” while choosing the BE programme, they prioritised disciplinary learning. They seemed less concerned about issues such as language choice, English proficiency, and language standard. Instead, they actively made use of both English and Chinese as resources to maximise their disciplinary learning.

Despite their positive attitudes towards the programme, the students raised a few critical issues. Firstly, the programme did not offer them sufficient opportunities to practise oral English. Of the 29 student participants, 27 had wanted to improve their English communication competence by choosing the programme. However, most BE classes were teacher-fronted which provide students with little opportunity to communicate with either teachers or peers (S1, 12/20/2013). Secondly, the most remarkable progress students made in the BE programme was in disciplinary English, particularly disciplinary vocabulary and reading. However, no examination or report certified students' English proficiency in this regard. Most companies in China only used students' CET 4 and 6 certificates or English interviews as employment requirements. BE students' distinction in disciplinary English would not help them excel in this type of companies (S25, 11/05/2015). Thirdly, while English did play an important role in students' development, it was their major that finally counted. If students did well in their own majors and had good English, they would be very competitive. At present, business management as a major was not in itself very attractive in the job market. Even good English cannot change that fact. This, more or less, influenced students' investment in BE (S22, 01/06/2015).

Discussion and Conclusion

The study examined the practices of a BE programme at a Chinese university through the lens of translanguaging. The study revealed that the recognition of BE at both national and university level allowed academics and students sufficient freedom to appropriate both English and Chinese for their own benefit, which indirectly engendered their translanguaging practices. At the national level, BE was rationalised in the official discourse as it cultivated English-knowing professionals. Likewise, BE was supported at the university level because it provided a competitive edge for the university to present itself as a first-class institute in the national higher-education market. With the legitimation of BE at both levels, the Business Management programme gained freedom to use both English and Chinese flexibly in subject learning. This has, in turn, spawned a widespread practice of translanguaging, ranging from bilingual label quest and simultaneous code-mixing, to cross-language recapping and dual-language substantiation. Though translanguaging was not originally desired by students, the programme's high social recognition and the improvement in English and disciplinary learning contributed to their positive evaluation of BE and their open attitude towards translanguaging.

The findings provide new evidence in support of translanguaging as pedagogy in bi/multilingual education. Previous studies focused mostly on contexts where English is the dominant language in society, and translanguaging makes use of other languages as resources in multilingual classrooms (Creese and Blackledge 2015; Hornberger and Link 2012). This study, however, looked at a context where all learners are native Chinese speakers who are supposed to be immersed in an English environment to improve their learning of English as a foreign language. Our study, thus, contributes to the existing literature by enriching the contexts of translanguging. Besides, our study examined language attitudes that were seldom explored in previous studies. The findings show that translanguaging practices may contribute to an open attitude towards English variations and language mixing. This might be a positive move away from the monolingual ideology that has permeated traditional English language courses where English-only was found to be the most desirable practice in class, and British/American English was prioritised as the standard variety (He and Zhang 2010; Wang 2015). Translanguaging as pedagogy shifts our attention to content learning or meaning construction, which indirectly loosens our guards towards correctness or standardness in language use.

It was, however, the assumption of English deficiency that led to the compromise of using both English and Chinese in BE (Yu 2017). EMI is still desired in the official discourse (Zhao and Dixon 2017; Zheng and Dai 2013). For example, the *National outline for medium and long-term education reform and development* (2010-2020) emphasises once again the need "to increase the offer of English teaching courses in higher education" (MOE 2010). If the programme is carried out entirely in English, positive learning outcomes and an open attitude towards translanguaging may not occur. Studies in the literature have demonstrated that the implementation of EMI at universities did not result in significant differences in students' CET 6 performances (Lei and Hu 2014). On the contrary, it has the potential to impede students' disciplinary learning, and jeopardise their pursuit of advanced Chinese academic literacy (Hu 2009). The mindless promotion of EMI has even had severe educational, economic, and sociocultural consequences (Hu and Alsagoff 2010). Different from EMI, the combined English-Chinese BE in this investigation was recognised by both teachers and students as not only facilitating students' disciplinary learning and their English development, but also increasing their flexibility in making use of whatever language resources available.

If these ground-level voices can be recognised in the official discourse and give rise to a revision of the English-deficiency assumption underlying the BE policy at the national level, the Chinese-English integrated form of BE and the value of translanguaging may be given due recognition and enjoy further development in the future. It is high time for policy makers and classroom practitioners to work together to re-examine the practices of BE at Chinese universities and maximise the benefits of this educational policy.

Acknowledgement:

The project was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, China University of Geosciences (Wuhan), Hubei, PRC.

References:

Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.

Cenoz, J., Gennessee, F., and D. Gorter (2014). "Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward." *Applied Linguistics* 35 (3): 243–262.

Creese, A., and A. Blackledge. 2010. “Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?” *The Modern Language Journal 94*(1): 103-115.

Creese, A., and A. Blackledge. 2015. “Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings.” *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 35*: 20-35.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L., and B. Sun. 2016. “Nurturing Bilingual Learners: Challenges and Concerns in Singapore.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19 (6): 689-705.

Fang, F. 2018. “Review of English as a Medium of Instruction in Chinese Universities Today.” *English Today* 34(1): 32-37.

Fenton-Smith, B., Humphries, P., and Walkinshaw, I. 2017. *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Gao, X., and Wang, W. 2017. “Bilingual Education in the People’s Republic of China.” In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education: Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, edited by O. García and A. Lin, 219-231. New York: Springer.

García, O. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blacwell.

García, O., and W. Li. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., and A. M. Y. Lin, 2017. "Translanguaging in Bilingual Education." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education: Bilingual and Multilingual Education,* edited by O. García and A. Lin, 117-130. New York: Springer.

Han, Y. 2017. "Mediating and Being Mediated: Learner Beliefs and Learner Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback." *System* 69: 133-142.

He, A. E. 2011. "Educational Decentralization: A Review of Popular Discourse on Chinese–English Bilingual Education." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 31(1): 91-105.

He, D., and Q. Zhang. 2010. "Native Speaker Norms and China English: From the Perspective of Learners and Teachers in China." *TESOL Quarterly* 44(4): 769-789.

Hoare, P. 2010. "Content-based Language Teaching in China: Contextual Influences on Implementation." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31(1): 69-86.

Holliday, A. 2007. *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Hornberger, N. H and H. Link. 2012. "Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Biliteracy Lens." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15(3): 261-278.

Hu, G. 2008. "The Misleading Academic Discourse on Chinese–English Bilingual Education in China." *Review of Educational Research* 78(2): 195-231.

Hu, G. 2009. "The Craze for English-medium Education in China: Driving Forces and Looming Consequences." *English Today 25*(4): 47-54.

Hu, G., and L. Alsagoff. 2010. "A Public Policy Perspective on English Medium Instruction in China." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31(4): 365-382.

Layder, D. 2006. *Understanding social theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lei, J., and G. Hu. 2014. "Is English-medium Instruction Effective in Improving Chinese Undergraduate Students' English Competence?" *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 52(2): 99-126.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., and C. Baker. 2012. "Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and beyond." *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18(7): 641-654.

Li, W. 2017. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39(1): 9-30.

Li, W., and H. Zhu. 2011. "Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain." *Journal of pragmatics 43*(5): 1222-1235.

Lin, X. 2016. "Implicit EMI policies: Taking Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand as Examples." *Chinese Journal of Language Policy and Planning 1*(2): 53-60.

Martin, P. 2005. "'Safe'" Language Practices in Two Rural Schools in Malaysia: Tensions between Policy and Practice. In *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice,* edited by A. M. Lin and P. W. Martin, 74–97. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

MOE. 2001. *Guanyu Jiaqiang Benke Jiaoxue Gongzuo Tigao Jiaoxue Zhiliang de Ruogan Yijian* [Recommendations on strengthening college undergraduate programmes and enhancing the quality of instruction]. Accessed 11 January 2014. http://jwc.whut.edu.cn/NewsShow.aspx?nId=79. 490.

MOE. 2004. *Guanyu Chengli Gaodengxuexiao Shuangyujiaoxue Gongzuo Xiezuozu de Tongzhi* [Bilingual Education Cooperation Committee's Notice about the Set-up of University Bilingual Education Cooperation Group]. Accessed 11 January 2014. http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A08/A08_gggs/A08_sjhj/201007/t20100729_124827.html.

MOE. 2007. Guanyu Qidong 2007 Niandu Shuangyujiaoxue Shifan Kecheng de Tongzhi [Notice on the Start-up of Exemplary Bilingual Education Courses in 2007]. Accessed 11 January 2014. http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A08/moe_745/tnull_25884.html

MOE. (2010). *Guojia zhongchangqi jiaoyu gaige he fazhan guihua gangyao (2010-2020)* [National outline for medium and long-term education reform and development (2010-2020)]. Accessed 11 January 2014. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A01/s7048/201007/t20100729_171904.html

Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., and K. Henderson. 2014. "Reframing the Debate on Language Separation: Toward a Vision for Translanguaging Pedagogies in the Dual Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 98(3): 757-772.

Park, J. S.-Y. 2011. "The Promise of English: Linguistic Capital and the Neoliberal Worker in the South Korean Job Market." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 14*(4): 443-455.

Ren, W., Y. Chen, and C. Lin. 2016. “University Students' Perceptions of ELF in Mainland China and Taiwan.” *System* 56: 13-27.

Rose,H.,and J. McKinley. 2017. “Japan's English Medium Instruction Initiatives and the Globalisation of Higher Education.” *Higher Education* 75(1):111-129.

Seargeant, P. 2008. “Ideologies of English in Japan: The Perspective of Policy and Pedagogy.” *Language Policy 7*(2): 121-142.

Thompson, G., and J. McKinley. 2018. “Integration of Content and Language Learning”, In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, edited by J. I. Liontas, 1-13. New Jersey, Wiley.

Wang W. 2015. “Teaching English as an International Language in China: Investigating University Teachers' and Students' Attitudes towards China English.” *System 53*: 60-72.

Williams, C. 1996. “Secondary Education: Teaching in the Bilingual Situation.” In *The Language Policy: Taking Stock*, edited by C. Williams, G. Lewis, and C. Baker, 193-211. CAI: Llangefni.

Yu, S. 2017. “A Study on Chinese Bilingual Education History.” *Foreign Language Learning Theory and Practice 2*: 57-61.

Zheng, D., and Dai, W. 2013. “University Bilingual Education in China in Ten Years: A Review and Looking Forward.” *Foreign Language World* (1): 54-61.

Zhao, J., and Dixon, L.Q. 2017. “English-medium instruction in Chinese universities”, by Jing Zhao and L. New York, Routledge.