



**Title of Project:**

Medium-of-Instruction Policies in  
Higher Education in Cambodia

**Researcher:**

Virak Chan  
University of Texas at San Antonio  
[virakifl@fulbrightmail.org](mailto:virakifl@fulbrightmail.org)



Virak Chan

**Research Supervisor:**

Dr. Peter Sayer  
University of Texas at San Antonio  
[peter.sayer@utsa.edu](mailto:peter.sayer@utsa.edu)

Dr. Wayne E. Wright  
University of Texas at San Antonio

---

**Project Summary**

In this dissertation, the medium-of-instruction policies in Cambodia higher education and its social, economic, and political contexts are examined. Guiding the study are the three research questions that follow:

1. What are the current medium-of-instruction policies in higher education in Cambodia?
2. How are English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English Medium Instruction (EMI) classes situated in and reflective of the larger language ecology of Cambodia University (CU)?
3. How are the medium-of-instruction policy choices in higher education practically and discursively connected to the social, economic, and political situations in Cambodia?

The current research raised interesting issues regarding mother-tongue medium, English medium, and bilingual medium education in post-colonial and developing countries, including issues of nationalism, modernism, hegemony and social inequality. Also, the research contributed to the increasing knowledge of the growing influence of foreign languages particularly English in Cambodia, of the potential inequalities caused by language policies, and of the social, economic, and political contexts that condition them. The knowledge in turns helps inform language policy actors from the top to the bottom levels, including legislators, rectors, administrators, instructors, and students.

The current research can be described as a case study of one flagship university in Cambodia. Data were obtained at different layers of the policies including legislations, institutions, and classrooms. At the legislation level, policy documents were analyzed to see how different languages are represented. At the institutional level, interviews with university administrators and job and scholarship announcements were examined for the contexts for the policies implementation. The contexts for implementation were also examined at the classroom level with data drawing from classroom observations and interviews with both students and instructors. Critical discourse and nexus analyses were done to uncover the discourses about language and the discourses intersected at the different layers of the policies.



An analysis of the policy documents shows that Cambodia Education Law 2007 does not have a clear mandate for a language of instruction in higher education, leaving this decision to individual higher education institutions. However, a movement towards English at universities is embedded in other legal documents, including the Policy for Higher Education vision 2030 and the Strategic Plans 2014-2018 of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MoEYS). These documents emphasize the importance of preparing students to live and work in the era of globalization and in a knowledge-based society and of bringing the quality of Cambodia higher education in line with regional and international standards. This movement towards English is also realized in the case study of CU. Many of the strategies in the MoEYS policy documents are also adopted by the Strategic Plan 2014-2018 of CU, including the plan to increase the number of international students, diversify the curriculum, and pursue staff and faculty professional development.

In practice, although Khmer is still widely used in many graduate and undergraduate programs at different universities in Cambodia, whenever resources allow, the programs are offered using English as a medium of instruction (EMI), and when the resources are short, effort is put into offering EFL classes instead. Whether the programs are offered in EMI or not, the desire to improve English proficiency is strong, illustrated by the English requirement in their entrance or exit exams. English has also dominated many important aspects of the programs including the textbooks and other instructional resources, information booklets, leaflets, and syllabi.

The Khmer language is promoted in the MoEYS Education Strategic Plan 2014-2018 through the translation and publication of educational materials and research papers; however, it has not been rigorously promoted at the practice level particularly in the case study of CU. Moreover, previous efforts in translating and publishing educational materials and research papers in Khmer language have met many challenges and are not practical.

Analysis of the interview transcripts and observation notes shows that English has an important status in Cambodia particularly in higher education. Although some participants express concerns over the lack of attention to Khmer language, all of them including administrators, instructors and students choose English as their preferred medium of instruction in higher education. Many of them link English proficiency to academic success, job opportunities and advancements, opportunities to obtain overseas scholarships, and a country development in general. This need for English is also evidenced in the job advertisements and the scholarship announcements, which constitute an important part of CU's language ecology. Many advertisements and all the announcements require certain level of English proficiency. This English requirement is a strong rationale for students to choose a university program with a strong English language component and for instructors and administrators of the university to tailor their instructions and programs to this need.

Although English is playing an increasingly important role in higher education in Cambodia, it is generally perceived as not threatening the existence of Khmer in the ecology. One given reason is the constitutional recognition of Khmer as a national language and its mandated use as a medium of instruction in public general education. Many participants believe that by the time students start university, their foundation in the Khmer language is already strong. Another reason is the discourse around the Khmer language is focused on the importance of Khmer as an identity and a symbol of culture in Cambodia; therefore, it needs protection and promotion. This discourse is shared in many of the interviews and focus groups. At CU, the increasing use of English is seen as a nice addition to the already existing programs in Khmer and as preparing students to become more competitive in the labor market as Cambodia is integrated into the ASEAN economic community. This is understood as a good condition for the co-existence between Khmer and English.



The decision to adopt EMI and to integrate as much English as possible into the teaching of content subjects illustrates the exercises of agency ([Canagarajah, 1999](#)) of the instructors and administrators of CU. They have shown awareness of the benefits and consequences of their decisions. All the participants see the movement towards English in higher education as an unavoidable trend and as providing benefits at both individual and societal levels. However, this agency is performed in specific social, economic, and political contexts.

The nexus analysis ([Hult, 2007, 2010](#); [Scollon & Scollon, 2004, 2007](#)) of all the data shows three important mediational layers for the decisions. First, these policy decisions are mediated by the historical body of policy actors, many of whom obtained their undergraduate and graduate degrees in EMI programs and in English-speaking countries. The English proficiency and experiences with English of the instructors in their specialized areas make it easier for them to provide instructions in English. Moreover, according to my insider knowledge of the MoEYS, those who are involved in the policy-making process are mostly Cambodian scholars who are returning from Western universities, and the process is usually strongly influenced by foreign experts from the English-speaking countries such as Australia and the U.S. ([Ford, 2003](#)). Therefore, the promotion of English in higher education embedded in many of the lines in the policy documents and the practices at the university may have been informed by the academic and ideological backgrounds of these Cambodian scholars and foreign experts. Secondly, these policy decisions are also mediated by important discourses in place including English as crucial for a good job, for academic successes and scholarships, and English as a competitive advantage for Cambodian students and not a threat to Khmer language. Finally, the policy decisions are mediated by important social, economic and political contexts including the development scholarships provided to Cambodian students, the ASEAN economic integration, and the internationalization of universities. Many students make it their academic goal to obtain scholarships and pursue their education particularly in Western countries, and the high English language requirement of the scholarships has significantly influenced the language choices of students, instructors, and the designers of many of the academic programs in higher education in Cambodia. Also, ASEAN has adopted English as its working language, making proficiency in English a competitive advantage for both individuals and a country in this single market when they were integrated economically at the end of 2015. Moreover, the internationalization of the universities will mean that they will need to have a stronger English language component to each of its academic programs.

In the current study, the growing influence of English in Cambodia higher education confirmed previous studies on the global spread of English ([T. Clayton, 2006](#); [Phillipson, 1992](#)). All of the participants perceived English to be a prestigious language, allowing a person to have access to more advance aspects of life. This perception reflects certain aspect of linguistic imperialism, “in which the minds and lives of the speakers of a language are dominated by another language to the point where they believe that they can and should use only that foreign language when it comes to transactions dealing with the more advanced aspects of life” ([Ansre 1979, cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 56](#)). This is even more evident in the preferences for EMI among all the instructors, many of whom reported that it is easier to give the instruction in English with their areas of specialization. Many of their professional trainings and their scholarships from English speaking countries such as the U.S. and Australia suggested the active promotion of English from the governments of these countries. This case may be an example of a weaker form of linguistic imperialism, in which the center countries such as the U.S. and Australia ([Kachru, 1992](#)) are indirectly involved in the promotion of English in the periphery countries ([Phillipson, 1992](#)).

Although English has increasingly been used in higher education in Cambodia, many participants do not consider it a threat to Khmer. They see it as being used in day-to-day communications and having



the status of a national language in the Cambodian Constitution. However, many of the participants expressed concern that the increasing use of English in higher education was limiting different aspects of Khmer language proficiency among the instructors and students. In addition to this concern, the limitation in the availability of Khmer words for use in particular content areas, as perceived by the instructors and students, reflects a lack of language planning and policy, particularly in the area of corpus planning in Cambodia. Although effort has been made in translating documents and compiling key terminologies in some areas at Cambodian universities and the Royal Academy of Cambodia, this effort has not been sufficient since its focus has been largely on the formation and standardization of new words in different content areas, but little on promoting their status in different domains of language use. Language policy makers and planners, therefore, may need to think in terms of how they could integrate new Khmer terminologies into different content areas and into different domains of language use, particularly in different curricula at all levels of Cambodian schooling.

The findings of this dissertation have important pedagogical implications. Programs and universities should not assume that the adoption of EMI program will be effective just because EMI is the current trend. They should consider the level of English proficiency of their students and instructors and the potential loss of content knowledge without the use of students' native language. In the current context of Cambodia higher education, academic programs may benefit more from a focus on some forms of bilingual models for medium of instruction, in which both Khmer and English are used purposefully.



### References

- Ali, N. L. (2013). A changing paradigm in language planning: English-medium instruction policy at the tertiary level in Malaysia. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14*(1), 73-92.  
doi:10.1080/14664208.2013.775543
- Alidou, H. (2004). Medium of instruction in post-colonial Africa. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 195-215). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Annamalai, E. (2004). Medium of power: The question of English in Education in India. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 177-194). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ayres, A. M. (2000). Tradition, modernity, and the development of education in Cambodia. *Comparative Education Review, 44*(4), 440-463.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Boxer, D. (2002). *Applying sociolinguistics: Domains and face-to-face interaction*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Bradley, D. (2010). Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. In M. J. Ball (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Sociolinguistics Around the World* (pp. 98-107). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bruthiaux, P. (2008). Language education, economic development and participation in the Greater Mekong Subregion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*(2), 134-148.  
doi:10.2167/beb490.0
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: A study of its development*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Butters, R. R. (1984). When is English 'Black English Vernacular'? *Journal of English Linguistics, 17*, 29-36.  
doi:10.1177/007542428401700103
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 601-626.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). On EFL teachers, awareness, and agency. *ELT Journal, 53*(3), 207-214.
- Candlin, C. N., & Maley, Y. (1997). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of alternative dispute resolution. In B. L. Gunnarsson, P. Linnel, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 201-222). London, UK: Longman.
- Chandler, D. P. (1988). Cambodia. In A. T. Embree & Asian Society (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of Asian history* (Vol. 1, pp. 219-221). New York, NY: Scribner.



- Chandler, D. P. (1991). *The land and people of Cambodia*. Washington, DC: Harper Collins.
- Chandler, D. P. (1998). *A history of Cambodia* (Rev. ed.). Chiang Mai, Thailand: Silkworms.
- Clayton, S. (2008). The problem of 'choice' and the construction of the demand for English in Cambodia. *Language Policy*, 7, 143-164.
- Clayton, T. (1995). Restriction or resistance? French colonial educational development in Cambodia. *The Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 3(19), 1-13.
- Clayton, T. (1998). Explanations for the use of languages of wider communication in education in developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 18(2), 145-157.
- Clayton, T. (2002). Language choice in a nation under transition: The struggle between English and French in Cambodia. *Language Policy*, 1, 3-25.
- Clayton, T. (2006). *Language choice in a nation under transition: English language spread in Cambodia*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Creese, A., & Martin, P. (2008). Introduction to volume 9: Ecology of language. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2 ed., Vol. 9, pp. xiii-xviii). New York, NY: Springer.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? *English Today* 93, 24(1), 3-6. doi:10.1017/S0266078408000023
- Crystal, D. (2012). A global language. In P. Seargeant & J. Swann (Eds.), *English in the world: history, diversity, change* (pp. 152-177). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dunnet, S. C. (1993). Cambodia, overcoming hardship, rebuilding its education system. *WENR: World Education News and Reviews*, Spring, 6(2), 20-23.



- Dy, S. S. (2004). Strategies and policies for basic education in Cambodia: Historical perspectives. *International Education Journal*, 5(1), 90-97.
- Ear, S. (2013). *Aid dependence in Cambodia: how foreign assistance undermines democracy*. New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
- Edwards, J. (2008). The ecology of language: Insight and illusion. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2 ed., Vol. 9, pp. 15-26). New York, NY: Springer.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119-161). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Faez, F. (2011). Reconceptualizing the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 10, 231-249. doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.598127
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Farr, M., & Song, J. (2011). Language ideologies and policies: Multilingualism and education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(9), 650-665.
- Fergusson, L. C., & Le Masson, G. (1997). A culture under siege: Post-colonial higher education and teacher education in Cambodia from 1953. *History of Education*, 26(1), 91-112.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Language in sociocultural change* (pp. 191-223). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fishman, J. A., Cooper, R. L., & Conrad, A. W. (Eds.). (1977). *The spread of English: The sociology of English as an additional language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. A., & Das Gupta, J. (Eds.). (1968). *Language problems of developing nations*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Ford, D. (2003). Cambodia accreditation: An uncertain beginning. *International Higher Education*(33), 12-14.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit* (2 ed.). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.



- Gill, S. K. (2004). Medium-of-instruction policy in higher education in Malaysia: Nationalism versus internationalization. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 135-152). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goodman, B. A. (2013). *Towards a multilingual future: The ecology of language at a university in Eastern Ukraine*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Pennsylvania.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. *AILA Review*, 13, 57-68.
- Green, J., Franquiz, M., & Dixon, C. (1997). The myth of the objective transcript: Transcribing as a situated act. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 172-176.
- Gregerson, M. J. (2009). Learning to read in Ratanakiri: A case study from northeastern Cambodia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(4), 429-447. doi:10.1080/13670050902935789
- Haugen, E. (1972). The ecology of language. In A. Dil (Ed.), *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen* (pp. 325-339). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1, 27-51.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: an ecological approach. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 315-339). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. K. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 24-41). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hult, F. M. (2007). *Multilingual language policy and English language teaching in Sweden*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Pennsylvania.
- Hult, F. M. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 2010(202), 7-24. doi:10.1515/ijsl.2010.011
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157-181. doi:10.2307/40264515
- Johnson, D. C. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 267-279.





- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kachru, B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 48-74). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). An ecology perspective on language planning. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2 ed., Vol. 9, Ecology of language, pp. 41-53). New York, NY: Springer.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). Learning English and other languages in multilingual settings: Principles of multilingual performance and proficiency. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 31-31.11.
- Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED037728.pdf>
- Linell, P. (1998). Discourse across boundaries: On recontextualizations and the blending of voices in professional discourse. *Text*, 18(2), 143-157.
- Manh, L. D. (2012). English as a medium of instruction in Asian universities: The case of Vietnam. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(2), 263-267.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mei, L.-W. S. (2001). The polemics of Singlish. *English Today* 65, 17(1), 39-25.
- Ministry of Education Youth and Sport. (2014). *Education Strategic Plan 2014-2018*. Retrieved from <http://www.moeys.gov.kh/images/moeys/policies-and-strategies/559-en.pdf>.
- Ministry of Planning. (2015). *Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey 2014*. Phnom Penh: National Institute of Statistics.
- Neau, V. (2003). The teaching of foreign languages in Cambodia: A historical perspective. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 16(3), 253-268.
- Paikeday, T. (2003). *The native speaker is dead*. Toronto, Canada: Lexicography Inc.
- Paul, L. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2016). Ethnologue: Languages of the world. 19th. Retrieved from <http://www.ethnologue.com/>
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA.
- Pennycook, A. (2004). Language policy and the ecological turn. *Language Policy*, 3, 213-239.



- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). English only worldwide or language ecology? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 429-452.
- Pit, C., & Roth, H. (2003). English language teaching development in Cambodia: Past, present, and future. In H. W. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Chaing policies and practices* (pp. 111-129). Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Pou, S., Geoff, W., & Mark, H. (2012). *Cambodia: Progress and challenges since 1991*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Quigley, C., Oliviera, A. W., Curry, A., & Buck, G. (2011). Issues and techniques in translating scientific terms from English to Khmer for a university-level text in Cambodia. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24(2), 159-177. doi:10.1080/07908318.2011.583663
- Ricento, T. K. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. In T. K. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 9-24). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401-427.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Sayer, P. (2015). Expanding global language education in public primary schools: the national English programme in Mexico. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 257-275. doi:10.1080/07908318.2015.1102926
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis: Discourse and the emerging internet*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2007). Nexus analysis: Refocusing ethnography on action. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 608-625.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133-158.
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (4 ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting Qualitative Data* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.



- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thong, T. (1985). Language planning and language policy of Cambodia. In D. Bradley (Ed.), *Papers in South-East Asian linguistics No. 9: Language policy, language planning and sociolinguistics in South-East Asia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: language policy in the community*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2004). Medium of instruction in Hong Kong: One country, two systems, whose language? In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies* (pp. 97-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Tollefson, J. W. (2004). The centrality of medium-of-instruction policy in sociopolitical processes. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 1-19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.  
doi:10.1177/0957926593004002006
- Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157-172.
- Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London, UK: Longman.
- Wright, W. E., & Boun, S. (2015). Striving for education for all through bilingual education in Cambodia. In W. E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. Garcia (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 517-530). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and method* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.