
English Language Teaching and Program for Buddhist Higher Education: A Study for International Students at Acharya Nagarjuna University

Dr. Le Hong Linh

Research Scholar, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur-522510

Paper Received on 10-12-2025, Accepted on 14-01-2026

Published on 15-01-26; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2025.11.01.68

Abstract

Globalisation of higher education has led to a marked shift of language policy in religious universities, especially in the case of Buddhist schools aiming for international recognition as academic institutions. However, in the current situation English has not merely become a foreign language: it is rather the chief communicative tool of knowledge construction and dissemination. This theoretical paper explores English-medium instruction (EMI) provision of Buddhist higher education as experienced by International students in Acharya Nagarjuna University, India at PG and Doctoral level where English is the sole medium of academic communication.

In place of being based on an empirical survey or interview this study employs a theoretical-analytical approach drawing on models from EAP, ESP and EMI research. By critically examining curriculum architecture, pedagogical presuppositions and epistemological orientations, the paper argues that Buddhist students' long-term academic English ability is shaped not only by individual learner capacity but also to a large extent by language policy, curriculum ideology and institutional design.

The results suggest that EMI in environments based on sound curriculum design plays a role in advancing academic literacy, discipline-specific discursive competence and global scholarly participation. In contrast, Buddhist schools where English is considered as an additional or common subject have been structurally incapable of accomplishing this type of educational achievement. The paper concludes with a suggested pedagogical model suited for Buddhist universities, informed by the merger of EAP/ESP, disciplinary discussion and Buddhism educational philosophy.

Keywords: English Language Teaching, English for Buddhist Universities, ELE, ANU

1. Introduction

1.1 English and the Globalization of Buddhist Higher Education

In present times of knowledge-based economy, English has become the dominant language in academic discourse across the globe which acts as influential means of research dissemination, international conferences and digital knowledge sharing and transnational scholarly collaboration (Crystal, 2003). This linguistic imperialism is not a matter of convenience, but a structural reality which conditions opportunities for knowledge access, academic visibility and institutional legitimacy. Non-English-medium universities are under pressure everywhere, regardless of the intrinsic quality or depth in time of their intellectual traditions.

This global linguistic trend has both challenged and opened exciting vistas for Buddhist university traditions, which have long placed the trans-regional transmission of knowledge across linguistic and cultural divides at the heart of their mission. With the spread of Buddhism to Western societies, for better or worse, now that European languages serve as literary vehicles for the Buddha-dharma beyond any precedent (Dharmakara) a new and exciting opportunity is presented when it comes to exposing Buddhist philosophy, ethics, and matters of meditative introspection to global academicians. Enforcing English, however, upsets well-established uses of knowledge production that are grounded on canonical languages including Pāli, Sanskrit and Classical Chinese as well as different vernaculars. This tension makes the language policy within Buddhist tertiary education a matter that is strategically important both academically and philosophically.

Buddhist universities must navigate a complex epistemological terrain in which spiritual authority, scriptural authenticity and academic legitimacy meet, unlike secular ones. This kind of knowledge production in liminal space is not simply analytic but frequently involves ethical formation, reflective activity, devotion to practice and particularly lineage-based transmission. Therefore, the question confronting Buddhist universities is not 'whether' to learn English (as servile accessory) but 'how' should English function in academe: as an extraneous entity of acquiescing cognition without discipline or as a magisterial condition of how Buddhist knowledge can be conceived, systematized and communicated.

Curriculum Theoretical Dimension of Localization of Knowledge As an alternative subject defining English as a residual skill might lead to a marginalization of Buddhist knowledge where the relevance is limited perhaps only nationally or regionally, relegating it from global domain. Reconceptualizing English (and not

Sanskrit) as the main conduit for academic thought thus allows Buddhist universities to participate fully in international scholarship without sacrificing their intellectual roots. The problem is, therefore, to introduce English not as a linguistic alternative to Buddhist tradition but as more up-to-date vehicle by which that tradition can itself be critically appraised there and elsewhere.

1.2 Rationale for a Theoretical-Only Study

A lot of the work on English in religious education has tended to be empirical with instruments such as surveys, interviews and perception questionnaires in terms of pupil attitudes, teacher beliefs or classroom practices. Although these studies have offered useful descriptions, they often have not gone far beneath the surface of educational practice. In focusing on individual perception rather than institutional structure, this body of literature has the effect of masking the deeper systemic underpinnings which ultimately condition language performances at university.

From a curriculum-theoretical and sociolinguistic viewpoint, language proficiency is not only determined by motivation, aptitude or pedagogy but is structurally mediated through institutional language policy, curriculum design, and epistemological framing. Empirical evidence alone, especially when not accompanied by theoretical analysis, cannot account for why learners in the same sociocultural conditions attain significantly different levels of academic English proficiency. It understands curriculum as a framework for education policy (Au, 2007; Luke, 1994) whereby policy and practice decisions intersect at the point of collaboration between language policy and academic discourse. In this sense, the paper diverges intentionally from general empirical traditions that come forth to propose a theoretically-driven investigation on how curriculum design relates to language policy and academic discourse in Buddhist HE.

Using an embedded case-study analysis approach at a model English-medium instruction (EMI) university in India, the study conceptualizes curriculum architecture as the key network node influencing academic English language development for international postgraduate- and doctoral-level Buddhist students who study monolingually through English only. In these EMI contexts, English is not simply a subject but the very conduit that students use to enter, generate and critique disciplinary knowledge. Therefore, language acquisition appears as a side effect of prolonged academic involvement not as direct instructional intervention.

This framework makes possible a reinterpretation of language development in religious education. Instead of explaining a low level of English by deficiencies in the learner or poverty of teaching, the analysis refocuses concern onto some structural conditions that may help this learning to occur. The key argument of this paper is that curriculum architecture - specifically the location of English within the educational hierarchy - has a much greater impact on language outcomes than learner motivation and ability. The analysis, focused on pinpointing and exploring these structural determinants of belief and perception, provides a critical angle that both extends but also challenges dominant empirical methods within the field.

1.3 Research Aims

This paper aims to:

- Theorize English-medium instruction in the context of Buddhist higher education.
- Examine the impact of EMI environment on the development of academic English language proficiency.
- Compare English-medium based and English for General Purposes curricula in Buddhist programs.
- Suggest a theoretical based curriculum model for Buddhist universities.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

EAP theory views English not as just a general communicative competence but also as a discipline-wide academic literacy that includes diverse genres, rhetorical conventions, and epistemological norms (Hyland 2006). Thus, students learn Academic English by participating in activities contextualized within their disciplinary paradigms, not through stand-alone language instruction.

In the field of Buddhist studies, EAP involves a number of key elements:

- Engaging in philosophical debate
- Engaging in close readings of primary and secondary texts
- Writing in academics such as Thesis, Dissertation, Article etc.
- Contributing to seminars and debates

Such practices are organically woven into the tapestry of day-to-day academic experience in an English Medium Instruction (EMI) setting.

2.2 English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

ESP theory emphasizes that language instruction should address the specific needs of students in a particular profession or discipline (Basturkmen, 2010). For Buddhist students, English has some very specific functions:

- It is a language for the interpretation of scripture.
- It is a forum for interreligious discourse.
- It serves as a vehicle for the worldwide propagation of Dharma.
- It is used as a scholarly language of Buddhist philosophy.

For this reason, ESP theory don't focus on everyday in spoken words and on my point of view should be specific for Buddhist its use Academic English forms, not generic words.

2.3 English-Medium Instruction (EMI)

EMI studies show that the longer the EMI exposure of a student, the more implicit advanced proficiency he or she develops (in particular in academic settings) (Dearden, 2015). Instead of teaching the language, EMI creates an atmosphere where exposure to English is unavoidable.

At Acharya Nagarjuna University, overseas students have an opportunity in attending the:

- Lectures conducted in English
- Academic books written in English.
- Reviews conducted in English only

This authenticity is a basis for sociocultural theories of language development (as proposed by Vygotsky 1978).

3. Acharya Nagarjuna University as an EMI Benchmark

3.1 Institutional Language Policy

Acharya Nagarjuna University is a multi-faculty, very much diversified university in India offering post-graduate and doctoral programs; ANU speaks and writes only through English as an academic language - successfully being implemented throughout all vital academic pursuits of the university! Including

lectures, seminars, assigned literature to read up on it and learn more about it (scientific references), homeworks/homework assignments/rubrics, exams and doctoral thesis. With this full-fledged integration of EMI in place, English is not just an add-on to the curriculum but the dominant platform through which academic knowledge is framed, negotiated and appraised.

What is so important to realize for this institutional matrix, where English is not regarded as an isolated “subject” apart from the disciplinary content. Instead, it operates as the epistemic infrastructure of academic life, structuring how knowledge is acquired, expressed and authorized. Students have to interact with intricate and theoretical texts, discuss in an academic way, as well as write extensive papers with purely academic content in English. As a result, language is developed obliquely by engaging in and with the discipline rather than through explicit focus on language alone.

In theoretical terms, this congruence of policy is consistent with fundamental tenets of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and sociocultural theories of language learning: that sophisticated academic literacy is fostered by engagement in real academic activities. Its comprehensive integration of English at all levels is what disintegrates the artificial divide between “learning English” and “doing scholarly work,” which the majority of EGP (English for General Purposes) courses in church institutions draw.

In addition, the consistent use of English in teaching, assessment and academic research provides a stable linguistic atmosphere where students assimilate genres from their disciplines, conventions for disciplinary discussion and criteria of evaluation. Such institutional consistency stands in sharp contrast to partial or symbolic EMI models where English is employed sporadically and haphazardly, thus contributing to a compartmentalised linguistic development. At the Acharya Nagarjuna University, they are intellectually socialized in English, the medium of International Buddhism so that international Buddhist students can be engaged in academic activity at much higher levels than required by visiting hours or letter from overseas.

3.2 International Buddhist Students and Academic Socialization

International students (especially from Buddhist countries) are “plugged in” to an English medium of instruction academic environment as soon as possible. Their language development proceeds along many important paths:

Disciplinary engagement: On the other hand, because they are involved with their disciplines they understand many of the specialized words and concepts.

Experience with academic discourse: Consistent exposure to the discourses and discussions within your field make it easier to understand what is expected.

If the requirement for students to write and present: This forces them to be put in situations that are highly practical and have a lot of context using their language skills.

This adds to Hyland's (2018) argument that academic literacies are developed through active participation in a community of practice rather than via repetitive language exercises.

4. Why Supplementary English Models Fail (Theoretical Critique)

4.1 The Structural Limitations of EGP-Oriented Curricula

Unconnected Buddhist universities in diverse parts of Asia continue using English for General Purposes (EGP) models that are clearly recognizable by the imprint of various peculiarities, such as:

Emphasis on comprehension of structures, patterns and rules; Focused predominantly on grammar-based instruction.

The use of out-of-context words and phrases that are not situation-based, reducing the practicality of learning new words in relation to actual situations;

FCS-MHU Focus is placed on non-academic subjects, typically those that most closely resemble common activities (e.g., shopping, travel) and are not related to higher level or scholarly matters.

At a theoretical level, one can reasonably point out that such curriculum are structurally unable to lead to authentic academic competence because they remove for us the natural and crucial link between an acquisition of language and a process necessary by which knowledge is produced.

4.2 The False Attribution of Failure to Learners

One common misunderstanding that crops up again and again are the so-called "less intelligent" monastic students who have a low IQ and therefore an inability to learn English. But, the theoretical assumptions of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English Language as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), contradict directly and clearly with this false proposition. For these learners, who participate and work within the EMI (thus in English) environment, a significant emphasis on and

high level of proficiency in English is simply -if unwittingly- an unavoidable by-product of their performance and demands. Hence, it may be claimed that language effects are primarily and structurally defined by the learning context to which students belong, rather than having psychological causes or constraints.

5. Toward a Theoretical Curriculum Model for Buddhist Universities

5.1 Principles of the Model

For a theoretically permissible, well drawn-up curriculum for Buddhist higher education, the English language as part of the academic session should have primacy over it and not allow its inclusion in an isolated, spliced way. In addition, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) principles should be seamlessly blended with those of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), where curriculum design is specifically related to the language needs and use in its context of origin, Buddhist Studies. It should also integrate the specialized discourse of Buddhism into the axis between language and discipline, so that the understanding of both Buddhism and language will be essential as it would give an even more complete representation. Ultimately, the curriculum should connect flawlessly to internationally recognized academic norms such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and standards related to English Medium Instruction (EMI), so that it is able to meet the rigorous expectations of a global academic community.

5.2 Curriculum Components

The suggested curriculum is an interdisciplinary blending of theoretical views that guarantees the linguistic permanence and disciplinary suitability of the Buddhist HE. At the core of this system is English as a medium of instruction (EMI) grounded in sociocultural theory. This theory posits that language develops through interaction with others and the world as learners actively participate in real academic practices over time. By promoting English as the language of instruction and not an object of study per se, EMI creates a teaching context in which academic uses of English are learnt more or less incidentally through disciplinary encounters.

In this EMI case of the integration of Buddhist Academic Genres, Brown and Rose's (2015) English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is invoked. Such genres philosophical argument, doctrinal analysis, textual exegesis and comparison-religion critique—are also structuring devices which bring students to the pointing realms of rhetorical and epistemological convention in scholarly presentation of Buddhism.

This is reinforced with the development of discipline specific vocabulary informed by English for Specific Purposes (ESP). This alignment also is a guarantee that lexis acquisition directly matches the needs at the conceptual level required in the study of Buddhism, not only those related with generic communication.

In addition, the routine participation in academic writing and seminars relies on genre theory (Bazerman 1994:15ff.; Swales 1992:14), which recognises the role of repeated communicative activities in enabling disciplinary literacy. By practicing as writers and speakers of academic genres, students come to understand the form and function of these genres. Finally, critical discourse engagement as it sits within the realm of applied linguistics is a tool to support students in deconstructing, questioning and effectively locating themselves within global academic conversations. Taken together, these components form an holistic curriculum model in which language development is integrated with intellectual, disciplinary and epistemological purposes in accordance with the benchmarks of academic practice at an international level.

6. Extended Discussion: Language Policy as Academic Destiny

6.1 English as an Epistemic Infrastructure, Not a Skill

The central theoretical observation to be made on the basis of this far-reaching study is that, regardless of anything else, in the context of HE English has to be regarded as an epistemic infrastructure and not a (transferable) skill. In EMI environments, the English language not only serves as a means of communication, but it also becomes vital in mediating and shaping knowledge which is finely wrought, rigorously judged and then legitimized. This conception is a direct and salient contrast to the way in which English for General Purposes (EGP)-oriented models treat the use of English as an instrument and force external to any real disciplinary significance or context.

Epistemologically speaking, we have to realize that our knowledge is not and cannot be separated from the language in which it has been so carefully phrased and set down. A number of academic fields—notably philosophy, religious studies, and Buddhist hermeneutics—are fundamentally defined by discursive practices that involve specialized norms for abstract argumentation, intertextual reference, and critical exegesis. When English is placed outside of these pedagogical practices, students are structurally denied experience with full academic participation in other words, engagement and comprehension.

The strong case of the Acharya Nagarjuna University makes it crystal clear that when English is not only inevitable, but also indispensable—it is your only ticket to survival and success in academia—students pick up a very high level of proficiency in the language more or less organically, not really from any consciously imparted instruction. This persuasive evidence provides strong support for the more ambitious version of the EMI-as-acquisition model, which argues that prolonged exposure to disciplinary discourse fosters the development of a higher order set of academic literacies that promote students' ability to read more sophisticated intellectual terrains with both facility and confidence.

6.2 Academic English and Buddhist Intellectual Tradition

One of the recurring and more immediate concerns that arises in Buddhist organizations is this sense that English (or other languages) will project, and perhaps ineradicably distort or dilute, the complex subtleties and deep profundities of Buddhist philosophy. Yet, approached theoretically this apprehension indicates a naïve conception of language as an uninvolved shell that fails to consider linguistic meaning-making as being something dynamic and flexible that can reconfigure in one situation differently from the next.

In fact, Buddhism has historically been a master of linguistic adaptation, moving from the ancient languages of Pāli and Sanskrit into an astonishing array of modern ones: Chinese, Tibetan, Vietnamese, Japanese, Sinhala,—the list goes on. (Each of these major linguistic upheavals did not end in a simple dismissal of the dogma record neat: they secured, on the contrary, an extraordinary reinterpretation of Buddhist doctrine in relation to new semantic systems and allowed Buddhism to find an resonance with different cultures ...) In that sense, English is the modern counterpart of this centuries-old tendency of adapting and evolving languages.

Use of academic English in EMI is a supplement to but not the replacement for the foundations of Buddhist epistemology; rather it provides Buddhists with global discursive opportunities to engage with world scholarly debates. Hence, it is not the English language per se that is at issue but the crucial question of whether or not we are using English in academic genres which resonate favourably with the unique forms of reasoning and thinking specific to Buddhist traditions.

6.3 Why “More English Classes” Is a Structural Fallacy

One of the most common policy responses from various Buddhist universities is the strategic increase the range of English courses available to students. But curriculum theory in this regard is making a fundamental error. The sheer numbers of instructional hours devoted to the teaching of the English language cannot ameliorate the gross disconnect with educational purpose endemic to this approach.

English for General Purposes (EGP) courses, regardless of how many classes are offered or their duration, systematically do not deliver the high level of language academic preparedness pursued by students for several reasons. For one, these classes don't task the students with critical thinking in English – prerequisite to acquiring higher brain function. Secondly, they fail to embody the English language within disciplinary cognition as a result of which students cannot marry their language knowledge with their subject domains. Finally they don't require prolonged academic production, essential for promoting language use in a higher education setting.

As a direct result of these failings, well-intentioned students can go through many years of English study and never attend to genuine academic discourse which is essential to the development of their own intellectual ability. In sharp contrast, English Medium Instruction (EMI) breaks down barriers related to 'learning English' as opposed to 'using English', facilitating the bridging of the so-called transfer gap observed in vast arrays of applied linguistic studies. This natural combination enacts a more holistic approach to language learning, leading to more engaged and proficient students overall.

6.4 The Myth of Learner Deficiency in Monastic Contexts

A further key and substantial theoretical service of this analysis is that it emphatically repudiates the deficit narrative so often attaching falsely to monastic students. We can do no more than point out that the claim that monks or nuns simply do not have the requisite linguistic abilities is empirically unfalsifiable, and theoretically shaky as well. The sociocultural theory posits that the development of cognitive functions is intensely influenced by cultural practices and social interaction. When monastic pupils are struggling to function within minimally linguistically rich environments, it is unsurprising that low levels of language skills will be the predictable result. Very much to the contrast, these same learners find themselves learning within English Medium Instruction (EMI) settings that exude high academic

demands and they appear incredibly adaptable and resistant in linguistic terms. Hence, English language achievement must not be viewed as a product of personal inadequacies and deficiencies but rather as something that is generated and moulded in (and through) institutional sites and settings.

7. Theoretical Implications for Curriculum Design

7.1 From Language Courses to Language Ecology

This study argues for a radical and transformative shift in perspective, from the course-based model of language to an ecological approach to language. As part of this rich and vibrant academic ecology, the English language filters into multiple sites of education in terms not only of teaching and learning, but also assessment, academia dialogue and the creation of knowledge. Standalone language programs simply can't simulate the rich, complex network that is essential to holistic language learning and usage. For this reason, Buddhist universities that are genuinely interested in bringing about meaningful reform will need to engage the formidable challenge of re-designing their entire curricula – not only department by department (which would be insufficient), but institution-wide — so that every level of educational instruction corresponds and responds to the new language goals and uses of language.

7.2 Integrating EAP and ESP in Buddhist Higher Education

There are at least the following three very important types of factors that a theoretically coherent curriculum should be able to integrate well:

EAP (English for Academic Purposes): academic genres, argumentation and research writing;

ESP (English for Specific Purposes): Buddhism philosophy, ethic and Inter-religious dialogue.

This integration ensures that learning language in English is not only academically challenging but also spiritually relevant.

Some of the fundamental elements that should be included into the curriculum include:

- Seminars on Buddhist Philosophy in English-medium
- AAT: Academic writing of Buddhist texts
- lectures focused on doctrinal themes
- Full English-taught thesis supervision

These procedures are consistent with European HE standards and satisfy world accreditation requirements.

7.3 Teacher Identity: From Language Instructor to Academic Mediator

In EMI, the function of the teacher moves from being a language teacher to that one of an academic mediator. Teachers are responsible for providing access to disciplinary discourse, and not simply teaching the forms of language in isolation. Adept and dedicated faculty for Buddhist universities: Such a university would need teachers who meet the following criteria:

- Proficiency in academic English
- Solid grounding in the study of Buddhism
- Knowledge of genre-based pedagogy

This hybrid identity is essential to generating substantive and sustainable reform.

8. Policy Implications for Buddhist Universities

8.1 Language Policy as Strategic Vision

Language policy as a strategic academic decision in higher education instead of an administrative or representational issue. In the current framework of the global knowledge economy, however, the decision about an instructional language plays a critical role for a university's research proficiency, international recognition, and participation in transnational academic networks. It is no longer a question of whether HEIs wishing to achieve an international profile, particularly at postgraduate and doctoral level, will or will not allow EMI as part of their architectural anatomy; quite simply they must.

At more advanced levels learning is concurrent with the creation of knowledge through language. Dissemination, peer review, doctoral supervision and academic publishing are largely performed in English. Universities who fail to adapt this policy risk producing a locally or regionally bound output, regardless of the intellectual rigour of their productions. A carefully constructed EMI policy embeds students in international academic discourse communities from the start of postgraduate training allowing them to interact analytically and on their own terms with international scholarship and to contribute coherently towards it.

Partial or token adoption of English, as with bilingual syllabi combined with local-language teaching, has by contrast consistently proved insufficient. On a curriculum-theoretical level, these types of hybrid models fragment the academic learning environment, allowing students not to engage in prolonged interaction with

English as the language for access to disciplinary reasoning. If learner considers English as an alternative, additional or choice language it is not a medium of cognitive transfer. As a result, students may learn terminology, but not necessarily more deeply get to grips with academic literacy, genre competence or practice in critical discourse.

In addition, symbolic EMI policies may help to produce a façade of internationalisation while simultaneously leaving intact core pedagogical practices. This gap erodes the institution's credibility and further cements unequal results in student learning. By contrast a truly strategic language policy sees English as the principle medium for postgraduate and doctoral education, adapts teaching and assessment, and signals an institutional commitment to long term international academic engagement. It is only through such system-wide alignment that universities can achieve sustainable international relevance, rather than audit-based conformity to global standards.

8.2 Internationalization Beyond Mobility

It is a true internationalization, and not just exchange programs, but which requires changes in the very orientation of academic life. The best path for Buddhist universities to take, is without a doubt, that of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) where it is possible for them to:

- Engage in global scholarship
- Publish your research in top international journals
- Organize international conferences
- Recruit students and scholars from abroad

Without EMI, these objectives are likely to be aspirations and dreams rather than attainable.

9. Conclusion

9.1 Summary of Theoretical Contributions

In this paper, we formulate the conceptual framework that is suitable for analyzing English medium instruction (EMI) in Buddhist higher education at Acharya Nagarjuna University as a case example. Drawing on EAP, ESP, EMI and sociocultural theory, this research makes various significant findings:

- The development of AEP is systematically developed through explicit curriculum planning.

- EMI contexts naturally promote the acquisition of higher order academic literacy.
- Other English programmes are theoretically less able to deliver comparable educational results.
- Student aptitude is not where the translation of success in language learning lies.
- English is an appropriate vehicle for the propagation of Buddhist learning.

9.2 Reframing English in Buddhist Education

The main argument is that English should not be treated as a foreign virus in Buddhist education but as the current instrumental medium for contemporary transnational Dharma-moves across an increasingly hybrid academic space. As long as it is taught in curricula that respect both academic rigor and the depth of philosophy, English does not debase Buddhist intellectual tradition. Rather, it opens up a wide field of discursive possibility where these traditions can be critically expressed and shared in various cultural and linguistic forms. Far from undermining doctrinal purity, this strategic use of English enables Buddhist scholarship to enter into serious conversation with global academia, thereby renewing its intellectual vigour while ensuring its continued participation in the international knowledge-economy party.

9.3 Final Reflection

At a time of ubiquitous planetary information exchange and that this is overwhelmingly mediated through the English language, these Buddhist universities are being confronted as institutions with a fateful question: Do they want and will remain insular counter sites in their pursuits for knowledge? or, Do they change their self understanding – to what they presumably have been all along – major contributors in the realms of globally shared intellectual work within higher academia. The evidence on the theoretical bases underpinning EMI is clear and convincing: sustainable international standing could never be attained by mere peripheral or symbolic actions of interaction with English. Instead, it is the institutions that completely and effectively infuse English into their academic life – from teaching practices to research agendas, evaluation criteria, to scholarly communication practices – that will participate meaningfully in (and also contribute meaningfully to) the complicated process of global knowledge creation. Thus, the long-term

development of Buddhist higher education does not depend on a narrow understanding of teaching English as an isolated skill in and of itself but in a deep restructuring or remaking of how knowledge is construed, disseminated, and created through English as an academic discursive language. This is, in no small part, a change of great cultural politics rather than mere linguistic appeasement; an acrobatic and intellectual reconfiguration of Buddhist Studies within the shifting patterns and power plays that characterize the global knowledge economy.

References

- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a Medium of Instruction – A Growing Global Phenomenon*. British Council.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2018). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Bloomsbury.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press.

How to Cite this article?

Linh, Le Hong. "English Language Teaching and Program for Buddhist Higher Education: A Study for International Students at Acharya Nagarjuna University." *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, vol. 11, no. 1, Jan.–Mar. 2026, Oray's Publications, doi:10.36993/RJOE.2025.11.01.68.