



**Teachers' Roles on Constructing English Medium Instruction Policy in
Community Schools**

Nani Babu Ghimire (PhD)¹, Yam Prasad Pandeya², Bhanu Bhakta Gurung³

¹Assistant Professor, Siddhajyoti Education Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

²Assistant Professor, Siddhajyoti Education Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

³Assistant Professor, Sindhuli Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Corresponding Author's Email: nanibabughimire@gmail.com

Abstract

Community schools have adopted English Medium Instruction (EMI) policy in response to the increasing influence of the English language in the world including Nepal. This study investigates the roles of teachers in constructing EMI policy in community schools. Employing a qualitative ethnographic research design, the study examines the opinions and experiences of three Grades (VI-VIII) teachers from three EMI community schools in the Sindhuli district. We collected data through in-depth interviews, participant observations, and field notes, gaining rich insights into the contextual realities of the schools. We transcribed audio-recorded interviews, translated them into English, coded, and categorized the data to derive key themes, offering a nuanced understanding of the teachers' experiences and practices. The study divulges that the effective execution of EMI policy in Nepal's community schools is hindered by the limited involvement of teachers in policy construction. Moreover, the findings highlight that SMCs and head teachers predominantly adopt a top-down approach to EMI

Copyright 2025 © Author(s) *This open access article is distributed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International \(CC BY-NC 4.0\) License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).*



policy construction, treating teachers primarily as implementers rather than policy creators. To enhance the effectiveness of EMI policy, the study offers a more inclusive bottom-up approach needs to be followed by SMCs and head teachers with active engagement of teachers in the development, planning, and review of EMI policy.

Keywords: EMI policy construction, teachers' role, limited participation, top-down approach, textbooks selection, community schools

Introduction

English Medium Instruction (EMI) policy has become a contested phenomenon in Nepal in recent years, analyzed from socio-political, historical, and economic perspectives (Phyak, 2016; Phyak et al., 2022; Poudel, 2019; Poudel & Choi, 2020; Sah, 2022; Saud, 2020). Defining EMI Sah (2020) mentions, “an instructional model of teaching non-English academic subjects through the medium of English in educational settings where English is not the mother tongue of most students, which aims to facilitate the learning of content knowledge as well as English skills” (p.1). Similarly, Moncada-Comas and Block (2021) state EMI as “the teaching of academic subjects in English in contexts where this language is not typically used for most day-to-day activities” (p.2). It becomes evident that EMI not only serves as a tool for teaching academic subjects in English but also plays a dual role in enhancing students' English language skills, particularly in settings where English is not the native language of most learners or commonly used in daily life. Due to this belief, both parents and teachers are increasingly supporting EMI, as they perceive that quality education can be enhanced through EMI policy (Ghimire, 2019, 2024; Phyak & Sharma, 2020; Saud, 2024). Furthermore, they believe that EMI policy serves as a pathway to advancing both socioeconomic status and symbolic prestige (Sah, 2023). However, some scholars claim that EMI policy is adopted in community schools of Nepal without considering the socio-cultural, sociopolitical, socio-historical, and socio-linguistic realities but rather under the influence of English as a global language and neoliberal and instrumental ideologies (Ghimire, 2024; Karki, 2023; Phyak, 2016; Sharma & Phyak, 2017). This often results in a mismatch between the policy's intentions and the practical challenges faced by schools, especially in multilingual and culturally diverse settings. In contrast

to this perspective, Eagle (1999) presents a counterargument, emphasizing the need for a thorough review and research into the rapid expansion of EMI policy. She also recommends giving careful consideration to the standardization and quality of English medium education. Scholars argue that schools are not required to follow any specific process or meet conditions to shift their Medium of Instruction (MOI) from Nepali to English. For example, exploring the practice of EMI policy formation in Nepal, Ranabhat et al. (2018) state that any community school can adopt EMI policy through a simple decision by the Schools Management Committee (SMC). In response to this issue, Brown (2018) suggests that the ad hoc approach to changing the MOI should be addressed by establishing a quality threshold to ensure the school can effectively deliver the curriculum in English. Due to this easy provision, many community schools have switched from Nepali to English without adequately preparing the necessary physical and human resources in Nepal. In other words, the SMCs and head teachers overlook teachers' beliefs and professional preparation when implementing EMI policy, despite teachers being key stakeholders in community schools.

"Teachers are the main policy actor in schools" (Johnson, 2013) and they are considered as agents of change because they shape their roles in schools by actively contributing on their work using their personal qualities (Biesta et al., 2015; Fullan, 2003; Vongalis-Macrow, 2007). In other words, teachers can play significant role in EMI policy construction in community schools. However, SMCs and school administrations do not assign a significant role to teachers in the development of EMI policy in community schools (Ghimire, 2021b, 2024). SMCs and head teachers impose EMI policy, compelling teachers to teach content subjects in English without considering their role in shaping language education policy in community schools (Ojha, 2018). However, Tiwari (2023) suggests that Nepal's community schools should prepare teachers with certain role beforehand to ensure the successful implementation of EMI policy. Ghimire (2024) highlight that teachers' performance reflects their sense of identity within EMI policy construction in community schools, yet SMCs and head teachers often impose the policy without acknowledging teachers' contributions to shaping language education policy. Moreover, the successful implementation of EMI

policy relies on the support, acceptance, and active collaboration of teachers, who play a direct role in applying the policy in classrooms by teaching content subjects in English. This discussion reveals that limited studies have examined teachers' roles in the introduction of EMI policy in community schools in Nepal. Consequently, this study addresses the research question: "What roles do teachers play in constructing EMI policy in community schools?" In other words, this paper aims to examine the teachers' role in constructing EMI policy in community schools in Nepal. This study contributes to the body of knowledge by emphasizing how teachers actively shape and negotiate EMI policy in community schools, offering insights into teacher agency and policy construction in multilingual contexts.

Methods and Procedures

This study employed an ethnographic research design (Fetterman, 2010), which focuses on "the predictable, daily patterns of human thought and behavior" (p. 1). Furthermore, Hornberger (2013) highlights that language policy ethnographers often focus on the planning and implementation of language teaching and learning policy as well as instructional practices in classrooms. Aligned with this approach, we adopted an ethnographic design to explore teachers' roles in shaping EMI policy in Nepali community schools, with a focus on their language ideologies (Phyak et al., 2023). The study was conducted in the Sindhuli district, where three community schools were selected from three distinct areas: one municipality and two rural municipalities. These schools had been implementing EMI policy for at least five years. To maintain confidentiality, pseudonyms were assigned to the schools as Kamalamata School, Bhimsen School, and Marin Thakur School. Three teachers teaching content subjects in English at the Grades VI–VIII level for over five years were purposively chosen as participants. We collected data through in-depth interviews guided by semi-structured questions, participant observations, and field notes. We fully transcribed the audio-recorded interviews. Using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach, we systematically coded the transcribed data. We then categorized the codes, developed themes, and analyzed them based on participants' accounts and relevant literature (Ghimire, 2019). Furthermore, we adhered to the ethical principles of ethnographic

research by obtaining informed consent, ensuring confidentiality, and fostering reciprocity throughout the study (Ghimire, 2021a).

Findings and Discussion

Teachers play a central role in the effective application of EMI policy. Their understanding of language and learning significantly influences how they address the challenges of EMI in diverse classroom contexts. In exploring teachers' roles in constructing EMI policy, the findings have been categorized and discussed under three key themes: 'Limited participation in EMI policy construction', 'inadequate involvement in textbook selection process' and 'top-down approach to EMI policy construction'.

Limited Participation in EMI Policy Construction

Teachers have a limited participation in EMI policy construction in community schools. Despite being key agents in language policy developing process, their involvement is minimal in EMI policy formation. Although research shows that teachers are viewed as the key "agents in the policy making process" (Johnson, 2009), SMCs and head teachers often take control of policy decisions without adequately including teachers in the process. According to Johnson and Johnson (2015), teachers serve as the final arbiters of language policy implementation, playing an important role in EMI policy creation and document preparation. However, Lalita from Kamalamata School shared a different experience, "I have not seen EMI policy document in our school. I think our school has not prepared it. However, we work hard to teach through EMI. We are doing our effort to teach content subjects in English." As teachers are the major policy actor of schools, they need to know about EMI policy document and its development process. However, Lalita is unfamiliar about it. As ethnographers, during a field visit to Kamalamata School, discussions with the head teacher and other staff revealed that EMI policy was created through a decision made by the SMC, with no formal document beyond the initial meeting. They did not prepare any policy document for the effective implementation of EMI policy; instead, they simply decided to execute it in their schools. Reflecting on the school's EMI policy history, Prakash from Bhimsen School, mentioned, "I have listened that teachers did homework for development and

implementation of EMI policy in the initial phase. When I transferred here, I have not participated in any interaction programs and policy development activities for EMI.” In a dialogue with other stakeholders to understand the ground realities of the creation of EMI policy in their school, the parents at Bhimsen School indicated that there was an initial joint meeting of parents and teachers to decide on EMI policy. One parent mentioned, “we did a combined gathering of teachers and parents and decided to create EMI policy in our school. Some teachers were against EMI policy by saying that they could not teach through EMI”. Prakash’s remarks align with this, as he confirmed that teachers were consulted only at the early stages of the policy creation process but were largely excluded afterward.

The context of Kamalamata and Bhimsen Schools highlight an insignificant role for teachers in the ongoing development and enactment of EMI policy. While teachers were involved in the initial discussions, the SMCs have since sidelined their contributions, believing that teachers’ primary role is to teach content subjects in English rather than engage in policy development. This reflects a broader issue where teachers’ role is limited, despite the research that emphasizes the need for teachers’ active participation in policy-making to ensure successful execution (Phyak, 2023). Moreover, after prolonged engagement with us, Binaya from Marin Thakur School mentioned “I do actually not know who makes EMI policy in our school. Perhaps, SMC and head teacher develop it through the decision of SMC meeting with the support of community”. Binaya’s reflections, following extended interaction, shed light on the gap between teachers’ participation and EMI policy-making process in his school. He expresses uncertainty about who exactly creates EMI policy, speculating that it is likely developed by the SMC and head teacher, with input from the community. His statement, “I do actually not know who makes EMI policy procedures in our school”, illustrates the limited involvement and awareness that teachers have regarding key decisions that shape their teaching environment. Two other participants, Lalita and Prakash, also agreed with Binaya, as they face similar conditions in their schools. In community schools, the decision-making authority resides largely with the SMCs and head teachers, and teachers are not consulted in the process. As the participants

explain, the SMCs and head teachers make decisions independently, viewing the role of teachers as merely implementing those policies. EMI policy is implemented by community schools without prior planning or teacher consultation (Ghimire, 2024; Tiwari, 2023). The SMCs and school administration believe that teachers should focus solely on teaching content in English rather than participating in policy creation. As a result, teachers are excluded from the textbook selection process, a vital aspect of their role in school education.

Inadequate Involvement in Textbook Selection Process

The textbook selection process is another major policy-related aspect in community schools. Since textbooks directly impact both teachers and students, teachers are given a limited role in selecting them. Decisions regarding textbook selection in EMI community schools are primarily made by head teachers and SMCs (Sah, 2022). Prakash, an experienced mathematics teacher with over ten years of teaching at Bhimsen School, has not been involved in the textbook selection process. For instance:

Principal Investigator: Do teachers have role in selecting textbooks for English medium instruction?

Prakash: In the past two years, the head teachers, along with a few SMCs, made the decisions regarding textbook selection. We now have a new head teacher who has discussed the matter with us. However, he ultimately chose the textbooks himself for this year. I hope that next year, he will involve us in the selection process.

Choosing textbooks is typically regarded as the responsibility of teachers. However, in some cases, head teachers limit teachers' involvement in this process. Ensuring teachers have the authority to select high-quality textbooks are essential for student learning. But, at Bhimsen School, for example, teachers were excluded from this critical decision-making process, despite being key stakeholders in executing the policy. This exclusion highlights a significant gap in recognizing teachers' roles. Likewise, Lalita, a teacher from Kamalamata School, shared, "Our head teacher decides

which books are taught to the students rather than asking us to select the textbooks.” Her statement further illustrates how teachers are excluded from the textbook selection process in community schools, reflecting a broader trend of disregarding in policy-making.

In Nepal, both the government and private publishers produce textbooks for school education. Most community schools use textbooks published by the Government of Nepal. However, English-medium community schools choose textbooks published by private publishers for their students. During our field observations, teachers expressed their preference for using English medium textbooks of content subjects published by the Government of Nepal, particularly translated versions of government textbooks. However, SMCs and head teachers often select textbooks from private publishers, believing these textbooks provide better quality education than government-issued textbooks. Similarly, Prakash from Bhimen School said, “we prefer English medium textbooks of Government publication because they are translated version of Nepali medium textbooks which are easy for us to teach. However, our schools implement textbooks of private publications which are burden for us to teach”. In Prakash’s narrative, we see a clear tension between teachers’ preferences and the decision-making power held by SMCs and head teachers. Prakash highlights that teachers favor the translated English-medium textbooks provided by the Nepal Government, as these are adapted from the Nepali-medium versions, making them more familiar and easier to teach. This preference underscores teachers’ desire for materials that align with their comfort and pedagogical knowledge. However, SMCs and head teachers tend to select textbooks from private publishers, believing that these offer a higher quality of education. This decision reflects authority-oriented approach to textbook selection, where teachers’ voices are marginalized in the process. Prakash’s statement, “our schools implement textbooks of private publications which are burden for us to teach”, illustrates the frustration teachers experience when they are required to use materials that are not aligned with their teaching methods or that create additional challenges in the classroom. Since head teachers and SMCs overlook teachers’ opinions in the textbook selection process, they end up using Nepali-medium textbooks while teaching students in the classroom.

During the field visits, we observed the library at Marin Thankur School, where our participant Binaya was searching for books. We asked him, “What are you doing?” He replied, “The SMC and head teacher decided to implement private publishers’ textbooks. I am searching for the translated version of the government science book as supporting material to teach science in English”. Despite their reservations about private publishers’ textbooks, teachers are forced to teach them, which goes against their preferences. This situation highlights that teachers are omitted from the textbook selection process in community schools. In this context, they cannot be expected to provide quality education effectively.

The detachment of teachers in making policy in textbook selection process reflects wider issues of teachers’ role within EMI policy construction. Although teachers are on the front lines of education, their professional expertise and preferences are often overlooked, leading to a mismatch between policy decisions and classroom realities. This gap not only affects teachers’ ability to deliver effective lessons but also has implications for the quality of education students receive. EMI policy needs to be implemented based on teachers’ participation and recommendations in community schools (Ghimire, 2021b, 2024; Tiwari, 2023). Therefore, for EMI policy to succeed, schools need to involve teachers in discussions, planning, and continuous review processes. The disengagement of teachers in EMI policy formation reflects a top-down approach to policy construction in community schools.

Top-down Approach to EMI Policy Construction

Though our ethnographic field observation and rigorous discussion with teachers, we reflect that EMI community schools follow a top-down approach to policy construction. SMCs and head teachers take primary responsibility for policy development. Teachers are detached from this process and are viewed merely as implementers. They are tasked with teaching content subjects in classrooms rather than contributing to policy construction. SMCs and head teachers view teachers’ primary responsibility as limited to classroom instruction, eliminating them from policy making. This practice reinforces a hierarchical structure that undervalues and banishes teachers’ professional insights. This dynamic creates a top-down approach

to EMI policy enactment, where teachers, despite being the ones directly affected by these policy, are not given a platform to influence or contribute to the decisions that impact their work. This not only limits teachers' role but also may result in policy that are detached from the practical realities of the classroom.

In our field observation, we spent a significant amount of time in all three schools, building close relationships with the participants and getting to know them well. We visited their homes, stayed with them, helped teach their children, and assisted them in preparing lessons for teaching through EMI. Through this, we became insider among our research participants. As a result, they behaved us as friends rather than researchers or lecturers at campuses, which led them to openly share their thoughts with us. We had more and more discussions about the role of teachers in shaping EMI policy in community schools. For this issue, PI also made a conversation with Binaya at Marin Thakur School on teachers' role on constructing EMI policy.

Principal Investigator: Did school ask you while constructing EMI policy?

Binaya: No, they did not ask me. They did not discuss with us. SMC decided and announced, and we implemented it. However, they had to consult and discuss with us before implementing it. They need to focus on the teachers' capacity and motivation to teach through EMI.

Binaya's account provides valuable insight into the lack of teacher involvement in EMI policy creation at Marin Thakur School. His statement, "No, they did not ask me... SMC decided and announced, we implemented it", highlights the top-down nature of the policy-making process, where teachers are disengaged from discussions despite being the ones responsible for implementing this policy in the classroom. Binaya emphasizes the importance of involving teachers in policy discussions, particularly in relation to their capacity to teach through EMI. His concern, "they need to focus on the teachers' capacity and motivation to teach through EMI", points to the detachment between the SMC's decisions and the realities of the classrooms. The teachers' limited proficiency in English is a major barrier to effectively teaching content in EMI, yet this critical factor is overlooked by the SMC when imposing EMI policy. Binaya's frustration reflects a broader structural issue where teachers' role is disregarded in policy construction. The SMC makes decisions without discussing with

teachers, who are major policy actor in school education (Ghimire, 2024). This creates a situation where teachers feel unprepared and unsupported, leading to ineffective policy implementation (Tiwari, 2023). Effective EMI policy requires not only top-down mandates but also bottom-up input from teachers, who are essential agents in policy success (Ali & Hamid, 2018).

If teachers are not involved in policy development process, that policy may not address the real problems teachers face. It also makes it difficult to effectively implement EMI policy and improve education through it. Our field observation further reinforces the need for dialog between SMCs and teachers. So we made a dialogue with Prakash at Bhimsen School who said:

EMI policy was implemented before I came here. I have not involved in any meeting of EMI policy improvement now-a-days. The head teacher calls staff meeting. We discuss about other things rather than EMI policy enactment, its challenges and ways of solutions. We do not have detail plans of implementation of EMI policy practically in our school.

Prakash, a teacher at Bhimsen School, reveals the lack of teacher involvement in discussions or decisions related to the improvement of EMI policy. He mentions that EMI policy had already been executed before his arrival, and since then, there have been no ongoing meetings to discuss its effectiveness or challenges. Prakash points out that staff meetings, led by the head teacher, focus on topics other than EMI policy, highlighting a gap in collaborative policy review and adjustment. Furthermore, he admits that the school lacks a detailed, practical plan for implementing EMI policy. This specifies a top-down approach to EMI policy construction without sufficient teacher input or planning, which hinders the effective execution of the policy in classrooms (Dearden, 2014). This disconnect undermines the collaborative foundation necessary for effective educational reform. Furthermore, Lalita from Kmalamata School asserted, “SMC and head teachers perceive us as teachers solely responsible for classroom teaching, not as participants in policy formation. To them, we are employees whose duty is limited to teaching, leading them to impose the EMI policy on us”. The omission of teachers from EMI policy-making reflects a hierarchical approach that limits their

agency, hindering the policy's practical success and collaborative potential. However, Airey et al. (2017) suggest that emphasizing policy construction through a bottom-up approach would be beneficial, advocating for grassroots discussions on EMI policy development process. Involving teachers in EMI policy-making process ensures more effective and inclusive policy development in community schools of Nepal.

Conclusion

The study discloses that the effective execution of EMI policy in Nepal's community schools is hindered by the limited involvement of teachers in policy construction. Teachers, who are key policy arbiter in the school education, are often omitted from decision-making processes such as EMI policy development and textbook selection. Teachers' roles in EMI policy formation are rarely evident during the preparation of policy that directly affects their teaching practices and professional accountabilities. Moreover, the findings underscore that SMCs and head teachers predominantly adopt a top-down approach to EMI policy construction, treating teachers primarily as implementers rather than active contributors. This approach reflects a hierarchical structure where decisions are made at higher levels without adequately considering the practical insights and expertise of teachers. As a result, there is a significant disconnect between the objectives outlined in EMI policy and the realities of multilingual and diverse classroom settings. This gap hinders the effective translation of policy into practice, as teachers often lack the necessary support, resources, and understanding of the policy they are tasked to implement. Teachers' disengagement in EMI policy construction not only limits teachers' roles but also compromises the quality and feasibility of EMI policy execution in community schools.

The findings of the study imply that teachers need to be actively involved in the construction of EMI policy in community schools in Nepal. A collaborative and participatory approach, with teachers' engagement in EMI policy formation, would enhance the practical and effective implementation of the policy. To enhance the effectiveness of EMI policy, a shift towards a more inclusive, bottom-up approach is essential. Policymakers and school management committees need to actively engage teachers in the development, planning, and review of EMI policy. This participatory approach can bridge the gap between policy intentions and practical challenges,

ensuring that teachers' capacities and experiences are reflected in policy decisions. Moreover, providing teachers with a platform for dialogue and collaboration can foster a sense of ownership and accountability, essential for the successful implementation of EMI policy. This study offers for a reevaluation of the role of teachers in EMI policy development to ensure that their expertise and experiences are leveraged effectively to bridge the gap between policy intentions and educational practices.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by the University Grants Commission (UGC), Nepal, through the Faculty Research Grants for the fiscal year 2078/079 (2022/023) under Award No: FRG-78/79-EDU-02. The authors extend their heartfelt gratitude to UGC for its generous support, which was instrumental in the successful execution and completion of this research.

References

- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, 73(4), 561–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2>
- Ali, N. L., & Hamid, M. O. (2018). English-medium instruction and teacher agency in higher education: A case study. In *Un (intended) language planning in a globalising world: Multiple levels of players at work* (pp. 234–250). Sciendo Migration. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110518269-013>
- Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching*, 21(6), 624–640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1044325>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction - a growing global phenomenon*. British Council. <https://tinyurl.com/2vx3v6ds>

- Eagle, S. (1999). The language situation in Nepal. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20(4-5), 272–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639908666382>
- Fetterman, D. M. (2010). *Ethnography: Step-by-step*. Sage.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *Change forces with a vengeance*. Routledge.
- Ghimire, N. B. (2019). English as a medium of instruction: Students' discernment in Nepal. *Education and Development*, 29, 146–160.
- Ghimire, N. B. (2021a). Review on ethical issues in ethnographic study: Some reflections. *Contemporary Research: An Interdisciplinary Academic Journal*, 5(1), 79–94. <https://doi.org/10.3126/craiaj.v5i1.40485>
- Ghimire, N. B. (2021b). Teacher identity in English medium instruction schools of Nepal. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki*, 4(1-2), 42–56.
- Ghimire, N. B. (2024). *Unravelling the dynamics of English Medium Instruction (EMI) policy in community schools: A critical ethnographic exploration of teacher ideology, identity and agency* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tribhuvan University, Faculty of Education, Kathmandu.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2013). Negotiating methodological rich points in the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2013(219), 101–122. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2013-0006>
- Johnson, D. C. (2009). Ethnography of language policy. *Language Policy*, 8(2), 139–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9136-9>
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, D. C., & Johnson, E. J. (2015). Power and agency in language policy appropriation. *Language Policy*, 14(3), 221–243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9333-z>
- Karki, T. M. (2023). *English as a medium of instruction in community schools of Nepal: Policies and practices* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tribhuvan University, Faculty of Education, Kathmandu.
- Moncada-Comas, B., & Block, D. (2021). CLIL-ised EMI in practice: issues arising. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(6), 686–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1660704>

- Ojha, L. P. (2018). Shifting the medium of instruction to English in community schools: Policies, practices and challenges in Nepal. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language teaching in Nepal: Research, reflection and practice* (pp. 187–200). British Council. <https://tinyurl.com/2ppw3972>
- Phyak, P. B. (2016). *'For our cho: Thung': Decolonizing language ideologies and (re) imagining multilingual education policies and practices Nepal* (Publication No. 10587361) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Phyak, P. B. (2023). Producing the disciplined English-speaking subjects: Language policing, development ideology, and English medium of instruction policy. *Language in Society*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404523000052>
- Phyak, P. B., Ghimire, N. B., & Saud, M. S. (2023). Engaged methodological approach in the study of language ideologies in EMI policies. In S. M. Curle & J. K. H. Pun (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Methods in English Medium Instruction for Emerging Researchers* (pp. 115–127). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003375531>
- Phyak, P. B., Sah, P. K., Ghimire, N. B., & Lama, A. (2022). Teacher agency in creating a translingual space in Nepal's multilingual English-medium schools. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 431–451. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221113950>
- Phyak, P. B., & Sharma, B. K. (2020). Functionality of English in language education policies and practices in Nepal. In R. A. Giri, A. Sharma, & J. D'Angelo (Eds.), *Functional variations in English* (pp. 321–335). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52225-4_21
- Poudel, P. P. (2019). The medium of instruction policy in Nepal: Towards critical engagement on the ideological and pedagogical debate. *Journal of Language Education*, 5(3), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.8995>
- Poudel, P. P., & Choi, T.-H. (2020). Policymakers' agency and the structure: The case of medium of instruction policy in multilingual Nepal. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2020.1741235>

- Ranabhat, M., Chiluwal, S., & Thompson. (2018). The spread of English as a medium of instruction in Nepal's community schools. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language teaching in Nepal: Research, reflection and practice* (pp. 81–107). British Council. <https://tinyurl.com/2ppw3972>
- Sah, P. K. (2020). English medium instruction in South Asian's multilingual schools: Unpacking the dynamics of ideological orientations, policy/practices, and democratic questions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(2), 742–755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1718591>
- Sah, P. K. (2022). *New hierarchies, new middle class: A critical ethnography of English as a medium of instruction policy in Nepal's public schools* [Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia]. <https://open.library.ubc.ca/soa/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0413796>
- Sah, P. K. (2023). Emotion and imagination in English-medium instruction programs: Illuminating its dark side through Nepali students' narratives. *Linguistics and Education*, Article 101150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101150>
- Saud, M.S. (2020). English medium public schools in Nepal: A new linguistic market in education. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 23(2), 319-333.
- Saud, M.S. (2024). From private to public: Students' perspectives on shifting to English medium education in Nepal. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 27(2), 972-984.
- Sharma, B. K., & Phyak, P. B. (2017). Neoliberalism, linguistic commodification, and ethnolinguistic identity in multilingual Nepal. *Language in Society*, 46(2), 231–256. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000045>
- Tiwari, H. P. (2023). Basic level English as foreign language teachers' experience about English medium instruction. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, Management*, 3(1), 55–63. <https://tinyurl.com/4hehtepx>

Vongalis-Macrow, A. (2007). I, Teacher: Re-territorialization of teachers' multi-faceted agency in globalized education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(4), 425–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701369376>

Appendix I: Guideline Questions for Interview

1. What is your name, age, gender, address, and education level?
2. Are you a permanent, temporary, or *rahat* teacher?
3. Can you share your teaching experience?
4. What grade and level do you teach?
5. What subjects do you teach?
6. Can you tell me about your school's educational history?
7. Has your school adopted an English medium instruction policy?
8. How was EMI policy formulated and put into practice at your school, and who was involved in this process?
9. Are you actively involved in the development and execution of EMI policy at your school?
10. What role do you play in the creation and execution of EMI policy at your school?