広島大学学術情報リポジトリ
Hiroshima University Institutional Repository

Title	The Effects of Professional Training on EMI Lecturers: A case study in a Japanese national university
Author(s)	SHIBATA, Miki
Citation	Bulletin of the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University. Studies in integrated arts and sciences , 3 : 13 - 28
Issue Date	2022-12-31
DOI	
Self DOI	10.15027/53569
URL	https://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/00053569
Right	掲載された論文，研究ノート，要旨などの出版権・著作権は広島大学大学院人間社会科学研究科に帰属する。 ©2022 Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University. All rights reserved.
Relation	

The Effects of Professional Training on EMI Lecturers:
A case study in a Japanese national university

SHIBATA Miki

School of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University
Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University

Abstract

English-medium instruction (EMI) courses and programs have strategically increased at the tertiary level of education in Japan in order to be internationally competitive. Implementation of EMI aims at attracting international students and improving Japanese students' English proficiency. On the other hand, shifting the medium of instruction from Japanese to English challenges lecturers in teaching academic content. Nevertheless, they receive little pedagogical training, and thus its impact on EMI faculty is not well-understood. Given this, the purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of EMI professional training on university lecturers who teach courses in English at a national university. Conducting pre- and post-course surveys and follow-up interviews with six lecturers who attended EMI training, the results show that the EMI training helped them to change their conceptualization of EMI and pedagogical approaches. The study suggests that universities should develop professional training to support EMI faculty members.

1. Introduction

English-medium instruction (EMI)[1] plays a key role in the internationalization of higher education (HE) worldwide (Dearden, 2014). By adopting English as an academic lingua franca, higher educational institutions (HEIs) in non-Anglophone nations have strived to make HE more accessible and attractive to overseas students for the last few decades (Dafouz & Smit, 2016; Macaro, 2018; Macaro et al., 2017). Besides international student recruitment, implementing EMI aims at improving domestic students' English proficiency (Macaro, 2018; Macaro et al., 2017).

Following this trend, the Japanese government has promoted EMI in HEIs with the dual purposes mentioned above (the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT], 2008). However, note that the medium of instruction is traditionally Japanese at the tertiary level of education (Bradford, 2012, 2016; Tsuneyoshi, 2005) and English is not a first language of the majority of domestic students and faculty members. Given this, shifting Japanese to English greatly impacts teaching and learning academic subjects. In particular, lecturers and students who are not well-equipped with English skills encounter language challenges in the EMI classroom (Bradford, 2012, 2016; Tsuneyoshi, 2005). Also, EMI includes international students

and domestic students in classrooms, which leads to pedagogical challenges. They are diverse in terms of linguacultural backgrounds, disciplinary knowledge, and academic traditions (Bradford, 2012, 2016). Thus, lecturers need to understand such student diversity to implement inclusive EMI classes.

Nevertheless, the majority of EMI instructors have received little support and formal training in how to teach academic subjects in English (Brown & Bradford, 2022; Leong, 2017; O'Dowd, 2018). Moreover, EMI professional development (PD)[2] is relatively new and not systematically offered in Japanese HE contexts (Brown & Bradford, 2022; Kuwamura, 2018; Nakai, 2011). Hence, research on EMI-related PD is limited (e.g., Horie, 2018), and further investigation is required to promote EMI training programs in Japanese HEIs. Such background motivated this study to investigate impact of PD on university lecturers' perceptions of and approaches to EMI.

2. Background

2.1 Internationalization of HE in Japan

Internationalization of HE is often argued in line with globalization (Maringe, 2010). Globalization is described as 'the opening up and coming together of business, trade and economic activities between nations' (Maringe & Foskett, 2010, p. 1). Such movement has influenced HEIs across the globe to provide educational services internationally (Maringe, 2010).

In the same vein, internationalization of HE is a national agenda in Japan. In 2008, the Japanese government issued the 300,000 International Students Plan with aiming to accept up to 300,000 students from overseas by the year 2020 (MEXT, 2008). To achieve this goal, the following five strategies were implemented systematically and

cooperatively (MEXT, 2008):

1. Inviting international students to study in Japan: offering incentives to study in Japan and providing one-step services

2. Improving introduction of entrance examinations, enrollment, and entry into Japan: facilitating procedures for studying in Japan

3. Promoting globalization of universities and other educational institutions: creating attractive universities

4. Improving the environment for accepting international students: efforts to create an environment in which students can concentrate on studying without anxiety

5. Promoting acceptance of international students in society after their graduation or completion of courses: globalization of society

The third strategy necessitated EMI to make universities attractive to international students. The government claimed that 'a system should be developed to allow students to obtain academic degrees by studying in English only' (MEXT, 2008, p. 4). Then, MEXT launched the Global 30 Project in 2009, which funded 13 universities to increase EMI courses and programs. Next, the Top Global University Project (TGUP) started in 2014 for a further increase of EMI courses and programs (JSPS, 2014; MEXT, 2014). The selected 37 universities will have been funded until 2023 to succeed the project (JSPS, 2014; MEXT, 2014). According to MEXT (2021), as of 2019, EMI courses were offered at 307 universities at the undergraduate level (41.4%) and 237 at the graduate level (38%) out of 786 universities; undergraduate English-taught programs (ETP) were offered at 45 universities and 90 faculties and graduate-level ETPs at 114 universities and 290 graduate schools.

2.2 Challenges in EMI classroom

Meanwhile, shifting the instructional language from Japanese to English has created difficulties in teaching and learning in EMI classrooms (Aizawa & McKinley, 2020; Aizawa & Rose, 2019; Bradford, 2012, 2016; Tsuneyoshi, 2005). Exploring short-term study abroad programs taught in English, Tsuneyoshi (2005) categorized challenges into three types: linguistic, cultural, and structural. Bradford (2016), investigating full-degree undergraduate English-taught programs, identified four challenges: linguistic, cultural, administrative and managerial, and institutional. The first two issues will be further described below since they are directly relevant to EMI faculty members.

EMI linguistically challenges domestic students and lecturers with limited English language competence. Students' insufficient English proficiency may impede adequate comprehension of the course content while listening to and taking notes of lecturers conveyed in their non-native language (e.g., Aizawa & Rose, 2019; Aizawa, Rose, Thompson, & Curle, 2020; Ishikura, 2015). Bradford (2016) reported that EMI lecturers need to spend more time on preparing for a class, which increases their workload. Other studies reported that their limited English made it difficult for lecturers to be reactive and spontaneous in giving examples and anecdotes and comprehending and responding to students' questions (Airey, 2011; Tange, 2010).

In addition, compared to teaching a homogeneous group in Japanese, lecturers note student diversity (Bradford, 2012, 2016; Tsuneyoshi, 2005). International students bring the classroom behaviors and expectations established in their learning experiences in their home countries to EMI classrooms (Tange, 2010). Given this, language shift is not mere changing the

code (Dafouz, 2021; Horie, 2018), but it requires EMI lecturers to shift their teaching approaches accordingly (Klaassen & De Graaff, 2001). In other words, successful implementation of EMI may not simply be a matter of English proficiency (Macaro et al, 2017; O'Dowd, 2018). Aizawa and Rose (2019) stated that 'merely being proficient in English and being an expert in a subject area does not indicate that a lecturer is qualified to teach that subject area in an EMI setting' (p. 1139).

2.3 EMI professional development

While recognizing EMI impact and challenges have been manifested, EMI professional training has received some attention (Costa, 2015; Macaro, Akincioglu, & Han, 2020). The effect of PD has been examined in HEIs in Europe. Costa (2015) reported EMI teacher training courses at universities in ten European countries: Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK. The overview of courses revealed that EMI training had dual purposes: training for better English language competence and training for new methodologies (Costa, 2015, p. 129). Across the countries researched except the UK, language specialists from the university language centers offered the courses (Costa, 2015, p. 134). Guarda and Helm (2017), researching the effect of in-house EMI training courses in an Italian HEI, found training to be useful in raising university lecturers' awareness of pedagogical aspects of EMI and changed their teaching approach toward more student-centered. Also, participants noted flexibility of language practices, rather than English-only in EMI contexts. In the same vein, Klaassen and De Graaff (2001) investigated the effect of internal EMI training on faculty members in a Dutch HEI. The results indicate that the training developed participants' awareness of the necessity for student-centered

pedagogy. Overall, EMI teacher training gives positive impact on faculty members in European HE contexts.

In the Japanese HE context, on the other hand, EMI training is still at the early stage and pre- and in-service EMI teacher training are reportedly not institutionally provided or supported (Kuwamura, 2018; Bradford, et al., 2022; Brown & Bradford, 2022). Brown and Bradford (2022) investigated EMI lecturers' attitudes towards PD for EMI in Japan. A total of 92 participants responded to the survey. They found that 20% of faculty members took part in pre-service training and 46% of them in in-service training. As for the training content, the majority of respondents recognized PD necessary to improve their pedagogical skills. Despite their awareness, they were reluctant to attend PD for EMI since their various institutional duties including teaching and research limited their time (Bradford et al., 2022; Brown & Bradford, 2022).

As mentioned above, EMI-related PD in Japan is still under implemented (Brown & Bradford, 2022), and thus its effect is unknown. Given this situation, this study examined how a five-day EMI training course has affected university faculty members' perception of and approaches to EMI.

3. Study

3.1 Research site

This study focused on six faculty members who teach academic subjects in English for the Department of Integrated Global Studies (IGS). The program was established in 2018 at a national university that was selected for the TGUP. IGS is an interdisciplinary undergraduate program and admits both international students and domestic students. Students from overseas are admitted through a screening procedure as Japanese students

do. Most international students are from Asian countries (e.g., Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand, Vietnam) with a small number of students from English-speaking nations (US and UK). Some students also have dual nationalities (e.g., Japanese American). It should be noted that the demographic diversity implies that most students use English as a second language (L2).

A total of 23 faculty members are affiliated in IGS: 17 are from Japan, and one member each from Canada, China, Germany, South Korea, Romania, and the US. Their disciplines are diverse with humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Out of 23, four already had some EMI experience since they were originally employed to teach graduate courses in English. None of the faculty members have received any formal EMI teacher training and they were not required to have any specific qualification including English proficiency to teach EMI courses.

3.2 An external EMI training course for IGS faculty members

The EMI training course in this study was offered by an external professional organization located in the UK. They offer the training courses both in the UK and overseas and certify participants after completion of the course. A total of seven EMI lecturers including the author participated in the course. They all teach disciplinary courses in English in the IGS program. The training was a five-day program from March 7 to March 11, 2022 in addition to a pre-course session on March 4. The training course was implemented online due to the pandemic situation. Two trainers from the organization led the course. Participants were assigned tasks every day and instructed to post their responses and answers on Padlet and comment on other participants' postings

during the day. Then, a 90-minute live session took place online in the evening. The session started with a 20-minute lecture given by one trainer, and then another trainer facilitated the discussion and gave participants feedback on individual and group tasks completed during the day. After the online session, the trainer who led the discussion e-mailed participants further feedback and comments on the issues covered in the day along with useful sites and references for EMI teaching. The course was designed to encourage participants' reflecting on their own lecturing and questioning their beliefs and assumptions, and to raise their awareness through skill practice exercises.

Table 1 shows the topics that the course covered:

Table 1 The course topics

Day		Topics
1	a.	Internationalization of higher education
	b.	Teaching and learning change in EMI
2	a.	Second language acquisition theories
	b.	Inquiry-Response-Feedback (IRF)
	c.	Teacher talking time: Wait-time
3	a.	Values of class observation
	b.	Higher order thinking skills: types of questions
	c.	Interactive teaching: features of comprehensible PowerPoint slides
4	a.	Expanding the IRF
	b.	Integration: Active learning
	c.	Classroom management
5		Online platform for EMI classes

Participants could gain key concepts of and theories of second language acquisition and learn pedagogical strategies useful in EMI classrooms.

3.3 Participants

Table 2 shows individual participants' backgrounds. Out of 7, YI and LK had no previous experience of EMI, whereas TK and

MM had been teaching EMI for eight years. When starting to teach at IGS in 2019, MW already had some experience of EMI teaching and received pedagogical training as a teaching assistant at a graduate school in the US. SM has been mostly lecturing in English since she started teaching at the tertiary level in 1998. She received an MA in TESOL (teaching English to speakers of other languages) and Ph.D. in SLA (second language acquisition) from universities in the US. RHT from Canada was the only native speaker of English among participants and received a master's degree in TESOL (Teaching English for Speakers of Other Languages). RHT has an extensive experience of teaching English in Japan. Considering their academic backgrounds, both SM and RHT have fundamental knowledge of L2 learning and teaching methodologies.

Table 2 Participants' backgrounds

Name	Discipline	Nationality	Length of teaching
LK	Tourism	Korea	4 years
MM	Middle East area studies	Japan	8 years
MW	Sociology	Japan	5 years
RHT	Applied linguistics	Canada	29 years
SM*	Applied linguistics	Japan	24 years
TK	Conflict resolution	Japan	8 years
YI	Chemical oceanography	Japan	8 years

* The author of the present paper

3.4 Data collection

The author conducted pre- and post-course surveys online with six participants (see Appendix for questions). The follow-up interview was conducted after the post-course survey to clarify their responses to the pre- and post-course surveys.

The interview data were transcribed, and transcripts were analyzed using MAXQDA, following the thematic analysis approach in Braun and Clarke (2022).

4. Findings

Overall, participants recognized that the course was inspiring and useful to teach upcoming EMI courses. A 5-point Likert rating scale used in the post-course survey showed that participants were highly satisfied with the course ($M = 4.8$). They perceived pedagogical interventions covered in the training course (e.g., grouping students to make them interactive, wait time for students' responses, and Bloom's taxonomy) helpful for effective EMI teaching. Specifically, YI and LK who had no EMI experience appreciated such pedagogical techniques. Furthermore, four participants (LK, MW, TK, and YI) claimed that such pedagogical skills are not limited only to EMI, but applicable to any courses regardless of languages of instruction.

The following subsections report the impact of the PD on participants and their perceptional changes.[3] Then, their views regarding future PD for EMI will be described.

4.1 Impact of EMI training on individuals

During the interview, LK articulated that he spent his first four years struggling to lecture in EMI. In addition to his little teaching experience, he found that he had to teach in his L2 (i.e., English) as an IGS faculty when he was employed in 2018. Also, he did not know who to consult with regarding his concerns and anxiety. Through this course, however, he could resolve some of these issues as articulated as the following (underlined by the author for emphasis in the excerpt):

LK: IGS is EMI, so I wondered if it was necessary to

be completely 100% in English. But there was no one to consult or teach me, and I knew that all the teachers were very busy, so I was just wondering if I should create a completely English-speaking environment. Or, if the students have trouble understanding, is it okay to use Japanese? But the training course has clarified my concerns a lot.

LK also claimed during the interview that the course was more than what he had expected: before the course, he claimed that he would mainly learn teaching techniques. On the contrary, the course impacted his perception of and attitudes towards EMI in general. Also, learning about educational theory and philosophy helped him to change his approach to EMI. YI, who also had no EMI teaching experience before being assigned to IGS, articulated at the interview that the training course was new experience to her.

TK found reflective practice helpful for her to realize the issues she faces in EMI classes as indicated in the excerpt from the interview:

TK: I had never expressed in words what kind of problems I was feeling in class, so I was given the opportunity to reorganize my thoughts, find out what the problems were, and learn how to deal with them. That was very refreshing.

Reflective practice for EMI training will be further argued in discussion section.

Despite her experience of teaching in English in the US, MW had her own concern which differed from LK and YI as verbalized in the excerpt below:

MW: I taught the same kind of class when I was in the US. Although I changed the content a little bit, and focused a little bit more on diversity, I taught [the IGS course] in a similar way to the class where most of the students were Americans. It's

because that's the only way I knew. I had learned about Bloom's taxonomy and that kind of thing when I was in grad school. However, I felt like I was teaching the students without taking care of the fact that they were not native speakers of English. I was worried about that for a long time.

As verbalized during the interview, she was wondering whether she could apply the way to teach native speakers of English to IGS students of who the majority are non-native speakers of English. After the training course, she realized the necessity of identifying individual students' English proficiency, knowledge of academic content, and other personality characteristics (e.g., expressive, quiet), rather than merely being concerned about the dichotomy of native and non-native speakers.

4.2   Perceptional changes

Individuals' responses to the same questions in the pre- and post-surveys were compared to explore their perceptual changes in terms of interpretation of EMI, effective EMI teaching, and necessary skills for effective EMI lecturers. Their articulation at the interview will be reported to support the survey results.

4.2.1   Interpretation of EMI

Before the training course, all participants simply described EMI as teaching the subject in English. Then, their awareness of cooperation of language and pedagogical aspects was raised in defining EMI. For instance, RHT responded to the pre-course survey claiming: "[b]asically EMI is teaching subject content in English." After the course, his interpretation includes language support as part of EMI (underlined by the author for emphasis):

RHT: EMI is the teaching of content through

English. This incorporates not only providing students with content knowledge but also specific linguistic issues and features of classroom interaction to facilitate content and language development.

The similar perceptional change is recognized in YI's responses. Before the course, her interpretation of EMI is simple: EMI refers to a class in which only English is utilized to teach academic subjects. After the training, her written response indicates language aspect that EMI lecturers should concern to linguistically support students as shown below (underlined by the author for emphasis):

YI: My image of EMI as "teaching specialized subjects in English" has not changed. Through the training, however, I recognized the importance of knowing the students' English level and having opportunities for them to not only input but also output (especially speaking). Especially from Japanese students' perspective, I think that EMI should be equal to English ability can be improved at the same time (output without hesitation) through learning specialized subjects in English.

As she claimed, her underpinning perception of EMI had not changed, yet she learnt that students' English proficiency should not be ignored in EMI classes. MW also verbalized that EMI lecturers should consider students' needs. Before the training, her interpretation of EMI excludes "teaching students the English language itself." However, realizing that domestic students want to improve their English through taking EMI courses, she verbalized that EMI classes should be designed to address students' language issues. Similarly, TK claimed that improving students' English skills should be addressed in EMI classes, although the

primary purpose of EMI was to cultivate academic knowledge and disciplinary-specific critical thinking.

Prior to the training course, LK also equated EMI with English use only. Then, through the course, he appeared to soften his English-only view realized in the written response to the post-course survey (underlined by the author for emphasis):

LK: Before the training, there was a certain pressure regarding the use of English: as long as it was EMI, it had to be an English environment for faculty and students. (Omission) After receiving training from EMI experts, I started to think more flexibly. Also, I learnt that a mix of languages is not a problem for the sake of creating more effective English classes.[4]

4.2.2 Effective teaching

Participants' conceptualization of effective teaching shifted toward more student-centeredness and student engagement after the course, except YI, who already claimed a necessity of student-centeredness before the course. In their written responses, students are foregrounded as an agent in EMI classroom. Before the course, MW described that teaching should be effective if EMI lecturers speak "good enough English" (her own expression) for students to comprehend the academic subject. This is based on her own experience at a university in the US. While taking the science courses taught by Russian and Indian instructors, she could understand the lecture content despite their accent and frequent grammatically inaccurate utterances. After the EMI training, her written response emphasizes accommodation of students' needs:

MW: I think effective classes/teachers are flexible in order to help students attain their objectives of taking the course (e.g., improve their English skills and their employment prospects, obtain good

knowledge & training in the academic subject). Also, effective classes don't let students be passive learners because English is not their first language (e.g., make them think and ignite curiosity).

Both LK's and MM's written response to the pre-course survey was teacher-centered: effective teaching refers to the situation in which lecturers successfully convey academic subjects in English. After the training, LK emphasized the necessity of feedback from other EMI lecturers and students to know whether his class was effective. Moreover, students' feedback should be reflected in upcoming classes to accommodate students with different English proficiencies. MM also shifted from lecture's perspective (i.e., to be able to explain abstract notion in English) to students' active participation in class.

YI and TK interpreted effective learning from the students' perspective before the course. After the training, YI maintained student centeredness in her conceptualization of effective teaching and did not add any other features to describe it. On the other hand, despite that TK perceived interactive classes as effective before the training, she added some other features as shown in her written response to the post-course survey below:

TK: It involves interactive interaction with students and encourages them to think while maintaining concentration. In addition, students' understanding should be properly checked.

During the interview, she verbalized that she learnt that an effective class should help students to cultivate skills to create their own views through critical thinking, rather than finding correct answers. She further stated that she should employ high-order thinking questions that require students to analyze, evaluate, and create rather than lower-

order thinking questions that ask for rigid (i.e., accurate) answers to promote student engagement at the cognitive level.[5]

4.2.3 EMI teacher competence

Participants' description of EMI teacher competence also shifted through the training. The written responses to the post-course survey became specific in terms of lecturers' awareness and pedagogical approaches that promote student engagement. Before the course, RHT described competence with content and linguistic knowledge along with some ability to have students use the four skills (i.e., speaking, listening, reading, and writing). After the training, he responded with:

RHT: EMI instructors should be more aware of the importance of English language development as part of teaching content in English. Also, they should know a little about how to facilitate knowledge and skill development through classroom interaction and how knowledge can be scaffolded through LOT (low-order thinking) and HOT (high-order thinking) questions.

RHT articulated the advantage of his extensive experience as an English instructor in Japan since he could provide some language interventions to support students such as giving vocabulary tasks. For example, students are requested to work on a list of technical terms necessary to comprehend the content in a future class. RHT purposefully uses reading and audiovisual materials that include the vocabulary terms studied and encourage students to use the terms in classroom interaction and the writing assignments to develop their vocabulary knowledge.

In the pre-course survey, YI described EMI teacher competence as the skills to find out students' English level and design lessons

accordingly. After the training, she wrote three questions as her response: Why do universities promote EMI? Why do students take EMI courses? What considerations (terminology, speaking speed, intensity, slides, etc.) are necessary when teaching specialized courses in English? Since there was no explanation written, her intention of listing three questions was clarified at the interview. According to her, EMI lecturers must understand institutional rationales behind promoting EMI and students' motivation for taking EMI courses. Also, lecturers should have a skill to choose appropriate pedagogical interventions according to students' English proficiency and fundamental knowledge. This point overlaps with her description in pre-course survey. However, her written response and verbalization in the interview imply that EMI lecturers cannot successfully practice any teaching techniques unless they understand the first two issues (i.e., institutional reasoning and students' motivation).

MW considered student-centeredness as core of EMI lecture competence before and after the training course, while claiming the ability to pay attention to individual students as EMI teacher competence. However, she extended it to the ability to adjust teaching approaches to accommodate students' diversity.

[Pre-course written response] MW: I think EMI instructors need an extra ability to be attentive to individual students' needs and challenges. (I hope to have a better answer after the training!)
[Post-course written response] MW: It applies to all instructors, but I think it's especially necessary for EMI instructors to have a willingness and skills to carefully observe students and adjust their teaching methods accordingly based on the observation.

Furthermore, MW verbalized that she considered

only the English language skills as individual differences before the training. Then, through the course, she could conceptualize individual differences across a number of factors such as language ability, content knowledge, and personality (e.g., leadership).

TK also considered the student-centeredness critical as EMI teacher competence. Her description in the pre-course survey includes the ability to apply theories to students' idea and experience, to answer students' questions, and to invite students to have their own views on the issues discussed. After the course, she added the ability to conduct an EMI class in a way that is understandable to non-native English-speaking students. For this purpose, lecturers should be equipped with pedagogical interventions such as comprehensible PowerPoint slides, speaking skills, and IT knowledge. At the interview, she claimed that before the training course, she reluctantly continued to teach without providing any pedagogical interventions even when she was concerned about students' comprehension. Thus, she found teaching techniques she learnt at the course helpful to address her concerns. She claimed that such pedagogical repertoire should be part of EMI teacher competence.

Like their conceptual shifts of effective teaching, LK and MM started with the lecturers' ability to successfully convey academic subject to students in English, and then through the training, both described the competence from the student perspectives. MM responded with the ability to promote student engagement. LK suggested that it should be the ability to promote students' skills to personalize academic content, apply it, and share it with other students.

4.3 View on institutional implementation of EMI-related PD

The last three questions on the post-course survey asked 1) whether other EMI lecturers should take the EMI teacher training, 2) whether the university should provide financial support to those who attend training courses, and 3) what considerations the university should make so that faculty can participate in EMI skills training. For the first two questions, four (RHT, YI, LK, & TK) participants responded positively. LK commented that he strongly recommended the training to those who have been appointed to a new faculty position should have to take the course and that the university should financially support them if the university advocates internationalization. On the other hand, MM and MW responded with reservation. At the interview, MM explained that he would not recommend the training course to other faculty members since it takes a lot of time. University faculty members are busy when the school is in session. MW gave a different explanation: the EMI training should not be forced on to everyone. She insisted that research-oriented faculty should be exempted from EMI-related PD even if they teach the courses. It is because they are supposed to devote themselves to research, and thus they have no need to improve their teaching skills.

Finally, all participants requested the university to reduce the number of meetings and administration work, reward participants with incentives, and give them time to completely free themselves from school duties in order to encourage them to participate in EMI-related PD.

5. Discussion

This study explored the impact of a five-day EMI training course on EMI lecturers teaching at an English-taught program in a national university. The findings revealed that the training course was effective for participants at both cognitive

and practical levels. They were aware that EMI lecturers should be concerned about students' motivation to improve their English proficiency and that teaching approaches should shift to a student-centered approach, considering student diversity (e.g., English proficiency, fundamental academic knowledge, and culture-dependent classroom behaviors). They could also develop their teaching repertoire to accommodate student diversity. The EMI training appears to successfully promote participants' awareness that students' comprehension is not only ascribed to English proficiency, but also pedagogical support to assist their learning (Yeh, 2014).

5.1 Teacher reflection

EMI training also provides the opportunity for participants to engage in reflection of what they did in EMI class (Guarda & Helm, 2017; Klaassenn & De Graaff, 2001), which is recognized in TK's comment in the post-course survey as shown below:

TK: I was able to reaffirm the difficulties I usually feel about how to teach by putting them into words.

During the training course, participants often needed to recall and explore their own teaching approaches to complete assignments.

The importance of teacher reflection has been emphasized in the field of English language teaching (Farrell, 2015, 2020). Macaro (2018) claimed that EMI teachers' beliefs about the professional development need to be analyzed prior to designing courses (p. 234). Taking a holistic approach, Farrell (2015) proposed the *framework for reflection on practice* and further Farrell (2020) applied the framework to EMI professional development. The framework consists of five levels:

philosophy, principles, theory, practice, and beyond practice. At the philosophy stage, EMI lecturers explore who they are, followed by principles where they reflect their beliefs about EMI teaching and learning. Lecturers can be conscious about their beliefs through verbalizing them. At the theory stage, EMI lecturers reflect what theory or rationale behind their choice of teaching approaches and skills employed in EMI classroom. At the next level (i.e., practice), the lecturers reflect their actual classroom performance. Finally, at the level of beyond practice, EMI lecturers critically examine "moral, political and social issues related to their work" (Farrell, 2020, p. 290). This stage could bring EMI lecturers' attention to broader critical issues beyond classroom. For instance, Farrell (2020) raised the question about the responsibility of EMI lecturers: Should they be asked to improve students' academic knowledge and English proficiency or just academic content? This is a fundamental, yet extremely critical point that all EMI lecturers should be concerned about.

During the training course, two trainers emphasized that EMI lecturers should accommodate students' desire to improve their English proficiency while delivering academic subjects in English. In order for students to develop their English ability, they encouraged participants to use only English in EMI classrooms, which should increase students' exposure to English input and their output in English. Moreover, the trainers suggested that lecturers should modify their English, rather than shifting to Japanese, to ensure students' content learning. Nevertheless, the training course did not fully cover how to adjust the English level according to students' language proficiency. Moreover, the course barely practiced how lecturers linguistically support students except language modification. This could be due to the limited time of the course (i.e., five days), which

forced the trainers to select more pedagogically fundamental knowledge and skills. This speculation implies that a continuous series of EMI-related PD is necessary to cover the distinctive EMI issues.

5.2 HEIs' support for EMI-related PD

Teaching in an L2 is more demanding on teachers as they need to shift their focus from academic content to language use and pedagogy (Bradford, 2018; Guarda & Helm, 2016; Macaro, 2018). Critically, however, lecturers at the tertiary level are not required to undertake pedagogical training even in their native languages unlike primary and secondary teachers (Fink, 2013). Consequently, university teachers tend to continuously employ their familiar, old-traditional teaching approaches (e.g., teacher-centered, knowledge transmitting, and one-way lecturing). In the same vein, it is not surprising that faculty members use the same approaches in an EMI context. Investigating university lecturers' perception of EMI in Japan, Brown and Bradford (2022) reported that half of the Japanese respondents claimed that they would not change their teaching styles, whereas 75.9% of the native English-speaker faculty would in EMI contexts. Admitting that various factors influence the figures of the two groups, a lack of professional training might partially affect the Japanese EMI lecturers' unchanged approaches between L1 (i.e., Japanese) and L2 (i.e., English).

Taken together, EMI-related PD needs to be implemented at the institutional level. Similarly, this study also implies that universities must support EMI lecturers by providing them EMI-related PD. More critically, the university should give faculty incentives to motivate them to attend the training.

6. Conclusion

Changing an instructional language from L1 Japanese to L2 English demands university faculty paradigm shift in teaching approaches and classroom management (Bradford, 2018; Macaro, 2018). Consequently, they need support such as EMI-related PD. This study has revealed the positive impact of the EMI training course on faculty members. This course helped them not only to develop pedagogical skills but also to reflect on their teaching and raise awareness of pedagogical beliefs and assumptions. Such PD should be systematically offered at the institutional level. Lastly, institutions must be aware that EMI-related PD should ultimately improve students' learning (Klaassen & De Graaff, 2011).

As for a potential limitation, participants length of teaching experience and their respective disciplines appear to be skewed: no participant whose teaching experience is over 10 years and only one instructor from natural sciences was involved in the study. In this sense, individuals' responses may not be representative and the findings are not generalizable. Nevertheless, exploring a shift of participants' perception of and attitudes towards EMI in the current study, demonstrates the pedagogical value of EMI professional training. Furthermore, follow-up investigations are necessary in the future and researchers should explore whether and how participants have implemented the knowledge and the skills learnt in the course in their EMI classrooms.

Notes.

1. This paper has adopted the working definition in Macaro (2018, p. 1):

    The use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or

jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English.

2. Faculty development (FD) is more familiar than PD in Japanese HE. However, since PD is more conventional in literature, PD is used in this paper.

3. The original responses are all written in Japanese except by RHT and MW. The author who is a native speaker of Japanese and fluent in English translated them to English.

4. L1 use was not explicitly addressed at the course. Also, two trainers even discouraged it while suggesting that we should modify English to suit students' English proficiency. Thus, the source of his comment on the L1 use is unknown. The only possible source is personal communication with the author, who advocates that some L1 use is inevitable.

5. High-order and low-order thinking questions are based on Bloom's taxonomy. It categorizes cognitive skills to six levels from lower-order to higher-order skills according to the degree of cognitive processing required (Adams, 2015). Thus, low-order thinking questions are such as asking students to retrieve information and choose one correct answer, whereas high-order thinking questions require them to create something new through applying what they learnt.

Acknowledgements

References

Adams, N. E. (2015). Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive learning objectives. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *103*(3), 152-153. http://dx.doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.103.3.010

Airey, J. (2011). Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. *Ibérica*, *22*, 35-54.

Aizawa, I., & McKinley, J. (2020). EMI challenges in Japan's internationlization of higher education. I H. Bowles & A. C. Murphy (Eds.). *English-mediumm instruction and the internationalization of universities* (pp. 27-48). Palgrave MacMillan.

Aizawa, I., & Rose, H. (2019). An analysis of Japan's English as medium of instruction initiatives within higher education: The gap between meso-level policy and micro-level practice. *Higher Education*, *77*, 1125-1142. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10734-018-0323-5

Aizawa, I., Rose, H., Thompson, G. & Curle, S. (2020). Beyond the threshold: Exploring English language proficiency, linguistic challenges, and academic language skills of Japanese students in an English Medium Instruction programme. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1362168820965510

Bradford, A. (2012). Challenges in adopting English-taught degree programs. *International Higher Education*, *69*, 8-10. doi: https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2012.69.8646

Bradford, A. (2016). Toward a typology of implementation challenges facing English-medium instruction in higher education: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20* (4), 339-356. https://doi.org/ 10.1108/AEDS-06-2012-0016

Bradford, A. (2018). It's not all about English! The problem of language foregrounding in English-medium programmes in Japan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1551402

Bradford, A., Park, S., & Brown, H. (2022). Professional development in English-medium instruction: Faculty attitudes in South Korea and Japan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2086559

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.

Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2022). Faculty perspectives

on professional development and certification for English-medium instruction programs in Japan. *Nagoya Journal of Higher Education*, *22*, 55-87. https://doi.org/10.18999/nhje.22.55

Costa, F. (2015). English medium instruction (EMI) teacher training courses in Europe, *Ricognizioni*, *4*(2), 127-136. https://doi.org/10.13135/2384-8987/1102

Dafouz, E. (2021). Repositioning English-medium instruction in a broader international agenda: Insights from a survey on teacher professional development. *Alicante Journal of English Studies*, *34*, 15-38. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2021.34.08.

Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2016). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university setting. *Applied Linguistics*, *37*(3), 397-415. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/applin/amu034

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction—a growing global phenomenon*. British Council.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professional*. Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2020). Professional development through reflective practice for English-medium instruction (EMI) teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(3), 277-286. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1612840

Fink, L. D. (2013). The current status of faculty development internationally. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *7*(2), 1-9. Art. 4. http://dx.doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2013.070204

Guarda, M., & Helm, A. (2017). 'I have discovered new teaching pathways': the link between language shift and teaching practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *20*(7), 897-913. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1125848

Horie, M. (2018). Faculty training for non-native speakers of English at Japanese universities: Effective English-medium teaching for a culturally diversified student population. In A. Bradford & H. Brown (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in Japanese higher education: Policy, challenges and outcomes* (pp. 207-221). Multilingual Matters.

Ishikura, Y. (2015). Realizing internationalization at home through English-medium courses at a Japanese university: Strategies to maximize student learning. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, *5*(1), 11-28. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i1.237

JSPS. (2014). *Top Global University Project*. https://www.jsps.go.jp/english/e-tgu/index.html

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). The language(s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism? *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 4-15.

Klaassen, R., & De Graaff, E. (2001). Facing innovation: Preparing lectures for English-medium instruction in a non-native context. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, *26*(3), 281-289. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03043790110054409

Kuwamura, A. (2018). Nihon no daigaku niokeru EMI (English-medium instruction) no yakuwari -Kadai to tenbo [The role of EMI in Japanese universities: Challenges and prospects]. *Ryugaku Koryu* [Study Abroad Exchange], *91*, 9-27.

Leong, P., NG, C. (2017). English-medium instruction in Japanese universities: Policy implementation and constraints. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *18*(1), 57-67. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1204053

Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction: Content and language in policy and practice*. Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2017). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 36-76. http://doi.10.1017/S0261444817000350

Macaro, E., Akincioglu, M., & Han, S. (2020). English medium instruction in higher education: Teacher perspectives on professional development and certification. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *30*(1), 144-157. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12272

Maringe, F. (2010). The meaning of globalization and

internationalization in HE: Findings from a world survey. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.). *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp. 18-34). Continuum.

Maringe, F. & Foskett, N. (2010). Introduction: Globalization and universities. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic, and management perspectives* (pp. 1- 16). Continuum.

MEXT. (2008). *Outline of the student exchange system: Study in Japan and abroad.* https://warp.da.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1364673/www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2009/11/04/1222424_20_001.pdf

MEXT. (2014). *Top global university Japan.* Retrieved from https://tgu.mext.go.jp/en/index.html

MEXT. (2021). *Reiwa gan nendo no daigaku niokeru kyoiku naiyoto no kaikaku jokyo nitsuite* [Status of reforms in educational content, etc. at universities in the year of 2019]. https://www.mext.go.jp/content/20211104-mxt_daigakuc03-000018152_1.pdf

Nakai, T. (2011). Eigo niyoru jugyo no tameno FD no Kadai [FD issues for teaching in English]. *Ryugaku Koryu* [Study Abroad Exchange], *6*, 1-7.

O'Dowd, R. (2018). The training and accreditation of teachers for English medium instruction: an overview of practice in European universities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(5), 553-563. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491945

Tange, H. (2010). Caught in the Tower of Babel: University lecturers' experiences with internationalization. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *10*, 137-149. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470903342138

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2005). Internationalization strategies in Japan: The dilemmas and possibilities of study abroad programs using English. *Journal of research in International Education*, *4*(1), 66-86. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240905050291

Yeh, C.C. (2014). Taiwanese students' experiences and attitudes towards English-medium courses in tertiary education. *RELC Journal*, *45*(3), 305-319. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688214555358

Appendix: Survey items

The pre- course survey included the questions below:

a. What do you expect from this training course?
b. What knowledge and skills would you like to obtain in this training course?
c. How do you interpret effective lessons when teaching in English?
d. What knowledge and skills do you think EMI lecturers should have?
e. Please explain your image or definition of EMI.

The post-course survey asked the following questions:

a. To what extent did the course meet your expectations? (5-choice Likert scale)
b. What content/topic(s) from the course did you find beneficial for your own EMI classes?
c. **Now that you have completed the training**, please explain your image or definition of EMI. It would be helpful if you could provide details and be as specific as possible.
d. **Now that you have completed the training**, what do you consider to be an "effective class" in teaching in English? It would be helpful if you could provide details and be as specific as possible.
e. **Now that you have completed the training**, what knowledge and skills do you think EMI lecturers should have? It would be helpful if you could provide details and be as specific as possible.
f. **Now that you have completed the training**, how would you like to improve the EMI classes (limited to face-to-face) you have conducted so far? It would be helpful if you could provide details and be as specific as possible.
g. Do you think university teachers who teach in English should receive training to improve their EMI

skills?

h. Do you think the university should provide financial support for faculty to attend EMI skills training (e.g., the university pays for participation)?

i. What consideration do you think the university should give to help faculty participate in EMI skills training?