

*Examining a Teacher Education Course in English for the Medium of Instruction  
Using 5Is*

Paul C. Corrigan, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2015  
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Policies requiring English as the Medium of Instruction (EMI) are sprouting at many universities in Asia and Europe. In many cases, challenges arise for students because they are using English as a Second Language (ESL), rather than their primary language, for learning. Furthermore, faculty members need to use English to teach even though for many of them English is also not their primary language. Intensive English Language Centers which exist at many universities help students to bridge the language gap through ESL instruction or by offering adjunct courses. Far less attention and far fewer resources, however, have been given to faculty members who need to teach in their second language, English. Hence, policies requiring EMI have created a growing but largely unsatisfied need to prepare such faculty members to use English in their teaching. *English for the Medium of Instruction* (EFMI) has been proposed as a term to describe such teaching while “5Is” is proposed as a way of looking at the course development cycle. At a university with an EMI policy in Hong Kong, a course in EFMI was recently launched; in this presentation, the “5Is” will be discussed in relation to that course. Audience members will learn about the EFMI course in Hong Kong as the presenter stencils the 5Is - Identify, Invent, Implement, Investigate, and Improve - over the course development cycle, providing explanations and samples of different “Is” along the way. Participants will also be invited to discuss EMI and EFMI at their universities.

Keywords: English as the Medium for Instruction; University pedagogy; University policy

iafor

The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## 1. Globalization, Demographics, and English in Higher Education

Globalization, demographics, and English are simultaneously shrinking and enlarging higher education. In the process they are creating new sets of challenges which will require universities to develop and introduce innovations, especially for classroom instruction. Globalization is about “trade, finance, people, and ideas in one global marketplace” (Soubotina & Sheram, 2000, p. 66), including higher education; demographics is about the study of changes in population. In OECD countries fertility rates are decreasing, leading to a change in demographic profiles (Vincent-Lancrin, S., 2008) expressed most visibly in the overall graying of their populations. As a result of those demographics changes, universities in OECD countries are likely to hedge their bets on how to sustain university enrollment. With the aging of populations in many economically mature countries, and with demand exceeding quality supply in many developing countries, universities in the former have turned to the global marketplace in education as part of their hedging strategy to sustain enrollment. When this strategy is presented as internationalization rather than global commodification of higher education, it is able to “stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits allegedly represented by the term globalization” (Brandenburg and de Wit, 2011, p. 16). In Europe the process is also pulled along by the Bologna process (Klaassen, 2008) which is “meant to ensure more comparable, compatible, and coherent systems of higher education in Europe” (European Higher Education Area, 2015).

Whether universities frame the issue as responding to / exploiting global economic forces, or standing up for internationalism / humanism, one enabling policy they pursue in relation to the issue is in the area of English as the Medium of Instruction (EMI). The shift by an institution to English for instruction is often in concert with their faculty members’ publication of research in English. Rostan (2011) found that most of the 25,000 academics in her global survey used English for research purposes and about a third did so for teaching purposes, although most of them used English as a Second Language (ESL). Globalization, internationalization, and shifting demographics are occasioning the movement of many international students into EMI programs and an increase in EMI courses as the global higher education market resolves supply and demand. In Europe, for example, Colemann (2006) has remarked that higher education is undergoing “Englishization” while Bolton and Kuteeva (2012, p. 430) have noted that “Across contemporary Europe, English is generally regarded as an *academic lingua franca*” (italics added). In East Asia as well, more courses are being offered in English at universities in recent years (in Corrigan, 2013). Many universities offer their students who use ESL a variety of courses in intensive English language, English for Academic Purposes, or English for Specific Purposes in areas such as science, business, and the humanities in order to facilitate their study in EMI in their chosen majors or programs. EMI, however, is rarely bifurcated into policy and pedagogy – the domain of faculty - and at universities where a policy of EMI has been adopted it does not mean that effective EMI in the classroom has inevitably followed.

Effectiveness of a policy depends on the relationships of several factors. These factors and their relationships can be labelled and fathomed within a policy studies framework. According to Sin (2014, p. 437), a “policy object” comprises “ontology” and is “a socially and contextually-determined construct in the minds of policy actors

(more precisely, what they believe it is)” Applying Sin’s explanation to the issue of emerging EMI, we can say that in the case of institutional EMI, the policy actors include, for example, institutional administrators, faculty, and students. They probably have relatively different perspectives about what EMI as ‘policy object’ may mean. Sin contrasts the policy object, or ontology, with “enacted ontology”; this means “what the policy object becomes when transposed into practice” (2014, p. 438). For EMI, the transposition of EMI as policy object occurs when it is put into practice by policy actors at the institution, e.g., faculty. In simple terms, this means that there is EMI as policy and EMI as pedagogy. Distinguishing between EMI policy and EMI pedagogy would enable universities to have a better prospect of succeeding in their drive to establish EMI as part of an internationalizing policy to help address the realities of globalization and changing demographics. A list of essential givens about EMI pedagogy should include the following:

1. Teachers are one of the sets of policy actors in institutional EMI;
2. Teachers are teaching discipline knowledge/skills/cognitive-affective mindsets in (often) a second language to students who are learning (often) in a second language;
3. The language and skills to enact it EMI policy can be called EMI pedagogy must therefore include the English language skills and teaching skills of the teacher

EMI pedagogy as pre- or in-service teacher education can be developed, for example, through faculty development workshops, coaching, and credit-bearing courses which go through institutional academic quality assurance (Corrigan, 2015). As a second language is involved, EMI pedagogy must consider English for teaching purposes. At a university on Hong Kong, a credit-bearing course in English for the Medium of Instruction (EFMI) was offered in the 2014-15 academic year.

## **2. 5 Is & a Course in EFMI**

To examine the course in EFMI retrospectively, a list of topics was generated for such an examination process and questions under each topic were created. These questions served as a kind of reflective stencil: they can be placed over different parts of the examination process to focus on and examine each part of the process. The five topics are: Identification, Invention, Implementation, Investigation, and Improvement. Each topic can be thought of as a separate frame or stencil in the examination process, allowing focus on that particular part. The 5I framework can be understood in comparison and contrast to the AIDDE (Davidson-Shivers, Salazar, and Hamilton, 2005) model, which seems inspired by Tyler<sup>1</sup> (1949), as seen in the table below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tyler’s 1949 classic identifies four stages in the curriculum design process: setting objectives, choosing materials and activities, organizing them, and evaluating the outcomes

	<b>AIDDE Curriculum Planning Model</b>	<b>5 Is</b>
<b>Characteristics</b>	Linear (1D); Rational (logical-cognitive); Mainly planning - future action	Framing (2D); Reflective (cognitive-affective); Retrospective – mainly past action
<b>5 stages / areas</b>	Analysis Design Development Implementation Review	Identification Invention Implementation Investigation Improvement
<b>Purpose</b>	Planning & Evaluating	Examining

Within each of the five topics is a set of questions. In the following paragraphs, each topic and its questions are provided, followed by a reflection on the questions for that topic. The list of questions under each topic may not be exhaustive; however, questions with the greatest priority have been included.

### **2.1 Identification**

1. Who took the course?
2. What need did it serve?
3. Have any new needs arisen which this course could address?

New PhD students, primarily in Science and Engineering, were required to take the course due to their low scores on a spoken English diagnostic interview. In the interviews, they demonstrated low fluency, low accuracy, and limited word families, as well as often unintelligible pronunciation /poor stress and rhythm. The course was a pre-requisite for a required pre-service teacher education course and helped students develop their EFMI.

No new needs and no change are expected in student profile.

### **2.2 Invention**

1. Based on the original need and audience, what learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment activities were invented?
2. Based on any rearticulated need and audience, should the course outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment tasks be revised?

In terms of learning outcomes, students would be able to provide various types of comprehensible oral instruction: with adequate fluency in English; with adequate grammatical precision and register appropriateness; with adequate command of prosodic features of English with appropriate command of lexis and communicative functions necessary for teaching in their general discipline area. They would also be able to hold coherent, sustained academic discussion with their students on matters within their general discipline area.

Teaching and learning activities included teacher-fronted presentation of material; pair work and small group discussions; impromptu speaking; simulated teaching

practice; guided listening and speaking activities; guided language corpora activities; and guided strategies training.

Assessments activities included an Oral Proficiency and EMI Teaching Demonstration. These took about five minutes and were considered to be able to provide a ratable sample of the students' oral English for instructional purposes.

With no changes in the new student profile expected, no new needs or modified needs are expected.

### **2.3 Implementation**

1. Based on the original need and audience, how was the course implemented in terms of class size, delivery mode, contact hours, etc.?
2. Based on any rearticulated need and audience, should the class size, delivery mode, contact hours, etc. be revised?

The size of the five course sections ranged from 6-26 students with one teacher. The contact hours ranged from 12-14, depending on the size of the class. An average smaller class size and more contact hours are preferred for future implementation in order to give more individualized attention to students.

### **2.4 Investigation**

1. What were the assessment results for the course and what do they say about the course?
2. How has the course been received by the intended audience? Based on survey data or other reliable means, what areas did the students find helpful and which areas did the students not find helpful?

The 'bar' was set at a minimum and 94% of students passed while 6% failed. The high pass rates suggests that the course outcomes were achievable by almost all students and that the assessment activity – designed to determine if students possessed an 'adequate' command of English for the Medium of Instruction in their respective subject areas – was appropriate..

On a 10 item survey looking at achievement of learning outcomes, about 80% reported the course was helpful; about 17% were neutral; about 2%-3% did not think the course was helpful; about 90% expressed the need for additional sessions.

### **2.5 Improvement**

1. Based on the assessment reports, what the students reported, and professional reflection, how can the course be improved in terms of learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment tasks, or in other ways?

Increasing the number of sessions to include additional learning outcomes and teaching & learning activities on making spoken English more intelligible, fluent, and accurate is considered desirable.

### **3. Summary and Conclusion**

In summary, globalization, demographics, and humanistic aims are driving the internationalization of higher education. Many institutions see EMI as a pillar of such internationalization and have added so-called content courses taught in English to their curriculum. Offering students ESL, EAP, and ESP courses to support such a policy is essential but insufficient when students are not learning in English as their primary language. As many teachers will also need to teach in ESL, EMI needs to be developed as pedagogy by faculty and this encompasses their own command of EFMI. To support an EMI policy, EFMI can be developed among faculty through pre-service or in-service teacher education credit-bearing, high-stakes, EFMI courses, or through EFMI workshops or EFMI coaching.

In this paper, a credit-bearing, required course in EFMI for pre-service teachers and teaching assistants has been retrospectively examined, using five topics with associated sets of questions: Identification, Invention, Implementation, Investigation, and Improvement. While the course discussed in this paper has met with good initial success, areas of improvement have been identified. However, as these areas require additional university resources in terms of time and finance, and as the course is institutionally perceived as fulfilling its mission adequately, it is not expected that changes in the course will take place at this time.

#### 4. References

Brandenburg, U. and H. de Wit. (2011). The End of Internationalization. *International Higher Education* Number 62 Winter 2011, pp.15-17.

Corrigan, P. (2013). Teaching and Learning in English as the Medium for Instruction for International Students. IN Mukerji, S. and P. Tripathi(eds.) *Handbook of Research on Transnational Higher Education (Advances in Higher Education and Professional Development*, pp 432-453.

Corrigan, P. (2015). *Building EMI Pedagogy to Support EMI Policy*. Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> QS-MAPLE Conference, Doha, Qatar, 5-7 May 2015.

Davidson-Shivers, Gayle V.; Salazar, John; Hamilton, Karen M. (2005). Design of Faculty Development Workshops: Attempting to Practice What We Preach. *College Student Journal*, v39 n3 p528 Sep 2005. 12 pp.

European Higher Education Area. (2015). *Bologna Process - European Higher Education Area*. Retrieved May 2015 at <http://www.ehea.info>.

Klaassen, R. G. (2008). Preparing Lecturers for English-medium Instruction. In Wilkinson, R. and Zegers, V. (eds.). *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University, pp33-42.

Rostan, M. (2011) English as “Lingua Franca” and the Internationalization of Academe. *International Higher Education* Number 63 Spring 2011, pp11-13.

Sin, C. (2014) The policy object: a different perspective on policy enactment in higher education *High Educ (2014) 68*: 435–448.

Soubbotina, T. P & Sheram, K. A. (2000). *Beyond Economic Growth: Meeting the Challenges*. Washington: The World Bank. Retrieved on line August 31, 2012 <http://www.worldbank.org/depweb/beyond/global/chapter12.html> .

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2008), "What is the Impact of Demography on Higher Education Systems? A Forward-looking Approach for OECD Countries", in OECD, *Higher Education to 2030, Volume 1, Demography*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

**Contact Email:** Paul.Corrigan@cityu.edu.hk