ROBIN ANDERSON
(UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO-BICOCCA, MILAN)

# A DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE ON THE CHANGING ROLES OF ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION

What are the implications for the unassailable position of the English language in social, professional and academic contexts in the world today? In this paper we briefly outline some of the watershed changes in the way we have viewed the teaching/learning of English and how we have evolved our notions as to what kind of English needs to be taught/learned. We argue that we are again at a watershed moment and intend to briefly analyse this and ask where we should be heading in the future.

KEYWORDS: English language teaching approaches, English as a lingua franca, English as a medium of instruction, the economic, academic and social place of English, English hegemony

In this paper we intend to briefly overview the history of the dominant teaching methodologies which have evolved over the years in response to developments in theories of second language acquisition (2LA) and learning (2LL) and applied linguistics. We consider these influences in the light of current global, economic and social changes which are influencing why and how individuals learn English, with specific reference to English medium instruction at tertiary level.

It is fair to say that English language teaching has always been teaching for special purposes and this therefore begs the question as to whether there such a of most subjects has, to a greater or lesser extent, remained the same, the teaching of the English language (ELT) has been subject to tremendous change, especially throughout the twentieth century. More than any other discipline ELT has undergone various evolutions in language classrooms all around the world for centuries. Why is this? Well one suggestion is that ELT, like no other discipline, has evolved to take account of changing social, cultural, institutional and student needs. An approach to language teaching involves a set of "assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning" (Anthony 1965: 63) which serve as a framework which informs pedagogic decisions and processes. Approaches come and go and come back again, as different social conditions and contexts render them more or less effective.

In order to deal with these new challenges both teachers and learners of English have to face, teaching approaches and their concomitant methodologies need to be reappraised. We need to reconsider how students best learn and what type of English they need in order to function successfully in the globalised contexts in which they find themselves today. In the second part of the paper we intend to look at English as the lingua franca of tertiary level instruction and learning in order to identify teaching approaches which may be appropriate to this context. The first part of the paper outlines some of the major approaches to ELT and the language teaching methodologies they have bequeathed us.

## HISTORICAL LEGACY. THE CLASSICAL METHOD

Throughout Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, the education system was formed primarily around the theory that the body and mind were separate and the mind consisted of three parts: the will, emotion, and intellect. It was believed that by learning the classical literature of the Greeks and the Romans intellect could be sharpened enough to eventually control the will and emotions. Language was seen as a closed system where correctness and accuracy were seen as morally desirable. Such an education was considered to mentally prepare individuals for the world and its challenges. Still today, in Italy, students can attend a *liceo classico*, where they study Latin and Greek and many Italians believe that this type of *liceo* 'forms the brain'.

These notions informed the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) of teaching when it emerged in the middle of the 19th century. It involved teaching about language; constructing abstract grammatical rules which were then explained by the teacher using the students' mother tongue and which were then reinforced with exercises. There was no attempt to contextualise the examples and so it was quite possible to encounter sentences which were constructed simply to exemplify a grammatical rule; 'The cat of my aunt is more treacherous than the dog of your uncle'. Just as Latin and Greek classics were used to teach those languages, in the GTM a main aim was to understand the literature of the target language. Teaching techniques were typically: learning by rote, memorisation of lists and verb conjugations and translation from target language into mother tongue. The advantage of this approach is that large classes can be taught and being focused solely on the written text means that non-native-speaker teachers can be used. It is also appropriate at all levels of proficiency. These three features of the GTM are probably the reasons why it is still a popular language teaching approach today.

## THE DIRECT METHOD

At the turn of the 20th century the increased opportunity for travel and interactions with speakers of other languages led to a shift in focus in language instruction and use from the written to the spoken word. This change is evidenced in the increased number of phrase books and the publication of the first International Phonetic Alphabet chart (Paul Passy 1888) and with it the beginnings of phonetic training. Speech becomes a primary teaching/learning objective and we begin to see the emergence of methods which reflect this goal. The Direct Method (DM) is perhaps the most famous and enduring language teaching method. The DM was adopted by many language schools at this time, most famously the Berlitz School which was founded in 1878 and continues to be a successful, global language school today (Berlitz International 1998). The Direct Method emerged to prepare learners for real life situations, using language to get things done in social and inter-cultural contexts. Mother tongue teachers were regarded as essential for this approach, not only to provide authentic oral models of English, but also as transmitters of the culture of the target language. Theories as to how children acquire their first language were used as models for how a second language should be taught and so meaning was conveyed through the here and now, using the teacher and visual aids as a learning resource linking language to what can be visually presented. Students were to be fully immersed in L2, and expressions such as 'full immersion' and 'language bath' became standard concepts linked to this method. It was essentially a see – hear – say method, where after hearing the language model students were invited to repeat what they had heard. The strong link between language and what was visible or demonstrable, meant that explicit grammar teaching, if taught at all, came later in a course. The mother-tongue teacher was essential as the learner's first language was not considered and L2 items were related to other L2 items. There was a great need for teachers to be energetic, skillful and highly motivated and the classroom techniques and management required in this method led to a growing interest in teaching methodology and language teaching practices.

## SITUATIONAL LANGUAGE TEACHING

In the 1930's we saw the emergence of the Situational Language Teaching approach (SLT), or Oral Approach (see Richards & Rogers 1986). This approach was based on a structuralist view of language influenced by the American linguist Charles C. Fries (see H. Fries & N. M. Fries 1985) and behaviourist notions of language learning. Structural Linguistics emphasized the systematic nature of language; by breaking language down into its constituent parts and syntactic

relationships, from phoneme-morpheme-word-structure-sentence (see Bloomfield 1933). Behavioural Psychology was the view that human learning is purely a process of habit formation and the ability to perform in a language is the possession of a set of linguistic habits which enable a speaker to respond correctly to any given stimulus. The stimulus is the target language and the response is verbal language behaviour of the learner. This language production receives reinforcement, usually in the form of teacher response/evaluation. A positive response means that the verbal behaviour is likely to reoccur, while a negative response means that the verbal behaviour is not likely to reoccur (see Skinner 1938). So, "the behaviorist theory of stimulus-response learning, particularly as developed in the operant conditioning model of Skinner, considers all learning to be the establishment of habits as a result of reinforcement and reward" (Rivers 1968: 73). The learner had no control over the content of learning, he was required simply to listen and repeat what the teacher said and to respond to questions and commands. The role of the teacher was regarded as fundamental as, "If we wish to control behaviour, say, to teach somebody something, we ought to attend carefully to reinforcers" (Brown 1987: 63).

The major features of the Situational Approach were that language teaching should have as its focus the spoken language and therefore language teaching material was taught orally before it was presented in written form. There was a greater focus on vocabulary, as having a wide range of vocabulary was seen as essential for developing reading skills and the selected vocabulary was introduced in different contexts. Not only was lexis selected for presentation, but language also was analysed and classified into its prominent grammatical structures which were then presented and practised following the principle that simple forms should be taught before complex ones. It was believed that this grading of structures would help students avoid errors which were still considered as evidence of bad or no learning. Consequently there was a high focus on error correction. These graded structures were then presented in a situation which was designed or chosen to generate more examples of the grammatical patterns. This would be typically followed by manipulation exercises of the grammatical patterns presented and in this way the learners were expected to internalize grammatical rules. With this approach there was a recognition of the four skills and reading and writing were introduced after the oral/aural focus and once a sufficient lexical and grammatical basis had been established (see Richards & Rodgers 1986).

## AUDIO-LINGUAL APPROACH

With the outbreak of World War II there was a heightened need for Americans to become orally proficient in the languages of their allies and enemies alike and so the 'Army Method' of L2 teaching was developed, which later came to be

known the Audio-lingual approach. This approach drew on many of the beliefs and practices of the Direct Method as it was also a marriage of Structural Linguistics and Behavioural Psychology. There was no explicit grammar instruction, everything was simply memorized in form. Learners learnt language by habit formation where grammatical rules were induced from repeated encounters with the selected grammatical form by means of an extensive use of structural tables and language pattern drills.

The approach aimed to teach language, not 'about' language and with its policy of using mother-tongue teachers aimed to focus on what native speakers say, not what we think they ought to say. It shared most of the features of the DM approach except that vocabulary didn't have the prominence it had had previously, this was partly due to the belief that errors and areas of difficulty should be avoided by presentations being graded, clear and unambiguous. This led materials' designers to limit vocabulary so as not to distract from the structural input. The students were given only "enough vocabulary to make such drills possible" (Richards & Rogers 1986: 47).

## TRANSFORMATIONAL GENERATIVE GRAMMAR

In the late 1950s the limitations of structural linguistics were pointed out most famously by Noam Chomsky in 1957 with the publication of 'Syntactic Structures', in which he introduced his notion of Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), which was a system of language analysis that recognized the relationship among the various elements of a sentence and among the possible sentences of a language. TGG uses processes or rules to express this relationship so, the active sentence 'Iga read the book' is related to the passive sentence 'the book was read by Iga'. Although such sentences appear to be very different in terms of grammatical structure (*surface structure*), TGG tries to show that in the underlying structure the sentences are very similar (*deep structure*). The notion of deep structure can be especially helpful in explaining ambiguous utterances; e.g., 'Flying airplanes can be dangerous' may have a deep structure, or meaning, like 'Airplanes can be dangerous when they fly' or 'To fly airplanes can be dangerous'. The TGG device generates only grammatically correct sentences of a language since it creates the rules and principles which are in native linguistic competence the language user. And it was this second feature of Chomsky's theory which led to the focus of placing language in the user's mind as opposed to being triggered by external factors beyond the individual's control as previously proposed by behavioural linguistics. This led to increased study and debate into the mental processing of language acquisition (see Chomsky 1957, 1962).

## LANGUAGE LEARNING AS A MENTAL PROCESS

The behaviourist theory of language acquisition was challenged by Chomsky in his review of B. F. Skinner's book on verbal behaviour (see Chomsky 1957). Chomsky later proposed the theory that all humans have an innate Language Acquisition Device (LAD). The LAD is the innate biological ability of humans to understand, acquire and develop language. This innate competence, or 'internal grammar', helps humans make sense of and eventually produce language from a set of linguistic principles or rules. Chomsky claimed that child utterances like 'Daddy goed' were of evidence of this rule-based system at work, as this utterance would not be encountered as a verbal stimulus, but is an example of the child generating from a rule on past tense verb formation. In this way he challenged the prevailing behaviourist theory that language was acquired through exposure to it in our environment. Chomsky backed up his theory with observations on child language acquisition, namely; that it is also not possible to memorise the totality of a language, stimulus and reinforcement are not always there or adequate enough for all children and that language is a highly developed intricate, complex thing for a child to master simply by way of hear/repeat/reinforcement and especially at the age by which children have mastered their language.

Second language learners were therefore seen as active participants in the L2 learning process, actively involved in intelligent, rule-seeking and problem solving processes, not the passive recipients of knowledge. L2 learners act upon the linguistic environment, hypothesising and testing out their hypothesese. Errors therefore were no longer considered negatively, as they were evidence of this process of hypothesising. Learning was seen as a 2-way process between the learner and the environment, but the learning resided with the learner, while the teacher's task was to organise the material being presented in such a manner that what was to be learned would be meaningful to the learner (see Chastain 1976). Rote learning, memorisation and mimicry were de-emphasised in language classrooms, however, language drills still had a place as phonological tongue training. The role of grammar teaching was to provide useful shortcuts to the rule formation that was going on in the brain, enabling students to generate more language.

The Behaviourist's belief that the learner was merely an instrument to be manipulated by an outside agency didn't take into account the contribution of the learner in the process of learning. For the new Mentalist approach to second language learning, between the external linguistic stimulus and the desired linguistic response was the learner's cognitive functioning and by means of the cognitive function the learner monitors and evaluates the linguistic stimuli being received, making the learner the controller of the learning process rather than the passive recipient, language learning is the process whereby the rules of language are discovered and internalized.

## HUMANIST APPROACH

In keeping with the view that the learner is the most important element when looking at how languages are acquired, linguists and educators developed this further into what is called a Humanist Approach. Humanists pointed out that despite the differences between various approaches, some of which we have presented above, learners still did or didn't learn. Therefore factors other than cognitive factors were obviously involved. Factors such as; the individual's emotional state, anxiety, self-confidence and the willingness to communicate, the quality and quantity of motivation and attitude towards the target language culture. Factors such as these constituted the learner's affective domain (see Stevick 1982). Krashen suggested that these affective factors constituted a learning filter and can affect 2LA by preventing information about the second language from reaching the language areas of the mind. When the affective filter blocks comprehensible input, acquisition fails or occurs to a lesser extent then when the affective filter supports the intake of comprehensible input (Krashen 1982). Practitioners believed that L2 instruction can and should work to minimize the effects of the affective filter and Krashen's theories spawned a great number of fringe approaches such as The Silent Way and Suggestopedia.

Krashen's notion of comprehensible input was elaborated in his 'Input Hypothesis' with the formula *interlanguage +1*; where input contains a structure that is a little beyond the current understanding, of the language learner (Krashen 1982). Another theory put forward by Krashen was the Natural Order Hypothesis, which argues that the acquisition of grammatical structures occurs in a predictable sequence, although the order of acquisition of a first language is different from the order of acquisition of that same language as a second language. The logical extension of this theory was that explicit teaching and learning could not change the natural order of acquisition (Krashen 1982). Although many of these influential theories came to be challenged later, from Chomsky's work in the mid 1950s to Krashen's work in the 80s we saw a permanent change in focus from viewing successful L2 acquisition as being determined by external factors, to viewing successful L2 acquisition as being dependent on individual cognitive and affective factors.

## FUNCTIONAL / NOTIONAL APPROACH

As the new theories of L2 acquisition and the nature of language structure were filtering through to methodologies in English language classrooms all over the world, there was another change happening to the way language can be described. In 1972 the British linguist, D.A. Wilkins, proposed moving away from the traditionalist,

structuralist or synthetic approach to language description to a model which described language use in social and professional communicative contexts (see Wilkins 1972). This approach is based on the idea that communication is meaningful behaviour in social and cultural contexts and that language is constructed around language functions and notions. So, for example, a lesson might be about how to buy something, in which case its notion is shopping and one of its functions might be asking prices. Functions often lend themselves naturally to specific grammatical patterns or common expressions; the function of making requests would typically employ the following linguistic exponents:

'Can I …?', 'Could you …?', 'Is it alright if I …?', 'Do you mind if I …?'

The functional Notional Approach to language is therefore concerned with what and why people want to communicate, where and when. It forms part of the dominant approach to ELT today, the Communicative Approach, which places the emphasis on identifying, classifying and presenting units of language in terms of the communicative situations in which they are used as "only through the study of language in use are all functions of language and therefore, all components of meaning, brought into focus." (M. Halliday 2002: 177). So the aim was to develop communicative competence, placing the message before code as it was believed that the ability to manipulate language does not necessarily mean that the learner can use that language in a communication; "grammatical competence remains in a perpetual state of potentiality unless it is used in a communication" (H. Widdowson 1973: 18). It was believed that people who speak the same language share not so much a grammatical competence as a communicative competence and so learners and teachers needed to take account of the rules of use as well as rules of grammatical structure paying "systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language" (Littlewood 1981: 1). In this way learners were introduced not only to grammatical knowledge of the language, but also to the cultural knowledge necessary for them to fully understand the target language and its culture.

With this approach came a more tolerant attitude to learner errors, for what is grammatically incorrect might still communicate and what might be grammatically correct, might not communicate. Teaching grammar was no longer considered an end in itself, "in any classroom situation, just so much attention should be given to grammar as may be necessary to promote quick and efficient learning. Thus we see the teaching of grammar, not as an end in itself, but as a useful aid in helping students achieve the practical mastery of language." (Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics 1975: 46). Therefore looking at what is feasible in terms of appropriateness to context and what is possible in terms of grammatical acceptability. But this phase also consolidated the inextricable link between language and culture, as Kabakchy and Rivers pointed out, "Ideally the foreign language should be learned in as close association as practicable with the culture of the country where it is

spoken, if its full meaning is to be plumbed to any depth" (Kabakchy & Rivers 1978). Through the influence of communicative language teaching, it has become widely accepted that communicative competence should be the goal of second language education, which is in contrast to previous views in which grammatical competence was commonly given top priority.


## TODAY'S CHALLENGE


This account, like all histories, is selective, but it is a tale of perpetual progress, motivated in part by the imperative to change which so often involves demonising the past, but more often by teachers thinking in their own contexts, being critical and reflective about their methodology which is informed and revised by theories of applied and cognitive linguistics, theories of language learning and also by the practical experiences of the teachers themselves. Today English language teaching methodology is facing a new challenges and it is our view that knowledge of past theories and methodologies will better enable language practitioners to face these challenges. One of the main challenges, as we see it, is the dominant position the English language holds in tertiary education worldwide, where students and teachers alike are being asked to achieve a specific proficiency in the English language, for a variety of reasons. The second part of this paper attempts to address this issue in the light of the aforementioned watershed moments in the history of second language learning and teaching.

The Bologna Process of 1999 began a series of measures through which European universities were required to play a key role in equipping nations with the necessary tools to participate in an increasingly globalised world. The inception of the European Higher Education Area in 2010 (EHEA) has led to increased harmonisation of degree structures, the promotion of teacher and student mobility and the increase in partnerships within the EHEA (Knight 2008: 22–24) and consequently, as the study destination choices increased so too did the marketisation of education (see Raisanen & Fortanet-Gomez 2008: 14–18). In this competitive global environment universities in non-English speaking countries have been compelled to provide courses in the global lingua-franca as they struggle to both; retain their best home students and provide them with the skills they need to compete in the global marketplace and attract foreign, fee-paying students. According to Knight "[I]nternationalisation must be taken as one of the main reasons for using English as a medium of instruction across universities in Europe" (see Knight 2008: 24) and for Smit & Dafouz; these fundamental changes in educational and language policies in tertiary education have led to a restructuring of many university programmes and curricula making English-medium instruction a present day reality (see Smit & Dafouz 2012).

English as a medium of instruction (EMI), where English is used to teach academic subjects in contexts where the first language (L1) of the majority of the student body is not English, has been the subject of many studies (e.g. Räisänen & Fortanet Gómez 2008; Smit & Dafouz 2012; Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra 2012 and Unterberger 2014) and as Boyd points out "there is clearly an important issue with regards to simply teaching in English and teaching through English as a methodological approach […], through requires the adoption of appropriate language-sensitive curricula and methodologies" (Boyd & Markarian 2015: 290).

EMI programmes (or English Taught Programmes (ETPs)) tripled through the 90s and in 2009 there were 2,389 EMI courses in continental Europe, mainly in Germany, The Netherlands and Scandanavia in 2009 and a 300% increase on BA and MA programmes from 2002 to 2012 (Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra 2012). The growth in ETPs has been steadily increasing with 725 in 2001, 2,389 in 2007 and over 8,000 in 2014. The largest number of these programmes in 2014 was in The Netherlands with 1,078. Poland is mentioned as having a marked increase in ETPs reaching 405, while Italy had 207 (see Wächter & Maiworm 2014).

Wächter & Maiworm's 2014 study identified substantial differences in the reasons for introducing or not ETPs, the main reasons being: to sharpen the international profile of the institution, to abolish language obstacles for the enrolment of foreign students, to improve the international competences of domestic students, to make domestic students fit for global labour markets, to improve the income base of the institution through revenue from tuition fees paid by foreign students and to recruit international academic staff. Among the main reasons for not offering ETPs were: the low levels of proficiency in English among teaching staff and a resulting reluctance to teach in English, the low-level of English skills amongst domestic students and the lack of necessity to introduce programmes fully taught in English, (Wächter & Maiworm 2014). However as Barbara Unterberger points out "there is still a lack of research evidence regarding fundamental aspects of programme design and development […] more research is needed with regards to the organizational difficulties which arise when EMPs are implemented" (Unterberger 2012: 81).

## THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF EMI AT TERTIARY LEVEL

The linguistic hegemony English now enjoys in economic, academic and social contexts, which have largely been created by globalization, has led to a reconsideration of the role of the native speaker in international communications and how the English language is changing in order to adapt to these realities. In sociolinguistics it has led to discussions on linguistic appropriation and the possible, negative cultural consequences of this. In academia it has spurred debate into 'domain loss', where an academic discipline is no longer available in the

L1 at national level (see Wilkinson 2012). Smit and Dafouz ask if as a result of internationalization, curricular harmonization might not lead to content harmonization and a loss of intellectual and academic diversity, in both linguistic, methodological and disciplinary perspectives (Smit & Dafouz 2012: 8). The question of English as a lingua franca ELF has also thrown up discussion about the ownership of English, who has the authority for the codification of English and who should propose standards for the use of ELF (Niina Hynninen 2012: 14).

As we have said, in this competitive global environment universities in non-English speaking countries are now compelled to provide courses in the global lingua-franca as they struggle to respond to pressure from national governments to retain their best home students and provide the highly educated workforce equipped with the skills, including foreign language proficiency, necessary in the global knowledge economy (see Dickson 2009). They also need to attract foreign students, boosting income by increasing recruitment of fee-paying students from around the world (see Fortanet-Gómez 2013). Adopting EMI instruction programmes allows universities to "gain visibility and is a strategy in response to the need to become competitive in both national and international markets" (Doiz, Lasagabaster, Sierra 2012: xviii, see also Komori-Glatz & Unterberger 2014). What is more EMI has a dominant position as the language of academia and transnational research and is seen as improving career prospects across disciplines; it is seen as a "communicative need" for participants in tertiary level education (Smit & Dafouz 2012: 3).

However, little empirical research has been conducted into why and when EMI is being introduced and how it is delivered. This lack of research is largely due to the fact that many institutions are autonomous in their policy decision making. Most of the published research confirms that the driving force to integrate language and content in higher education is clearly one-sided with the groups in favour of EMPs including linguists, educators and language teachers. However, while governments, university administrations and subject specialists have embraced the new top-down internationalisation scenario and its possibilities for professional and academic development, the necessary pedagogical and language learning concerns are seen by them to be of secondary importance. As Smit and Dafouz point out, strategic developments are seen as belonging to institutional factors while their practical implementation comes under pedagogic factors (see Smit & Dafouz 2012: 8, Smit & Dafouz 2014a). Due to this past lack of consideration, institutional language policy decisions are now a growing concern and these decisions are being informed by aspects of language management, beliefs and practices, all of which however might not fit neatly together, but are often in conflict or in competition, reflecting the "diverse interests and language ideologies of different societal groups" (Shohamy 2006: 45).

EMP students are very often a heterogeneous group of international and domestic students and there is often, as Barbara Unterberger found in her study, "certainly no uniform admissions policy for EMPs" (Unterberger 2012). If we accept that

the typical reality of EMPs is a non-native English teacher, teaching discipline content in English to mixed groups of home and international students, with very different levels of language proficiency and content schemata, it seems clear that serious consideration must be given to the many pedagogical challenges this context poses. Levels of success on EMI programmes are "only possible because of the interactants' willingness to invest time and energy in collaboratively co-constructing their exchanges across diverse multilingual repertoires" (Smit & Dafouz 2012: 3).

## THE PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF EMI AT TERTIARY LEVEL

The findings for the pedagogical implications of EMI at tertiary level are very context-specific, however we agree that there is a need for further research into EMI programmes "to explore how much language is being gained by such programs as well as how much academic content is being achieved" (Shohamy 2012: 203). Pawan proposed that "students in any type of interdisciplinary or integrative curriculum do as well as, and often better than, students in a compartmentalized program" (Faridah Pawan 2008: 450). A study of 157 Taiwanese students concluded that the students were; motivated to take EMI courses to strengthen their English ability and professional knowledge and thought that EMI courses were helpful and that multicultural interactions motivated learning (Da-Fu Huang 2015: 71). Studies have however highlighted student difficulties in comprehending content due to insufficient English language proficiency, (Chang 2010 / Wu 2006 / Huang 2009 and 2012). At Delft university in Holland students complained about the quality of the instruction on EMI courses (Klaassen & Bos 2010). Reliable research is also made difficult by a constant blurring of the edges between 'pure' EMI courses and those which are integrating content and language learning (ICLHE & CLIL) and adjunct EAP courses which are run separately from the content courses.

As we said above, participants' willingness to invest in the process is essential for effective EMPs and as each type of programme inevitably has different goals and objectives, so they will require a different pedagogical approach. So, content specialists are being asked to re-evaluate their pedagogical approach, which they do with varying degrees of willingness from eager acceptance that they are "all language teachers now" (Hughes 2016) to the more entrenched opinion of "I don't teach language" (Airey 2012). The pedagogic belief embodied in 'I don't teach language' will likely obscure any effective "consideration of the exact nature of the interaction between language and content" (Brumfit et al. 2005: 158), which on EMI programmes will lead to the specialist being unclear of their pedagogical aims. There is often "little awareness of the complexity of teaching and learning through an additional language. Not only are the challenges of this situation not addressed, the potential for this situation for integrating content and language learning is

sadly not realized either" (Fürstenberg & Kletzenbauer 2015: 2). Fürstenberg and Kletzenbauer, in their study of Austrian universities, point out that many of the teachers involved in EMI programmes are non- native English speaking, content teachers with little preparation and support from their institutions and they are generally autonomous in their curricular planning decisions (see Fürstenberg & Kletzenbauer 2015). Smit & Dafouz state that "[t]ertiary teaching staff are largely defined according to their role as researchers and seldom obtain any substantial pedagogical training" (Smit & Dafouz 2012: 3). Were such training available to tertiary level content specialists it is not always clear if this would resolve this problem, for as Costa points out "[it] is very difficult to imagine that experienced subject specialists with a high social status (such as Italian university lecturers) will adapt to following […] methodological training or accept English language training" (Costa & Coleman 2012: 17) and they go on to say that it seems likely that non-native English-speaking experts would be more disposed to teaching content over language (Costa & Coleman 2012: 12).

There are European institutions where the English language proficiency of the staff is tested; the university of Copenhagen introduced a certification for EMI programme teachers and the university of Delft requires C2 level for the content specialists on EMI programmes (see Klassen & Bos 2010). But it is not only the content specialists' language level that is involved, content experts are generally not aware of what pedagogical consequences are involved in adopting English as a medium of instruction. Teacher cognition refers to their beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions and attitudes, all of which affect the pedagogical decisions teachers make (see Borg 2003). We feel this an area of research which needs more consideration, for, as we have seen above, teaching is a process of active decision making based on previous experience and existing knowledge in contexts where pedagogical considerations "can contradict with each other, especially if there is a mismatch between teacher cognition and the educational changes implemented" (Smit & Dafouz 2012: 8).

And here we refer back to the first part of the paper and how teacher cognition can be drawn upon for effective classroom teaching/learning. Tertiary level teachers need to reflect on the discursive classroom practices they employ, what van Lier calls 'micro-systems' within an EMI approach (see van Lier 2004). Discursive classroom practices are highly contextualised and can include, lecturing practices (see Fortanet-Gomez & Raisanen 2008), different types of specialised ELF interactions such as academic or business contexts and lecture comprehension and interactive explaining in EMI lectures (Airey 2009). However, not enough research has been carried out into EMI at tertiary level which takes into account the multilingual, multicultural interactional settings in which teachers and students communicate and the pedagogical implications of these factors (see Hynninen 2012). Worton states that "universities should take a more active leadership role […] by emphasising the importance of intercultural competence and multi-lingual skills" (Worton 2009: 35).

Existing studies are very often context-specific, in that they are carried out in different countries, within different disciplines, within different institutions with different policy agendas and with different participants. We argue therefore that universities need to develop a more systematic approach to the needs of content specialists and students. This will almost certainly include drawing on the expertise which is to be found in the language teaching departments where strategies for making input comprehensible, providing opportunities for social interaction and communicating meaning through speaking and writing are standard features of the pedagogical toolkit. It will also certainly include in-service teacher education. As language and content instruction cannot be separated (see Hughes 2016), in-service teacher education is essential as "crucial to the learning quality of EMI courses seems to be the teaching quality on the part of the EMI teachers" (Huang 2015: 77, see also Jensen & Thøgersen 2011).

## REFERENCES

AIREY, J. (2012): "'I don't teach language'. The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden", *AILA Review* 25, 64–79.

ALLEN, J. (1975): Edinburgh course in applied linguistics, vol. 2: (1975), OUP, Oxford.

ANTHONY, E. (1965): *Approach, Method And Technique In Teaching English As Second Language*, McGraw Hill, China.

BERLITZ (1998): *Berlitz 120 Years of Excellence: 1878–1998*, Berlitz International, Inc.

BLOOMFIELD, L. (1933): *Language*, Henry Holt, New York.

BORG, S. (2003): "Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do", *Language Teaching 39*, 81–109.

BOYD, M.P., and W.C. MARKARIAN (2015): "Dialogic teaching and dialogic stance: Moving beyond interactional form", *Research in the Teaching of English*, 49(3), 272–296.

BROWN, H.D. (1987): *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

BRUMFIT, C., MYLES, F., MITCHELL, R., JOHNSTON, B. and P. FORD (2005): "Language study in higher education and the development of criticality", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 15, DOI: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00085.x

CHANG, Y.Y. (2010): "English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reactions from Taiwanese undergraduate students", *Taiwan International ESP Journal*, 2, 55–84.

CHASTAIN, K. (1976): *Developing second-language skills*, Rand McNally College Pub. Co., U.S.

CHOMSKY, N. (1962): "A transformational approach to syntax", in: HILL, A. (ed.): *Third Texas conference on problems of linguistic analysis in English*, The University of Texas, Austin.

CHOMSKY, N. (1957): *Syntactic Structures*, Mouton, Paris.

COSTA, F. and J. COLEMAN (2012): "A survey of English-medium instruction in Italian higher education", *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(1) 3–19.

DICKSON, T. (2009): "Knowledge transfer and the globalisation of higher education", *Journal of Knowledge-based Innovation in China*, *1*(3), 174–184.

DOIZ, A., LASAGABASTER, D. and M.J. SIERRA (2012): *English-Medium Instruction at Universities – Global Challenges*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol. UK

FORTANET-GÓMEZ, I. (2013): *CLIL in higher education: towards a multilingual language Policy*, Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

FORTANET-GÓMEZ, I. and C.A. RÄISÄNEN (2008): *ESP in European Higher Education: Integrating Language and Content*, Philadelphia, US.

FRIES, P. and N. FRIES (1985): *Toward an understanding of language: Charles Carpenter Fries in perspective*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

FÜRSTENBERG, U. and P. KLETZENBAUER (2015): "Language-sensitive CLIL teaching in higher education: approaches to successful lesson planning", *ELTWorldOnline.com, Special Issue on CLIL*. Retrieved from http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/?p=4791

HALLIDAY, M. (2002): *On grammar volume 1. The collected works of M. A. K. Halliday*, Continuum, New York.

HUANG, DA-FU. (2015): "Exploring and assessing effectiveness of English medium instruction courses: The students' perspectives", *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 173, 71–78.

HUANG, Y.P. (2009): "English-only instruction in post-secondary education in Taiwan: Voices From students" *Hwa Kang Journal of English Language & Literature*, 15, 145–157.

HUANG, Y.P. (2009): "Design and implementation of English-medium courses in higher education in Taiwan: A qualitative case study", *English Teaching & Learning*, 36 (1), 1–51.

HUGHES, N. (2016): "We're all language teachers now: teaching subject discipline content through the medium of a second language", in: GORIA, C., SPEICHER, O. and S. STOLLHANS (eds): *Innovative language teaching and learning at university: enhancing participation and collaboration*, Dublin, 131–137.

HYNNINEN, N. (2012): "ICL at the micro level: L2 speakers taking on the role of language experts", *AILA Review. 25*, 13–29.

JENSEN, C., and J. THØGERSEN (2011): "University lecturers' attitudes towards English as the Medium of Instruction", *Iberica*, *22*, 13–33.

KABAKCHY, V. and W.M. RIVERS (1978): "Cultural Identity and Foreign-Language Teaching", *ELT Journal*, XXXII (4), 313–318.

KLASSEN, R. and M. BOS (2010): "English language screening for scientific staff at Delft University of Technology", *Hermes journal of language and communication studies 45*, 61–75.

KNIGHT, J. (2008): *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization*, Sense, Rotterdam.

KOMORI-GLATZ, M. & UNTERBERGER, B. (2014): "English-medium business education: creating the international managers of tomorrow, today" in: *English in business and commerce: Interactions and policies. English in Europe: Opportunity or threat conference series*, Prague.

KRASHEN, S. (1982): *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*, Pergamon, New York.

LITTLEWOOD, W. (1981): *Communicative language teaching*, Cambridge language teaching library, Cambridge.

PAWAN, F. (2008): *Helping English Language Learners/Middle and High Schools*, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Incorporated (TESOL), UK.

RÄISÄNEN, C.A. and I. FORTANET-GOMEZ (2008b): "The state of ESP teaching and learning in Western European higher education after Bologna", in: RÄISÄNEN, C.A. and I. FORTANET-GOMEZ (eds): *ESP in European Higher Education: Integrating language and content*. AILA Applied Linguistics. Series 4. 11–51.

RICHARDS, J. & ROGERS, T. (1986): *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

RIVERS, W. (1968): *Teaching Foreign Language Skil1s*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.

SHOHAMY, E. (2006): *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*, Routledge, UK.

SHOHAMY, E. (2012): "A Critical Perspective on the Use of English as a Medium of Instruction at Universities" in: DOIZ, A., LASAGABASTER, D. and J.M. SIERRA, (eds.): *English-Medium Instruction at Universities – Global Challenges*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, UK.

SKINNER, B. (1938): *The Behavior of Organisms: An Experimental Analysis*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

SMIT, U. & DAFOUZ, E. (2012): *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: Gaining Insights into English-Medium Instruction at European Universities*. AILA Review, 25, John Benjamins, Philadelphia.

SMIT, U. & DAFOUZ, E. (2014b): "Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English medium education in multilingual university settings". *Applied Linguistics*. doi: 10.1093/applin/amu034.

STEVICK, E. (1982): *Teaching and Learning Languages (Cambridge Language Teaching Library)*, CUP, Cambridge.

UNTERBERGER, B. (2012): English-medium programmes at Austrian business faculties: A status quo survey on national trends and a case study on programme design and delivery. *AILA Review*, 25, 80–100.

UNTERBERGER, B. (2014): *English-medium degree programmes in Austrian tertiary business studies: Policies and programme design*. University of Vienna.

VAN LIER, L. (2004): *The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Moscow.

WÄCHTER, B. and F. MAIWORM (2008): *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education*. The Picture in 2007. (ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education). Bonn: Lemmens.

WÄCHTER, B. and F. MAIWORM (eds.). (2014): English-taught programmes in European higher education, the state of play in 2014. Bonn: Lemmen.

WIDDOWSON, H. (1973): "Directions in the teaching of discourse", in: CORDER, P. and N. ROULET (eds.): *Theoretical linguistic models in applied linguistics*, AIMAV/Didier. U.K.

WILKINS, D.A. (1972): *Linguistics in language teaching*, Edward Arnold, London.

WILKINSON, R. (2012): "English-Medium Instruction at a Dutch University: Challenges and Pitfalls 3", in: DOIZ, A., LASAGABASTER, D. & SIERRA, J.M. (eds.). *English-Medium Instruction at Universities – Global Challenges*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, UK.

WORTON, M. (2009): *Review of Modern Foreign Languages provision in higher education in England*, Higher Education Funding Council for England report.

WU, W.S. (2006): "Students' attitudes toward EMI: Using Chung Hua University as an example", *Journal of Education and Foreign Language and Literature*, 4, 67–84.