

**To cite this article:**

Andjekov, S. (2022). English Medium Instruction (EMI) in a Spanish university: Does integration ever happen?. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 5(1), 23-40. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.75>

<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.75>

e- ISSN: 2604-5613

Print ISSN: 2605-5893

# English Medium Instruction (EMI) in a Spanish University: Does Integration Ever Happen?



**SONJA ANDJELKOV**

UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA

[sonja.andjekov@gmail.com](mailto:sonja.andjekov@gmail.com)

**T**his article reports on the case of a non-native English-speaking university instructor who teaches her academic subject in the English Medium of Instruction (EMI) track of the Primary Teacher-Education Bachelor's Degree programme offered by a publicly-funded Catalan university. By means of three semi-structured interviews with the instructor, this study seeks to explore whether and how content and language are integrated into her EMI teaching and assessment practices. Analysis of the instructor's comments suggests that, on a practical level, the change in the language of instruction seems to change the dynamics of how she teaches and consequently how she assesses, leading to points of conflict among her rationale, institutional policy, and her students' needs. This tension is most sharply felt when the instructor tries to cope with the lack of clear assessment criteria that could be applied fairly and consistently. The study concludes by noting the practical implications of these results for pre-service teacher education.

**KEYWORDS:**

English Medium Instruction, Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education, Cognitive Discourse Functions, shaping learner contributions, corrective feedback

**E**ste artículo aborda el caso de una profesora que imparte su asignatura en el itinerario de Docencia Universitaria en inglés (DUI) del Grado de Educación Primaria (GEP) en una universidad pública catalana. Mediante tres entrevistas semiestructuradas, el estudio busca comprender si existe algún tipo de integración de contenido y lengua en la práctica docente y evaluadora de la profesora DUI y, en ese caso, describir cómo funciona dicha integración. El análisis de los comentarios de la profesora sugiere que, en la práctica, el cambio de lengua de instrucción parece modificar las dinámicas de cómo se enseña y, consecuentemente, como se evalúa. Dicho cambio genera conflictos entre la justificación de la profesora de su enfoque pedagógico, la política institucional y las necesidades de sus alumnos. La tensión se siente más marcadamente cuando el instructor intenta compensar la falta de criterios de evaluación claros, que puedan ser aplicados de forma consistente. El estudio concluye con implicaciones pedagógicas par la formación inicial del profesorado.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:**

docencia universitaria en inglés, integración del contenido y la lengua en la educación superior, funciones cognitivo-discursivas, modelado de las contribuciones del aprendiz; Retroacción correctiva.

## Introduction

During the previous few decades English has gained global prominence in all spheres of our lives including business, trade, technology, science, popular culture, and education (Crystal 2003; Dimova et al., 2015; Kuteeva, 2013). The number of non-native speakers of English (NNS) now greatly exceeds that of native speakers (NS), so that, it is widely agreed, English today no longer ‘belongs’ to native speakers (Crystal, 2008; Hultgren, 2020). Increased cross-national mobility, whether for political or economic motives, greater international travel facilitated by low-cost airlines, and the development of online communities, have all contributed to the promotion of English to the status of a global lingua franca (Crystal, 2003; Graddol, 2006; Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2009).

This tendency has played a key role in the transformation of European higher education (HE), starting with the ratification of the Bologna Declaration in 1999 and the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), whose goal was to standardise HE systems and thus facilitate students’ mobility (Knight, 2008; Unterberger, 2012). Consequently, many university programmes and curricula have been restructured with English introduced for teaching and learning along with national languages (Smit & Dafouz, 2012).

## Literature Review

When it comes to bi/multilingual HE settings, there are distinct approaches to teaching content subjects through an additional language (AL). Focusing on different learning goals and traditions, they are labelled English Medium Instruction (EMI), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE). While CLIL and EMI can be found at all levels of education- from primary to tertiary, ICLHE is exclusively associated with the HE environment. However, with respect to learning goals, all three approaches involve specific content teaching with or without an explicit focus on language. CLIL (Coyle et al., 2010) and ICLHE (Smit & Dafouz, 2012; Unterberger & Wilhelmer, 2011) adopt similar pedagogical considerations addressed at students’ development of both content and language skills. By contrast, EMI programmes are not necessarily language development programmes.

Macaro (2018) defines EMI as ‘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’ (p.19). Previous research suggests that, because of EMI’s greater focus on content than language, EMI instructors all too often deliver academic content without clear guidelines, previous training, or resources with regard to teaching in what is usually also an L2 for them (Dearden, 2015; Walkinshaw et al., 2017). This negligence of language in EMI policy reflects

a widespread problem. EMI instructors have been reported to be less detailed in comparison to L1-medium instructors, providing students with fewer examples of content (Aguilar, 2015; Airey & Linder, 2006; Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011), whilst for their part, EMI students find it more difficult to follow the lectures or take notes, and are less willing to ask questions (Airey, 2012; Airey & Linder, 2008). Research on the context of EMI shows that instructors’ concerns revolve primarily around content (Airey, 2012; Dafouz, 2011; Lasagabaster, 2018). Furthermore, they express reluctance to teach (Airey, 2011; Dafouz, 2011) and provide corrective feedback on English (Airey, 2012; Costa, 2012; Escobar Urmeneta, 2020).

And yet, studies have highlighted that the integration of content and language learning in content-focused programmes delivered through an AL can be observed through discursive classroom practices and interactions that co-construct meaning. Smit and Dafouz (2012) argue that classroom discourse captures the distinction between EMI and Integrating Content and Language (ICL) approaches through classroom practices, regardless of ‘what role, if any, language learning might play for them’ (p. 8). That is to say, if observed through discursive lenses, ICL may occur independently of the explicit learning goals (Escobar Urmeneta, 2020). This notion of integration is aligned with Mohan’s (1986) stance that ‘the integration of language and subject areas is relevant to all teachers, whether they teach language or subject matter, and whether they teach second language learners or native speakers’ (p. iv).

## Conceptual Framework

In relation to the role that language plays in AL programmes, research on French immersion programmes pointed at an ‘incidental focus on language’ (Lyster, 2007), which is explained through Long’s (1991) ‘focus on form’, whereby teachers who teach their content subjects direct students’ attention to linguistic elements which appear in content-focused lessons. Likewise, previous studies on classroom discourse in CLIL contexts have highlighted some of the teachers’ actions, such as interactional scaffolding, negotiation of meaning, corrective feedback (CF), and focus on form, which are targeted at language learning and typically associated with second language acquisition (SLA) (Nikula et al., 2013).

According to Evnitskaya (2018), classroom interaction plays a fundamental role in helping learners to appropriate and use academic language effectively in the classroom. The construct of classroom interactional competence (CIC), coined by Walsh (2006), refers to learning-oriented interactions where the teacher makes ‘guiding, clarifying, supporting, and shaping contributions so that learners have opportunities to reflect on and learn from the unfolding interaction’ (Walsh 2011, p. 64). Likewise, Escobar Urmeneta and Evnitskaya (2013) describe some of the most important teaching strategies for achieving this kind of interaction, including the use of learner-convergent language, the

facilitation of interactional space, and the shaping ‘of learner contributions through clarification, modelling, paraphrasing, reiterating or repairing the learners’ productions’ (p.115). As argued by the authors, understanding the nature of these conversational adjustments appears crucial for teacher education programmes addressed at instructors teaching their academic subjects through an AL. On the other hand, Lyster and Ranta (1997) show that CF from a teacher is frequently followed by learner uptake or a discourse move that can either be correctly reformulated by students or in a way that still ‘needs repair’.

By seeking to address both cognitive and linguistic aspects, Dalton-Puffer (2013) developed cognitive discourse functions (CDF) as a construct ‘to support research on and the development of ICL pedagogies in all forms of multilingual education by making visible how disciplinary thought processes are handled in classroom talk’ (p. 232). The CDF construct aims at providing an area where content and language overlap and ‘can function as a kind of lingua franca that may enable educators to communicate across subject boundaries’ (Dalton-Puffer, 2013, p. 242). The CDF construct comprises seven categories which are labelled using discourse-related verbs, namely Classify, Define, Describe, Evaluate, Explain, Explore, and Report, and each category is connected to a specific communicative intention (see Table 1). Furthermore, CDF labels aggregate many ‘members’ who share the same communicative intention and cognitive activity within a required academic activity. For example, “IDENTIFY” and “CHARACTERIZE” are

members of the category labelled as “DEFINE” (Dalton-Puffer, 2013).

In the context of EMI at the university level, where academic subjects are learned through the L2 medium of instruction, discourse is seen as a meeting point of cognition and linguistics, i.e. content and language (Escobar Urmeneta, 2020). A more systematic focus on discursive aspects of content subjects may lead to ‘killing two birds with one stone’, simultaneously clarifying students’ learning outcomes, enhancing fairness and accuracy in assessment and making it possible to achieve a more profound integration of content and language (Morton, 2020).

In Spain, the implementation of EMI programmes at universities has tended to take a ‘bottom-up’ perspective (Dafouz et al., 2014), in that university departments have often been plunged into it experimentally, with important decisions being left in the hands of the instructors themselves (ibid.). This being so, the introduction of the L2 medium of instruction has imposed significant challenges on the instructors, especially with regard to methodological approaches. It has been reported in the literature, for example, that EMI instructors frequently do not make any adaptations to their habitual teaching methodology and assume that EMI teaching simply means changing the vehicle of classroom instruction (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Costa & Coleman, 2013). Consequently, there appears to be a mismatch between the claims made by HE institutions offering EMI programmes designed to develop students’ language competencies and their lack of methodological actions directed at this goal.

**Table 1**

*Cognitive Discourse Functions and their Members (Dalton-Puffer, 2013, p.235)*

<b>CDF Label</b>	<b>Communicative Intention / Members</b>
CLASSIFY	I tell you how we can cut up the world according to certain ideas <i>Classify, compare, contrast, match, structure, categorise, subsume</i>
DEFINE	I tell you about the extension of this object of specialist knowledge <i>Define, identify, characterise</i>
DESCRIBE	I tell you details of what can be seen (also metaphorically) <i>Describe, label, identify, name, specify</i>
EVALUATE	I tell you what my position is vis-a-vis X <i>Evaluate, judge, argue, justify, take a stance, critique, recommend, comment, reflect, appreciate</i>
EXPLAIN	I give you reasons for and tell you causes of X <i>Explain, reasons, express, cause/effect, draw conclusions, deduce</i>
EXPLORE	I tell you something that is potential <i>Explore, hypothesise, speculate, predict, guess, estimate, simulate, atke other perspectives</i>
REPORT	I tell you about something that is external to our immediate context on which I have a legitimate knowledge claim <i>Reportm inform, recount, narrate, present, summarise, relate</i>

This paper seeks to help bridge the gap between the invisibility of language in EMI programmes on the one hand, and on the other, language as a key part of content teaching and learning as reflected in the instructors' practices. It focuses on a university professor in the field of education who is teaching an undergraduate course entitled 'Processes and Educational Contexts' (see Orden ECI/3857/2007, de 27 de diciembre) as part of a pre-service Primary Teacher Education Bachelor's Degree (PTED) at a publicly-funded university in Catalonia, Spain.

Despite the need to provide quality education to in-service teachers, few studies have focused on PTED from the EMI instructors' perspective (Escobar Urmeneta, 2018a, 2018b, 2020; Dafouz, 2018; Torras, 2016). This is what will be attempted here. The decision to focus on EMI instructors teaching in PTED was made in order to gain insight into how educationalists approach EMI teaching and assessing. More specifically, the study intends to ascertain how the participant's rationale for teaching and learning in EMI contexts relates to her declared EMI practices. Considering the issues mentioned above, the overarching research question (RQ) that drove this study is as follows: How does the language switch from L1- to L2-medium instruction affect an EMI instructor's reported teaching and assessment practices? This RQ has been broken down into three specific research questions:

RQ1: How does the language switch affect course planning?

RQ2: How does the language switch affect the EMI instructor's teaching practices?

RQ3: How does the language switch affect the EMI instructor's assessment practices?

## The Study

This exploratory study adopts a qualitative research approach (Merriam, 2002). It forms part of a multiple-case study that investigates the interrelationship between content and language in four EMI teacher education (TED) programmes at four Catalan universities. The sample design applied in this broader study is based on 'purposive sampling' (Dörnyei, 2007). Reflecting the overarching purpose and research questions of the study, a sample of six participants were selected to explore the diversity and commonality of the pedagogical strategies these instructors adopted to accommodate their switch to a non-native language of instruction. The six participants had to fulfil the following two inclusion criteria: (1) they had been teaching in or have taught in a PTED; and (2) they had been teaching in or have taught their academic subject both in an EMI context and in a non-EMI one.

Though the full study involves six participants, here we will analyse data coming from just one, who served in effect as a pilot participant, and who was deemed to have all the features of what Morse (1991) calls a 'good informant'

i.e. 'one who is articulate, reflective, and willing to share with the interviewer' (p. 127).

## Data Collection

The primary data for this study were obtained by means of three semi-structured interviews with the participant over a two-year period. Each interview involved a prepared list of questions (interview script) and a protocol for the administration of the interview intended to make the interviewee feel more comfortable and hence produce higher quality data.

The participant was initially contacted via email and provided with information regarding the purpose of the study, a request for participation, and a consent form. By signing the consent form prior to the interview, the participant gave permission to record, transcribe, and utilize her data for the study. She was offered the choice of responding in Catalan, Spanish, or English, and she opted for the English version

A preliminary draft of the interview questions was validated for content by colleagues in the Language and Education (LED) research team and then redrafted where necessary. The interview protocol was rehearsed with a colleague and piloted with a university professor familiar with EMI programmes in Catalonia who provided feedback on the interview design and administration procedures, leading to further adjustments before the actual interviews took place.

The three interviews were designed to be sequential. The first interview was intended to elicit information from the participant about a wide variety of topics, such as her teaching background, her initial motivation for agreeing to teach an EMI course, her expectations prior to the experience, the institutional support she received for EMI teaching, how she experienced EMI teaching as different from teaching in her native language, and so on. This was by far the longest interview, lasting roughly one hour. (The questions for Interview 1 may be seen in Appendix A). The second interview took place a month after the first and right after the instructor had finished grading her students' final written exams. This scheduling was deliberate because the special focus of this interview was on how the instructor dealt with assessment in her EMI course and the special challenges she encountered in this regard (see Appendix B). For example, the participant was asked to comment on her students' exam outcomes, explain what assessment criteria she employed, and reflect on aspects she took into consideration when determining the final mark. Finally, the third interview was scheduled some ten months later, after the audio recordings from the first and second interviews had been fully transcribed. This was because the goal of this interview was to discuss specific comments that the participant had made in the previous two interviews for the purpose of clarification and elaboration (see Appendix C). At the interview, the participant was presented with a copy of the previous interviews' transcripts with the ambiguous sequences highlighted. The second interview lasted about 35

minutes and the third about 20 minutes.

All three interviews were video recorded. The interviews generated a total of 114 minutes of recorded data. The recordings were transcribed verbatim, the result constituting a corpus of 19,506 words for analysis.

Secondary data was also used. This comprised assessment tools devised by the instructor such as assessment rubrics as well as the final exams, and the marks awarded to students through the use of the rubrics volunteered by the participant. This secondary data was requested from the participant following the first interview. Collecting complementary data in this fashion allowed us to triangulate our findings in order to ‘cross-check the consistency of information’ (Patton, 1990, p. 467). With regard to sample graded exams, the participant was asked to provide three: one exam which she awarded a high mark, one which she had given an average mark, and one which she had assigned a low mark.

## Data Analysis

The transcribed data was coded using NVivo12 software. The data-driven analytical approach applied in this study is thematic analysis (Patton, 2015) and its outcome is presented in the form of a narrative account. Thematic analysis is a flexible and widely used approach that enables the identification of themes and patterns related to designated research questions, and it permits the creation of a deep interpretation of data (ibid.). Open coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994) was used for data analysis. The first round of reading the data resulted in 67 open codes. In the next stage, overlapping codes were merged and the number of codes was reduced to 40. The process of code examination was reiterative, i.e. the researcher went through the codes and the participant’s responses several times to make certain that the assigned codes corresponded to the content while being attentive to the new codes that emerged as well as to the research questions. At this point, it became clearer how different codes related and formed an overarching theme. The final stage of analysis consisted of assigning codes to categories and sub-categories, resulting in four overarching themes: EMI pedagogy, EMI assessment policy, EMI assessment principles, and EMI assessment practices. The emerging themes were examined and aligned with the research questions and the main objective of the study.

The names of individuals, places, and all other identifying information have been changed in order to preserve the participant’s anonymity. Hereafter the participating instructor will be referred to by the pseudonym ‘Olga’.

## Results

The analysis of results is organized as follows. Firstly, Olga’s EMI course planning and teaching practices will be discussed. Secondly, the support she received from

the institution will be addressed, followed by an outline of her assessment principles and then practices. The next section provides an overview of the assessment tasks and practices she employed, followed by a look at Olga’s approach to the assessment of oral presentations in particular.

## Planning

In her narrative, Olga discussed similarities between her non-EMI and EMI academic courses with regard to planning. She noted that both courses had the same structural organization in terms of lectures and seminars, and reflected that on the institutional level, besides the language of instruction no other aspects would distinguish one from the other: ‘Nothing else, that’s right. Nothing else.’ When asked about the language goals for the course she was teaching through English, Olga explained that there were no expected outcomes regarding language. We see this in the excerpts in (1), both from Interview 1 (in this and subsequent excerpts, RES refers to the researcher and OLG to Olga).

(1)

RES: Do you have specific language goals stated in the instructions for your subject?

OLG: Specific language goals? Goals. No.

RES: Because you have content goals. For example, by the end of this course, my students should..

OLG: There aren’t any, any content goals. No, at all.

RES: Language goals.

OLG: Aaah, sorry. Language. Sorry. We don’t have any language goal, no.

Olga reported that the language switch did not imply any modifications in the syllabus of the academic course, and it did not impose any language learning objectives for the EMI students ‘not as a goal in the program or in the guidelines’.

## Teaching Practices

When asked about how she approached EMI students’ struggles caused by the English language, Olga acknowledged providing her students with CF, as we see in (2), also from Interview 1.

(2)

OLG: I would try to rephrase what they’re saying using a proper vocabulary, proper English structure and they say ‘Yes!’ And then they repeat it

correctly. So, if I see them struggle with a word instead of saying 'No!' I would say 'Yeah, I see what you are saying, you want to say that.' And then I rephrase or I encourage them to use it in small groups, I encourage them to use it with me when face to face encounters. And I encourage them to lose fear. I encourage them to not be ashamed if they make a mistake. When I make a mistake, I [point out]: 'I'm doing a mistake.'

Excerpt (2) illustrates how Olga, an experienced pedagogue, uses CF techniques (Lyster, 2007) to attend to her EMI students' language needs. The sentence 'I would try to rephrase what they're saying using a proper vocabulary, proper English structure' shows Olga recasting and shaping students' answers. When she says, 'then they repeat correctly', this indicates the promotion of 'uptake', a term defined as a 'student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance' (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.49). Llinares and Lyster (2014) studied CF and learner uptake patterns across CLIL and immersion settings and concluded that the amount of uptake and repair produced by students immediately following CF will be greater if the CF is delivered intentionally with a didactic purpose.

Olga was not only concerned that her students mastered content but she also nurtured their language development. It seems, however, as if Olga was unaware of the role her actions were having in her students' ability to cope with the L2 medium of instruction.

Olga also mentioned supporting her EMI students with vocabulary or structures 'if I see them struggle with a word... I would say: "Yeah, I see what you are saying, you want to say that."' By drawing a learner's and the class's attention to a specific lexical item and providing them with a correct form, we see how Olga seeks to 'shape' (Escobar Urmeneta & Walsh, 2017) the learner's response rather than just accepting it.

By saying 'I encourage them to use it in small groups, I encourage them to use it with me when face to face encounters', Olga demonstrates the intention to create 'space for learning' (Evnitskaya, 2018), increasing student talking time, and providing the opportunities for interaction. Importantly, she does not enforce these interactions but rather encourages and supports them. According to Ellis (2000) 'learning arises not through interaction, but in interaction' (p. 209).

Being aware of the 'foreign language anxiety' (Horwitz et al., 1986) that EMI students may feel, Olga tried to ease the transition from L1 to L2. At several points in the interviews, she stresses the importance of 'losing fear' when interacting through English, and she seeks to create a favourable environment for this to happen: 'I encourage

**“Olga demonstrates the intention to create ‘space for learning’ (Evnitskaya, 2018), increasing student talking time, and providing the opportunities for interaction. Importantly, she does not enforce these interactions but rather encourages and supports them.”**

them to not be ashamed if they make a mistake. When I make a mistake, I [point out]: "I'm doing a mistake". Here she is also using humour by introducing a premeditated error ('doing' instead of 'making' a mistake) to emphasize the message, acknowledging that everyone is entitled to make a mistake and that there is no need to worry. She thus invites her students to participate and enjoy the EMI setting. Olga favours participation over linguistic accuracy. Making mistakes is an intrinsic and inevitable part of language learning.

However, the way Olga explains her approach to language learning does not suggest a clear awareness of this process; rather, she sees language as a tool for learning, not as an object of learning that is aligned with her course planning.

### **Institutional Support**

In the course of the first interview, Olga mentions having participated in an EMI instructor support group, part of an innovation project officially supported by the university and the Catalan government (3).

#### **(3)**

OLG: You know there was a very useful group... we were doing periodic meetings with all the teachers of this group. And for me, that was very helpful, very helpful. I think this group, it was Ana directing this, and I think it was very linked to our

research project which ended already... I really liked that group. It was not research; it was a group to reinforce and give support to teachers in Ana's group. And I think that was great. Because we can share that: 'What do you do?', 'Do you do the face-to-face meeting in Catalan or in English?', 'How do you feel?', 'Have you done the... I don't know?' It was very nice to have meetings with teachers in the support group.

Olga here expresses satisfaction with having the opportunity to participate in a support group and stresses the features she liked best: getting answers to practical, ongoing questions and concerns, comparing notes on classroom experiences, and talking about their feelings. The last feature is especially important since the EMI instructors in the support group were pioneering a new project, trying to implement a new way of delivering content, and were all facing the same new teaching challenges. Olga labelled this group and form of institutional backing as 'infinite help', but it only lasted while the official innovation project was active.

### Grading Principles

When talking about the instructions she had been given regarding the assessment of EMI students' learning outcomes in EMI academic courses, Olga's answer centres on identity, competency, and fairness (4).

(4)

RES: Do you have any instructions like how to evaluate or not because it's in English?

OLG: Yeah, yeah, yeah, we have instructions. We are not supposed to [pay attention to language]... You know what, I'm not an English teacher. You know, maybe I can identify some mistakes and others not, you know. So, I'm not, I'm not, hmmm. How you say, hmm, trained to correct English, you know. So, I cannot correct. I would correct some mistakes the ones I know but I am sure there are others that I cannot detect I cannot identify either because I'm not an English grammar teacher. So I am sure that even though I put attention in correcting the English it's going to be a lot of mistakes that I cannot see. And then, it's unfair that I only correct some mistakes.

What Olga says in (4) reflects her sense that she lacks the competence to provide quality, objective, and accurate feedback concerning her students' use of English. Olga justified her focus on content by expressing her inability to identify with equal accuracy all L2 language mistakes: 'I would correct some mistakes, the ones I know, but I am sure there are others that I cannot detect, I cannot identify'. By saying 'I'm not trained to correct English' Olga highlighted her perception that she lacked legitimacy (Escobar Urmeneta, 2020) to provide her EMI students with adequate CF. At the same time, the statement 'I am sure that even though I put attention in correcting the English it's going to be a lot of mistakes that I cannot see and then it's unfair that I only correct some mistakes' demonstrates the importance Olga placed on achieving fairness and objectivity in her EMI assessment.

### Grading Practices

Olga's account of her EMI assessment practices is characterised by struggles caused by the lack of defined English language assessment criteria. When asked if she had any focus on language or if instead she only evaluated content, Olga's reply in (5) leads her to discuss several issues all stemming from this lack of criteria. She reports that her struggles were exacerbated by her frequent inability to understand students' written answers and her uncertainty about what criteria to apply with regard to errors in morphosyntax.

(5)

RES: Do you have any focus on language or do you just evaluate content?

OLG: You see, that's a struggle (...) And that's a struggle because sometimes exams are awfully written (...) So I have, I have a struggle because we are supposed not to pay attention to that. So, we are supposed just to pay attention to content. Sometimes the idea is not clear either because the use of language is not being proper or correct (...) And I cannot count this part of the question because I don't know what you are telling me. Then it's a problem and I put 'Improve your English', 'Come talk to me', 'I don't understand this idea'.

RES: Do you evaluate it, or do you just tell them to...

OLG: Well, if I do not understand what they are saying I cannot. If I'm asking, I don't know what, and that answer I don't understand it because it is completely wrongly formulated, like super wrong like I don't understand the

meaning, the idea, blah blah blah. Then I cannot give [points], of course. What I don't pay attention is when there is a spelling mistake for example and when it's more, yeah, spelling mistakes those even though I...

In excerpt (5), Olga's repeated use of the word 'struggle' manifests her inner conflict between what she assumed she was supposed to do ('just to pay attention to content') and what she felt was needed. Her statement 'the idea is not clear (...) because the use of language is not being proper or correct' raises the issues of L2 intelligibility and comprehensibility (Smith & Nelson, 1985) and leads to her conclusion that 'I cannot count this part of the question because I don't know what you are telling me.' By 'count' she refers to being unable to give points for a student's answer. It seems that Olga realizes how interwoven language and content are at least when it comes to intelligibility, meaning the students' ability to get their message across clearly, which is in line with Mohan's (1986) statement that 'linguistic content is inseparable from linguistic expression' (p. 1).

By verbalizing the mismatch between her principles and practices, Olga makes an important discovery that represents a key moment for her as an EMI instructor in terms of personal development. Olga touches on the ICL perspective through her realization that content and language cannot exist separately. For the first time, Olga admits that in this particular way language may affect scores for content since she marks students down if the quality of their language use affects the intelligibility of their explanation of content. In addition, Olga reports providing her students with CF in the form of a clarification request, which implies applying EFL pedagogy in EMI assessment practices and thus making a slight shift in the direction of ICL practices.

**“By verbalizing the mismatch between her principles and practices, Olga makes an important discovery that represents a key moment for her as an EMI instructor in terms of personal development. Olga touches on the ICL perspective through her realization that content and language cannot exist separately.”**

By telling a student 'Improve your English', 'Come talk to me', 'I don't understand this idea', Olga is both making recommendations for the student to improve their linguistic skills outside the context of the EMI course she is teaching and proposing an individualized tutoring session to address the problem. Here Olga appears to be close to a central issue in linguistics studies which argue that integration of content and language is a natural occurrence (Mohan, 1986; Smit & Dafouz, 2012). Can a piece of writing, whether a poem, a novel or an answer to a test question be broken down into content and language just as seawater can be broken down into water and salt?

### Assessment Task Typology

In the course of the second interview, when discussing the possibility of changing the exam format, Olga explained that evaluating students' learning outcomes through multiple choice questions was not an option (6).

(6)

RES: For example, the option of multiple choice would be a kind of a solution?

OLG: I don't like multiple choice. It's not telling me anything. It's very memoristic. (...) Hmmm, to do that I prefer not to do an exam. Like, I will never do a multiple-choice thing, no. I prefer short questions, a little bit of critical thinking, a little bit of... I need to see how they write for me, it's important. They're going to be teachers, I need to see how they write, how they connect things.

Here Olga reflects her belief that the effect of open-ended questions in an exam is deeper, requiring 'critical thinking' and 'connecting things'. We can see that Olga's assessment approach in EMI naturally leans towards integrating content with language. Her emphasis is on the need to see how well her students are able to express knowledge since 'they're going to be teachers. I need to see how they write, how they connect things.' This statement suggests a link between cognition and language, thinking and writing. As Mohan (1986, p.12) argues, the role of writing becomes critical in learning once the role of language is to 'represent experience to the self in order to make sense of new information.' Olga justifies her decisions from the perspective of an ICL instructor interested in both content and form, 'how they write.'

### Assessment Practices: Task Rubrics

When asked how she formulated exam questions and what criteria she applied to evaluate her EMI students' academic performance, Olga illustrated



her views by reference to how she marked a student exam, analysing each section, to illustrate what she expected from her EMI students (7).

(7)

OLG: So, first of all, it's like they have to define the four obligations of the states which are the four A framework, and highlight the main idea for each and classify them as referring to the right in or the right to and why, and then which problems does society face in order to guarantee the fulfilment of this obligations? Relate the current educational policies and legislation.

Excerpt (7) reveals ideas that are clearly reminiscent of ICL. For example, Olga uses discursive verbs like 'define', 'highlight', 'classify', and 'relate' to describe the target tasks required by the exam item (Escobar Urmeneta, 2016, 2020), showing a clear link to Dalton Puffer's (2013) CDFs, namely: Classify, Define, Describe, Evaluate, Explain, Explore, and Report. Olga's 'highlight the main idea' task corresponds to the category of 'define' and her 'relate' to that of 'report'. These findings are also supported by a previous study by Escobar Urmeneta (2020) outlining 'content-related and discourse-related verbs', i.e., verbs that embody the twofold learning goals which bear the processes of cognition applicable to academic work.

### Assessing Oral Presentations

Olga reported that the students in her EMI course were required to give an oral presentation at the end of the course. Its goal was to make students reflect on the content of the three courses comprising the cross-disciplinary EMI subject 'Processes and Educational Contexts', of which Olga's course was one, and the grade awarded to each student was decided by the three EMI instructors working together. In the second interview, Olga noted that when assessing the presentations, the three instructors focused predominantly on content. Therefore in the third interview, she was asked to expand on that answer (8).

(8)

RES: [In Interview 2] You mentioned that 'we mostly evaluate the content', okay? Besides the content what else?

OLG: In the rubric, you can see, for example, the originality of the presentation, if all of them are taking part [in] it, like maybe the methodologies that they are using to present, like in the rubric. I don't

remember. But that's why we are three of us because there's... it's of course content-related. So, as it's a transversal [course] (...) we are the three of us to just evaluate the content.

In her response, Olga refers to several of the items listed in the rubric that all three instructors used to assess their EMI students' oral performance, namely 'originality', 'presence of all group members', and 'methodologies they are using to present.' However, she then once more emphasises content, referring to it as the central point of the oral presentation: 'it's of course content related (...) we are the three of us to just evaluate the content.'

After this interview, Olga's comments were compared with the actual text of the instrument used by the three teachers to assess the oral presentations (see Appendix D). In fact, the instrument asks the assessing instructor to qualify the presenter's language skills through descriptors of language competence like 'vocabulary of presentation is appropriate for the topic' (appropriacy), 'use of a variety of structures in the sentences' (range), 'sentence structures are occasionally correct', and 'the language is generally correct' or 'grammar during the presentation is correct' (accuracy), and 'the language is correct and fluent' (accuracy and fluency). The descriptors of the above-mentioned categories fall into the 'correctness, accuracy, fluency' (CAF) construct that is extensively applied in language pedagogy and research in SLA (Housen & Kuiken, 2009).

However, in excerpt (8) above we see that Olga has the impression that the primary concern of assessment of the oral presentation is mastery of content. In this regard, she seems not to comply with the principles of content-language-integrated pedagogy, even though the teacher-made assessment materials she was using tell a different story, making clear reference to the use of language in order to mediate subject knowledge.

## Discussion and Conclusions

In this paper we have analysed three interviews with the instructor of an EMI university course in which she provided details of her teaching and assessment principles and practices. The analysis was based not only on full transcripts of the interviews but also on actual course-related materials submitted by the instructor. The goal of the analysis was in part to determine the degree of consistency between her rationale regarding EMI teaching and assessment, and her actual practices, as reflected and demonstrated in the documents she shared with the researcher.

The results reveal occasional contradictions between the instructor's apparently non-ICL beliefs and her actual classroom practices, which are often consistent with ICL teaching strategies. Concerning the effect that the

language switch from L1- to L2-medium instruction had on her course planning, it can be observed that this EMI instructor operates in a non-ICL mode, apparently due to the fact that no specific language-related goals have been stipulated for this EMI course by the university. The lack of a clearly defined language policy for the university's EMI programme is mirrored in Olga's description of her teaching and assessment practices through non-ICL lenses. In the same vein, Escobar Urmeneta (2020) observed the lack of 'pedagogical postulates' that would target language development within content subjects in Spanish EMI degrees. In the interviews, the instructor also makes it clear that she identifies as a content specialist in her field and lacks legitimacy as a language teacher. Her argument that her lack of formal training to teach or assess English leaves her with inadequate knowledge to provide her EMI students with corrective feedback is in line with what has been found by many previous researchers (Airey, 2012; Dafouz et al., 2014; Escobar Urmeneta, 2018b). Olga's identity as an EMI instructor is coherent with her refusal to act as a language teacher. Regarding the question of EMI assessment, her main preoccupation is to achieve and maintain fairness and consistency.

Nonetheless, concerning the effect that L2 medium instruction has on the EMI instructor's teaching practices, there are indicators that she in fact deploys ICL teaching strategies conducive to language development. Olga herself reports using a variety of strategies to promote EMI students' participation and provide them with different types of corrective feedback (Lyster, 2007; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). For example, she rephrases students' answers, motivates them to use English, provides them with correct language models, and encourages them to avoid negative emotions. This is consistent with techniques frequently used in CLIL for scaffolding oral output such as asking questions, encouraging participation, providing students with feedback (Guerrini, 2009), shaping learner output (Walsh, 2012), and promoting learner uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Concerning the effect of the language switch on the EMI instructor's assessment practices, we can see a shift in Olga's assessment practices in the direction of ICL. The way Olga formulates her assessment task is in line with Dalton-Puffer's (2013) CDFs. This is consistent with Escobar Urmeneta (2020), who found that once EMI instructors gain an understanding of 'language as discourse' it can help improve their practices as teachers of content and contribute to their students' language development. This, however, can be achieved through the guided discovery of practical problems instructors encounter in their classrooms (Escobar Urmeneta, 2020). Consequently, Olga's participation in the support group may have influenced her formulation of the tasks. Thus, although Olga expresses a refusal to be perceived as a language teacher once language issues arise during the class or in assessment, she eagerly attends to them.

Olga's story is marked by contradiction. She perceives herself as primarily concerned with content, regarding EMI as an approach for the mere transmission of content. Yet,

**“The way Olga formulates her assessment task is in line with Dalton-Puffer’s (2013) CDFs. This is consistent with Escobar Urmeneta (2020), who found that once EMI instructors gain an understanding of ‘language as discourse’ it can help improve their practices as teachers of content and contribute to their students’ language development.”**

her classroom practices demonstrate a relatively high level of ICL. Olga's teaching and assessment practices range from providing EMI students with oral corrective feedback (recasting and shaping their answers, promoting uptake) to applying Dalton-Puffer's CDFs in task formulation. This contradiction also manifests itself with regard to assessment. For example, on the one hand, it is evident that Olga seems not entirely aware of the language-related descriptors she and her EMI colleagues included in the assessment rubric for student presentations. Yet on the other, she readily acknowledges that the intelligibility of students' answers affects their comprehensibility and consequently how she grades them.

If we imagine Olga's story as a set of sequenced vignettes, in the first we see institutional policy which rests on EMI principles — neither the university nor the Faculty of Education nor the department has a clear linguistic policy regarding the language development of the students. The second vignette shows how Olga's rationale is rooted in EMI principles. Vignette 3 shows EMI students' language needs to which Olga attends by incorporating a set of pedagogical techniques and strategies favouring language learning. In vignette 4, we observe Olga's inner conflict between EMI policy and her students' needs. Finally, vignette 5 depicts Olga's certain level of awareness that everything is linked, and content and language need to be observed as a whole (see grading practices).

Olga's participation in a teacher development programme addressed at EMI instructors might in part explain her ongoing partial switch in favour of integration. While the direction in which Olga is moving is promising, the level of insecurity she reports suggests that she could

have benefited from a more sustained programme and/or more intensive support in that respect. EMI programmes may need to reflect on the form of the institutional support that is offered to instructors in terms of content, approach, intensity, and length.

The purpose of this study has been to gain insights into one EMI instructor's teaching and assessment policies and practices, and we make no claim that our conclusions are broadly generalizable. Hence, its contribution is to provide illustrations of instances where content and language merge in the EMI context, despite the instructor's avowed intention to keep the two separate, and this is a topic that deserves further scrutiny in future research. It will be recalled that this study forms part of a larger study involving six EMI instructors altogether: the outcomes of this exploratory study need to be checked against the attitudes and behaviours of the other five participants in the research to look for similarities and differences across the cases.

Finally, future research could examine 'practice groups' or 'panels of EMI instructors' (Escobar Urmeneta, 2020) as a form of institutional support for the instructors engaged in teaching through L2 that will help them integrate content and language most effectively. Such research could be beneficial for both EMI instructors and policymakers in other contexts to develop practical ideas for supporting EMI programmes. ■

## References

- Aguilar, M. (2015). Engineering lecturers' views on CLIL and EMI. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.  
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1073664>.
- Aguilar, M. & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 183–197.
- Airey, J. (2011). Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, 22, 35–54.
- Airey, J. (2012). I don't teach language. The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden. *AILA Review*, 25(25), 64–79.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.05air>.
- Airey, J., & Linder, C. (2006). Language and the experience of learning university physics in Sweden. *European Journal of Physics*, 27(3), 553.
- Airey, J., & Linder, C. (2008). Bilingual scientific literacy? The use of English in Swedish university science courses. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 7(3), 145–161.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101.
- Costa, F. (2012). Focus on form in ICLHE lectures in Italy: Evidence from English-medium science lectures by native speakers of Italian. *AILA Review*, 25, 30–47.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.03cos>.
- Costa, F., & Coleman, J. A. (2013). A survey of English-medium instruction in Italian higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16, 3–19.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? *English Today*, 24, 3–6.
- Dafouz, E. (2011). English as the medium of instruction in Spanish context: A look at teacher discourses. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. M. Sierra, & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and foreign language integrated learning: Contributions to multilingualism in European contexts* (pp. 189–210). Peter Lang.
- Dafouz, E. (2018). English-medium instruction and teacher education programmes in higher education: Ideological forces and imagined identities at work. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(5), 540–552.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1487926>.
- Dafouz, E., Camacho, M., & Urquía, E. (2014). 'Surely they can't do as well': a comparison of business students' academic performance in English-medium and Spanish-as-first-language-medium programmes. *Language and Education*, 28(3), 223–236.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2013.808661>
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 216–253.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0011>.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction—a growing global phenomenon*. British Council. [https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484\\_emi\\_cover\\_option\\_3\\_final\\_web.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf).
- Dimova, S., Hultgren, A. K., & Jensen, C. (2015). *English-medium instruction in higher education in Europe*. Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language teaching research*, 4(3), 193-220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688000400302>.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2016). Conversación educativa y aprendizaje integrado de competencias lingüísticas y curriculares: las muchas tareas de la maestra AICLE. *E-Aesla*, (2), 42-55.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2018a). Docencia Universitaria en Inglés (DUI) en el grado de Educación Primaria: fundamentación, contexto y toma de decisiones. In C. Escobar Urmeneta & L. Arnau (Eds.), *Los retos de la internacionalización de los Grados Universitarios en el Contexto del Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (EEES)* (pp. 33–59). Síntesis.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2018b). Cuatro años de Docencia Universitaria en Inglés (DUI) en Cataluña. Miradas críticas de los participantes. In C. Escobar Urmeneta & L. Arnau (Eds.), *Los retos de la internacionalización de los Grados Universitarios en el Contexto del Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (EEES)* (pp. 89–114). Madrid: Síntesis. <https://doi.org/10.4272/978-84-9745-387-5.ch7>.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2020), 'From EMI to ICLHE: Teacher Development for L2-Medium Instruction in a Teacher Education Institution', in N. Sánchez-Pérez (Eds), *Teacher Training for English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education*, 179-204, Hershey, PA: IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2318-6.ch009>.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C., & Evnitskaya, N. (2013). Affording Students Opportunities for the Integrated Learning of Content and Language: A Contrastive Study on Classroom Interactional Strategies Deployed by Two CLIL Teachers. In J. Arnau (Ed.), *Reviving Catalan at School* (pp. 158-182). Multilingual Matters.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C., & Walsh, S. (2017). Classroom interactional competence in content and language integrated learning. *Applied linguistics perspectives on CLIL*, 47, 183-200. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.47.11.esc>.
- Evnitskaya, N. (2018). Classroom interaction and language learning in CLIL contexts. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 1(1), 7-17. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.3>.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next. Why global English may mean the end of English as a Foreign Language*. British Council.
- Guerrini, M. (2009). CLIL materials as scaffolds to learning. In D. Marsh, P. Mehisto, D. Wolff, R. Aliaga, T. Asikainen, M. Frigols-Martin, S. Hughes and G. Langé (Eds.), *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field* (pp. 74–84). University of Jyväskylä.
- Hellekjaer, G. O. (2010). Language Matters: Assessing Lecture Comprehension in Norwegian English-medium Education. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula & U.J.B. Smit (eds.), *Language Use and Language learning in CLIL Classrooms*, 233–258. John Benjamins.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>.
- Housen, A. & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp048>.
- Hultgren, A. K. (2020). Global English: From “Tyrannosaurus Rex” to “Red Herring”. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(3), 10–34.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003>.
- Jensen, C. & Thøgersen J. (2011). Danish University lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Ibérica*, 22(fall), 13–34.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalisation*. Sense Publishers.
- Kuteeva, M. (2013). English in Academic and Professional Contexts. *Special Issue of Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 13(1), 1–6.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Fostering team teaching: Mapping out a research agenda for English-medium instruction at university level. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 400-416. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444818000113>.
- Lincoln, W. G. T. Y. S. (1997). *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice*. Suny Press.
- Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 181-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889509>.

- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach* (Vol. 18). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034>.
- Macaro, E. (2018). *English Medium Instruction*. Oxford University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice. Examples for Discussion and Analysis*. Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Sage.
- Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content* (Vol. 5288). Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Strategies for sampling. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue* (pp. 127–145). Sage.
- Morton, T. (2020). Cognitive discourse functions: A bridge between content, literacy, and language for teaching and assessment in CLIL. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 3(1), 7–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.33>.
- Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C. & Llinares, A. (2013). CLIL classroom discourse: Research from Europe. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 70–100.
- Orden, ECI/3857/2007, de 27 de diciembre, por la que se establecen los requisitos para la verificación de los títulos universitarios oficiales que habiliten para el ejercicio de la profesión de Maestro en Educación Primaria. Boletín Oficial del Estado (29 de diciembre de 2007). Retrieved from <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2007/12/29/pdfs/A53747-53750.pdf>.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: integrating theory and practice*. Fourth edition. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. *Aila Review*, 25(1), 1–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.01smi>.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333–342.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.1985.tb00423.x>.
- Torras, B. (2016). *The role of student-teachers' imagined identities in their investments in English in an "Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education" (ICLHE) Catalan pre-service teacher education context* (Doctoral Dissertation). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.  
[https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tesis/2016/hdl\\_10803\\_400872/btv4de4.pdf](https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tesis/2016/hdl_10803_400872/btv4de4.pdf).
- 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.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.06unt>.
- Unterberger, B. & Wilhelmer, N. (2011). English-medium education in economics and business studies: capturing the status quo at Austrian universities. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 161, 90–110.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.161.06unt>.
- Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Motivation, language identities and the L2 self: A theoretical overview. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 1–9). Multilingual Matters.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 6(1), 1–14.
- Walkinshaw, I., Fenton-Smith, B., & Humphreys, P. (2017). EMI issues and challenges in Asia-Pacific higher education: An introduction. In B. Fenton-Smith (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific* (pp. 1–18). Springer, Cham.

## Appendix A. Interview Script 1

BACKGROUND	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First of all, could you tell us something about your academic background?</li> <li>2. When did you start teaching?</li> <li>3. When and how did you get involved in the EMI programme?</li> <li>4. Could you please tell us some basic information about the academic course you teach in English and your research field?</li> <li>5. What was the main reason why you agreed to teach an EMI course? What motivated you to get involved in teaching your academic subject in English?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching experience</li> <li>• EMI experience</li> <li>• Personal feelings</li> <li>• Fears</li> <li>• Reasons</li> </ul>
EXPECTATIONS, CHALLENGES, & OPPORTUNITIES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Now, think back to before you started teaching a course in English and tell us something about your expected fears, the things that worried you the most.</li> <li>7. What problems did you anticipate?</li> <li>8. What kinds of challenges did you encounter while teaching an EMI course?</li> <li>9. Can you remember any particular problem that was special?</li> <li>10. Is there anything else that stands out in your memory about when you started teaching an EMI course?</li> <li>11. Were these problems similar to those you had expected to face? Could you tell us more about this?</li> <li>12. Were your problems similar to those of your colleagues?</li> <li>13. What strategies did you apply in order to cope with these problems?</li> <li>14. Did you ask for help?</li> <li>15. Did you have any support from your colleagues?</li> <li>16. Are you happy with the results?</li> <li>17. Have you noticed any difficulties that your colleagues are facing? Have you got any recommendations for them?</li> <li>18. Are these problems particularly difficult to solve, and if so, why?</li> <li>19. Although some of the problems EMI instructors face are likely institutional or structural in nature, is there anything you as a professor could do in order to make things work better?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected challenges</li> <li>• Challenges you faced while teaching</li> <li>• Coping strategies</li> <li>• Help (from your colleagues)</li> <li>• your colleagues' problems</li> <li>• Institutional obstacles</li> <li>• Solutions</li> <li>• Suggestions</li> <li>• What would be an ideal solution?</li> </ul>
SUPPORT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20. Did you use any of the resources offered by the university? (additional language courses, training in using a new methodological approach, cooperation with a language expert)?</li> <li>21. Was the support offered by the university beneficial to you?</li> <li>22. Is there any kind of support for EMI instructors that you think is lacking? If so, what is it?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name the resources used</li> <li>• Benefits</li> <li>• Training Needs</li> <li>• Recommendations</li> <li>• Ideal situation</li> </ul>
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN L1MI AND EMI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23. Do you teach any academic courses in Catalan/ Spanish? If so, are your EMI classes differently organized from the classes you teach in Catalan/Spanish?</li> <li>24. If you are not currently teaching both types of courses, can you think back and try to compare your experiences of teaching courses in Catalan/Spanish and EMI courses?</li> <li>25. What would be the main similarities and differences between classes delivered in Catalan/Spanish and classes delivered in English?</li> <li>26. Is this just the case for your classes in particular or is it generalizable to all courses offered by the Faculty of Education? How much leeway do teachers have to organize their classes the way they want?</li> <li>27. What are the main differences in the way you teach your academic course in Catalan and the one in English?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarities</li> <li>• Differences</li> <li>• Teaching methodology</li> <li>• Strategies used</li> <li>• Examples</li> <li>• Institutional regulations vs teacher's autonomy</li> <li>• What can be different? (realist view/ idealist view)</li> </ul>

CONTENT	<p>28. Do you feel that students in EMI courses learn the same amount of content as students in non-EMI courses?</p> <p>29. Is it difficult for students in your EMI classes to learn new content in a foreign language?</p> <p>30. Do they feel insecure?</p> <p>31. Do you notice that your students are struggling because their level of English is inadequate?</p> <p>32. Do your students need any additional help with the tasks you assign them so that they can master the content?</p> <p>33. If so, how do you give them that additional help?</p> <p>34. What percentage of reading materials for the course are your students expected to read in English?</p> <p>35. How difficult do you think are they for your students?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content outcomes</li> <li>• Goals</li> <li>• Linguistic goals</li> <li>• Students learning outcomes</li> <li>• Students educated in Catalan vs students educated in English</li> <li>• Learning difficulties</li> <li>• Authentic materials</li> <li>• Language support</li> <li>• Reading materials</li> </ul>
LANGUAGE LEARNING: EXPLICIT TEACHING (with clear goals) and IMPLICIT (by the incident)	<p>36. Do you think that your students learn English in your classes?</p> <p>37. If not, why not?</p> <p>38. If so, how does this happen? How do you notice that their English language skills are improving?</p> <p>39. What aspects of the language do they improve?</p> <p>40. Do you provide corrective feedback? For example, how do you correct your students when they make mistakes in oral presentations or essay writing?</p> <p>41. Do you think it is important to give them feedback?</p> <p>42. Do you have any clear language learning goals or discursive goals that you set at the beginning of your course? (in terms of English)</p> <p>43. If so, can you explain and give an example?</p> <p>44. If not, do you think such language learning goals would be useful?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes in language learning</li> <li>• Explicit language learning goals</li> <li>• Corrective Feedback in oral and written form</li> </ul>
ASSESSMENT	<p>45. How do you assess your students? What are the main similarities and differences between how you assess them in Catalan and how you assess them in English?</p> <p>46. As far as you know, is this true for you only, is it generally the case for the whole Primary Education Bachelor's Degree? Why? Do you keep it similar or different?</p> <p>47. Which of the following assessment tasks do you incorporate in your EMI class: exams, group work, pair work, presentations, essays, book or article summaries, oral debates?</p> <p>48. How does English affect the assessment process?</p> <p>49. Do you give higher marks if your students show strong English language skills, and do you penalize them if their English language skills are weak?</p> <p>50. Could you give examples of how you do this?</p> <p>51. If on the other hand, students' English language skills have no impact on the grades you give them, justify your reasoning for this approach.</p> <p>52. Are there any particular reasons why you avoid assessing student English language skills, such as lack of time?</p> <p>53. What are the most important problems you encounter when it comes to assessing your EMI students?</p> <p>54. Do you assess both language and content? If so, could you please tell us something more about how you do this? In other words, what are your assessment criteria? How do you calculate grades?</p> <p>55. Do you apply any specific language criteria related to things like syntax or vocabulary when assessing your students? Can you please give us an example of how you do that?</p> <p>56. Does the discursive quality of a student's English influence the final mark you give them?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment criteria</li> <li>• Tools</li> <li>• Types of assessment tasks</li> <li>• Is language being assessed?</li> <li>• What can be changed</li> <li>• How (realistic and idealistic view)</li> <li>• Ideal situation</li> <li>• Co-assessment</li> <li>• External language examination</li> </ul>
OTHER	<p>57. Of all the things we have been discussing, what do you feel is the most important?</p> <p>58. Is there anything that you feel we should have discussed but didn't?</p>	

## Appendix C. Interview Script 2

1. Could you please explain what components you bear in mind when assessing your EMI students? How many tasks are there?
2. How do you arrive at your final mark?
3. Could you tell me more about the written exam? How do you write your questions?
4. Could you show me the tasks you created for the written exam?
5. How do you write your questions? Can you please clarify this? Do you try to use simple structures and clear explanations?
6. Could you please show me one example of each of a student exam to which you gave a high mark, one that you gave an average mark, and one that you gave a failing mark?
7. What are the elements that a student exam must exhibit in order for you to award it a good mark?
8. How important is the quality of the students' discourse in English, the way they are writing their answers?
9. How do you evaluate the language aspect of student exams?
10. What problems do you commonly face in marking the exams?
11. Looking at the example of a 'good' student exam, how do you know that this is a good fragment? What things caught your attention?
12. How do you think that the quality of their writing influences your decisions?
13. Does the level of English affect their mark either positively or negatively? Could you explain this in more detail?
14. Do you take into account any grammar or spelling mistakes they make when you grade the exam? Is this also the case when you are grading an exam for a course where the medium of instruction is Catalan?
15. What are the biggest challenges you encounter regarding the evaluation process of your EMI students?
16. What strategies do you apply in order to overcome them?
17. What is the possible solution? How do you imagine an ideal situation regarding the assessment in EMI university courses?
18. Finally, to wrap up this interview session, is there anything we should have discussed but didn't?



### Appendix C. Interview Script 3

- |     |  |       |
|-----|--|-------|
| 1.  | You mentioned here debate, role-play, etc. Do you take these activities into consideration when you assess your students at the end of the course? What about their performance? Do these activities     | Ref 1 |
| 2.  | How frequently during the term do you have debates?  |       |
| 3.  | What do you evaluate when you have debates?  |       |
| 4.  | Do you regard student oral presentations as an assessment task?  | Ref 2 |
| 5.  | You mentioned 'critical thinking' here. Does this mean that you prepare your students for the final presentation during the seminars? Do you take this into account?                                     |       |
| 6.  | Does evidence of critical thinking have any weight in the final mark?  |       |
| 7.  | Here you say: 'We mostly evaluate the content'. I note that you use the word 'mostly'. What else did you evaluate besides content?   | Ref 3 |
| 8.  | Here you mention: 'conclusions they reach in each of the three blocks'. Can you elaborate on this?   | Ref 4 |
| 9.  | Do you pay attention to the way students analyse content, the way they reason, or the way they link content?   |       |
| 10. | Here you mention 'silhouettes'. What activity do students perform in this case?  | Ref 5 |
| 11. | Here you mention 'conceptual map'. What do you ask your students to write about the concepts, and how do they present them? Do they write about the concepts at home and then explain them to you in     | Ref 6 |
| 12. | What do you evaluate here, for example? The way they connect the concepts or the way they explain? What is important in this case for you?   |       |
| 13. | Here you mention 'peer feedback'. Can you explain a bit more about this? Is it carried out within the peer group? Is this written feedback in English? Are there any criteria? What kinds of comments do | Ref 7 |
| 14. | Here you mention 'feedback on form'. What does this refer to? What is the form in this case? Does it refer to the writing?   | Rec 8 |
| 15. | You mentioned that you provide your students with detailed instructions on how to write an essay, and what to include in a paragraph. Are they all expected to follow the same format?                   |       |
| 16. | What about the instructions for the feedback? Do you provide your students with such instructions before they start writing?   |       |
| 17. | Does peer feedback refer to the cross-disciplinary project? Is it connected to the oral presentation in any way?   |       |

## Appendix D. Oral Presentation Rubric

English translation of language-related sections of the rubric used to assess student oral presentations in the cross-disciplinary course 'Processes and Educational Contexts' (original text in Catalan)

CONSTRUCT	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTOR OF LOW-LEVEL PERFORMANCE	DESCRIPTOR OF DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE	DESCRIPTOR OF EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE
Vocabulary (1 POINT)	Vocabulary, sentence structures, and grammar.	The vocabulary of the presentation is not sufficiently suitable for the topic. The content of the presentation is occasionally grammatically correct.	The vocabulary of the presentation is suitable for the topic. Sentence structures are occasionally correct. The content of the presentation is mostly grammatically correct.	The vocabulary of the presentation is appropriate for the topic. Different structures are used within the sentences. The grammar used during the presentation is correct.
COMMUNICATIVE CAPACITY  Critical ability to generate interest and debate  (2 POINTS)	Ability to engage the audience.          Skill in answering questions from the audience	There is some visual connection. Minimal techniques are used to include the audience, and they are not sufficiently effective.      Answers are not provided for all questions. Some are answered with difficulty. There is little knowledge about the topics of the presentation.	An interesting approach to the topic is made. Presenters use appropriate visual techniques, examples, anecdotes, and relevant ideas to capture the audience's attention.      Most questions are answered. The answers show good knowledge of the topic. Language is generally correct.	Presenters adapt their presentation to the reactions of the audience, There is an interesting approach to the topic. Presenters use appropriate visual techniques, examples, anecdotes, humour, and relevant ideas to capture the audience's attention.      Questions are answered with little difficulty. Very good knowledge of the subject is demonstrated. Language is correct and fluent.