6 The use of English in linguistics classes

When and how do we do it?

Miao-Hsia Chang and Li-Hsin Ning¹

Introduction

Recently, there has been a rapid increase in programs encouraging the use of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education (HE) in non-anglophone countries (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Galloway et al., 2017; Kuteeva & Airey, 2014; Macaro et al., 2018). Described as a “pandemic” (Chapple, 2015, p. 1), EMI reflects the government’s urge to boost technological development and globalization of the economy, as well as to promote “educational internationalization.” Almost inescapable from this trend, universities in non-anglophone countries are offering more and more EMI programs to attract international students and to attain higher university ranking (Jensen & Johannesson, 1995; Kim, 2017; Kirkpatrick & Bui, 2016; Kuteeva & Airey, 2014; Macaro et al., 2018; Manakul, 2007).

Despite the global drive to implement EMI programs in universities, concern has been raised among stakeholders about their negative effects, such as the threat they pose to local languages (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012, p. 431; Chang, 2018; Galloway et al., 2017, p. 6; Her, 2018b; Lai, 2018; Li, 2018; Yeh, 2018); the impact they have on the political, socio-linguistic, and economic stability and development of the country (Manh, 2012, p. 97); the longer time needed for instructors to prepare course content; and above all, the oversimplification of input to accommodate student language proficiency, especially of specialized disciplinary knowledge. Accordingly, the challenges and problems that students face include language issues such as difficulties in understanding the instructor’s lecture, lack of ability to express themselves or ask questions, and the need to switch between their first language (L1) and the second language (L2). This can result in students being resistant to participation in EMI and a possible increase in the dropout rate (Airey, 2011; Chang, 2010; Chern & Lo, 2017; Hou et al., 2013; Galloway et al., 2017, pp. 6–7; Jensen & Johannesson, 1995; Kim, 2017; Manakul, 2007; Wu, 2006; Yeh, 2013). Especially noteworthy among these problems is a lack of ability among students to “express oneself with nuance and precision,” referred to as “domain loss and capacity attrition” by Kuteeva and Airey (2014, p. 536). In spite of the increasing studies questioning the adequacy of a unilateral

implementation of EMI across disciplines (Bernstein, 1999; Kuteeva & Airey, 2014; Lindblom-Ylänne et al., 2006), little is known about the effect of EMI in HE in Taiwan (Chung & Lo, 2016, 2017; Huang, 2018; Yeh, 2013). One of the disciplines where EMI is widely used in this context is the discipline of linguistics. The present study aims to explore the implementation of EMI in linguistics programs in universities in Taiwan. Before we present the research questions, a brief description of the linguistics discipline in Taiwan is provided in the following section.

Linguistics is a rigid scientific study examining the use of language with well-defined data and methodology. It views language as a socialized behavior with “regularity of configuration and tendency... as real as the regularity of physical processes in a mechanical world” (Sapir, 1929, pp. 213–214). Core fields of linguistics include syntax, phonetics, phonology, morphology, and semantics. Related to these core fields are sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, computational linguistics, language acquisition, and discourse studies. Linguistics can therefore be regarded as a scientific study because the argument is based on empirical evidence of data or experimental results. It also belongs to the humanities as it explores language as a kind of human behavior. In terms of Neumann et al. (2002) classification of knowledge-making practices: pure soft, applied soft, applied hard, and pure hard, we can thus place linguistics in the category of “applied soft” while sometimes closer to applied hard when computational or mathematical knowledge is involved, as schematically represented in Figure 6.1 below (the author’s own figure).² With these epistemological features, potential tensions may arise due to the variability of knowledge involving linguistics.

In universities in Taiwan, linguistics is mainly rooted in departments of local or foreign languages, in particular, those of English (language) studies, where linguistics has regularly been a required subject and where English is regularly employed as the instruction language. As linguistics is closely related to implementation of EMI inasmuch as it commonly involves cross-domain knowledge, in this study, we take an insider’s view by investigating EMI in linguistics programs in Taiwan. The following research questions are addressed:

- How is EMI implemented in linguistics courses embedded in Departments of English in universities in Taiwan?
- What attitudes do the professors and students from linguistics programs take toward EMI?

Figure 6.1 Linguistics and disciplinary categories (based on Neumann et al., 2002).

- Is EMI beneficial to the students? If yes, what have students learned in the EMI courses? If not, why?

The organization of this study is as follows. First of all, we provide an overview of English education in Taiwan. Then we review EMI in the disciplines of hard sciences and soft sciences. We report on the questionnaire results of linguistics professors and present the results of interviews with linguistics MA students. Finally, we discuss the findings and conclude this study.

English education in Taiwan

In common with the global trend of placing English education at the forefront of the globalization and modernization drive, since the early 1990s, the government of Taiwan has been making efforts to enhance the English ability of its people. In 2001, after the new government took power, English, which had long been a required subject in the high school curriculum, became a mandatory subject in elementary schools.³

In recent years, as different Asian countries have been more actively engaged in the implementation of large-scale EMI, the Taiwanese Government has been considering adopting English as a second official language (ESOL). In response to a piece of headline news from a leading newspaper in Taiwan (Lin, 2017) that Taiwanese students have fallen behind its neighboring countries in terms of TOEIC scores and a legislator's interrogation at the Legislative Yuan regarding local people's poor English proficiency, two days later, on October 14, 2017, the Ministry of Education (MOE) established the "English Promotion Committee" to evaluate the viability of adopting ESOL. A recent national survey conducted by the Committee, however, showed that there has actually been a gradual increase in local people's English proficiency between 2002 and 2012.⁴ Given the results, a press release was issued by the MOE (Central News Agency, 2018), stating the government's current position on national English education:

- 1 No timeline is set for ESOL.
- 2 To facilitate effective English learning, a more supportive environment must be provided.
- 3 Accordingly, the government will partially relax the ban on bilingual education allowing for the gradual inclusion of bilingual classes and enhancing teaching training programs.

While the government has been engaged in a nationwide English promotion campaign, research has demonstrated both the positive and negative effects of EMI on learning. At the national level, linguists have voiced their grave concern over the impact of ESOL on the survival of the vernaculars (Taiwanese Southern Min, Hakka) (Tiun, 2013) and of the minority languages (Chang, 2018; Her, 2018a; Lai, 2018; Li, 2018; Yeh, 2018). The positive effect mainly involves improvement in language skills (Chang, 2010; Chern &

Lo, 2017) or exposure to global views or international culture (Wu, 2006). The disadvantages, on the other hand, include difficulties in understanding content knowledge, difficulties in expressing oneself in English (Wu, 2006), unchallenging input (Huang, 2018), and lack of motivation in learning (Wu, 2006; Yeh, 2013). Due to the controversy involving EMI in the teaching and learning of specialized knowledge, in the following section, we provide a more detailed review of EMI in different disciplines.

EMI in different disciplines

In his analysis of the dynamics of social class, Bernstein (1964) distinguishes two types of language codes that characterize different social classes: restricted codes and elaborated codes. Restricted codes are structurally more predictable, involving everyday knowledge, and are typical of the language of the working class. Elaborated codes are structurally less predictable, require more planning, and have the main purpose of delivering “relatively explicit meaning” (p. 65). According to Bernstein (1999), the modalities of the elaborated codes are what underlie the principles of pedagogic transmission and acquisition in education. Since disciplinary knowledge focuses on transmission of specialist knowledge, elaborated codes are the main type of language used in educational settings.

A survey by Bolton and Kuteeva (2012) also called for distinction among disciplines in EMI practice. Involving 668 staff members and 4,524 students across different disciplines in Swedish universities, the study showed that there was a higher proportion of English at the graduate than the undergraduate levels. As for disciplinary difference, English is used more frequently in sciences than humanities. The use of English poses greater challenges for humanities such as literature. These findings are consistent with Kang and Park (2004), whose study found that professors were opposed to EMI expansion in liberal arts classes although they were more positive to EMI in other areas. A further study by Kuteeva and Airey (2014), which focused on the parallel language policy by the Swedish government⁵, demonstrated similar results. The social sciences, however, presented a more diverse picture. Some disciplines are closer to the natural sciences “both in the way they construct knowledge and perceive the role that language plays in the process” while others are closer to humanities. For example, in sociology, where language is used to describe “social reality,” it is difficult for one to use English to express ideas in Ph.D. theses with “depth and analytical precision” unless the authors are very competent in English (p. 544). The findings agree with an earlier study on EMI in Finland and the UK (Lindblom-Ylänne et al., 2006).

Studies in non-anglophone countries in Asia have also called for the need to address disciplinary variation in EMI. In Byun et al. (2011) survey of five university professors and 20 students in Korean universities, the level of students’ satisfaction score about the effect of EMI from 2006 to 2009 ranked from Business School to College of Engineering, College of Nursing, and College of Science

in descending order. The dissatisfaction was related to a number of factors. For example, many students found the English lectures hard to follow because of their poor English language abilities. Furthermore, both the students and professors revealed that the professors' limited English proficiency resulted in simplification of the input of knowledge. In fact, both the students and professors questioned the adequacy of compulsory EMI or implicitly resisted it. In this light, Kim et al. (2018) supported the use of local languages to teach humanities, through which students can not only achieve greater subject literacy, but can also become more skillful communicators in "intercultural encounters," such as in telling jokes or in giving summaries. In short, all these studies conclude with the suggestion that the administrators have proper preparation and enough human and non-human resources before a compulsory EMI policy is enforced.

Lei and Hu (2014) investigated the English-related affect and perceptions of EMI programs in Business Administration at a university in China. The results indicated that EMI does not produce a positive effect on students' proficiency or on their language learning and use because of both the students' and the instructors' poor language ability. The students' prior English proficiency, however, is positively correlated with their degree of satisfaction while negatively correlated with their level of anxiety when using English inside and outside the classroom. The finding again suggests that proficiency is an important factor for success in EMI.

Research in the Taiwanese context has been concerned with EMI practiced in the disciplines of management, engineering, and business. Chung and Lo (2016, 2017) discussed the curriculum development of EMI in the Department of Transportation Management. While students in this department are more motivated to learn English because of the job market, the findings propose an adaptive approach allowing for code-switching in class (see also Yeh, 2013), consideration of students' proficiency, respect for teachers' choice of language in the classroom in teaching content courses, and professional development of EMI teachers. A similar concern was raised in Chang's (2010) survey on students' attitude toward EMI across the disciplines of engineering and management. It was suggested that students' and instructors' English proficiency be taken into careful consideration in EMI practice.

In applied hard sciences, Hsieh (2007) conducted interviews with nine professors and made a comparison of an EMI course (18 students) and a Chinese-medium-instruction (CMI) course (47 students), both in Engineering Graphics. The instructors revealed that students were less responsive in EMI courses so that they needed to switch to Chinese or slow down their lecture. In addition, the students' proficiency affected the efficacy of the instruction. Some of the participants also questioned the necessity of EMI in content courses for professional knowledge, suggesting that English should be learned in postgraduate years since the purpose of instruction was to teach professional knowledge. As for the comparison between the CMI and the EMI courses, EMI was *not* found to be a more conducive approach. Instead, it may even have brought about negative effects with regard to professional

development. As for the positive effects of EMI, both the students *and* the professors benefited from the EMI courses in terms of their language ability. For students, the training with PowerPoint presentations better prepared them for international conferences. The instructors also felt that their English had improved through the instruction. However, it should be noted that that students' positive response may be attributed to their past learning experience, having taken more EMI courses before, and their motivation for learning in English. Besides, the EMI class had a much smaller number of students. Whether the results are conclusive is yet to be further explored.

Huang (2018) investigated the learning experiences of four students from the College of Commerce in a university in Taiwan. As recalled by these students, the inclusion of international students forced the instructors to simplify the input, which was thus non-challenging to local students and greatly reduced their learning motivation. Concerning the style of teaching, though not directly related to whether the course was in EMI or CMI, a dialogic mode which involves interaction between the instructor and the students and illustration with examples which elucidate abstract concepts are preferred by the students than a monologic one. In sum, the author called for "learner agency" and further study on "potential learner resistance in EMI practices" (p. 435).

The review above raises a number of issues that are worth the attention of EMI researchers and stakeholders. First, and most important, disciplinary knowledge needs to be addressed in EMI practice. A second noteworthy point is that the appropriateness of EMI practice differs across disciplines in different language areas. Third, as noted above, the instructors' English proficiency, irrespective of discipline, is an important factor for the input to be comprehensible. Since content knowledge learning is the main purpose of disciplinary knowledge instruction, unless the class is composed mainly of international students, whether it is necessary to force professors without sufficient English proficiency to practice EMI remains a contentious question. Equally important is the students' English proficiency, which is in proportion with the satisfactory degree of EMI. While the above points operate under the assumption that EMI should take priority over CMI in teaching disciplinary knowledge, in this paper, we argue that complete input of specialized knowledge by instructors should take precedence over the learning of language or globalization, especially given the finding that EMI is mainly beneficial to language development rather than to complete learning of disciplinary knowledge.

In the following section, we present the results of our survey of EMI in linguistics. The results of questionnaires to the linguistics professors surveyed are presented and discussed. They are then compared with the students' responses in the later section.

Questionnaire for linguistics professors

An off-line questionnaire containing both close-ended and open-ended questions was designed to investigate how EMI has been implemented in

linguistics courses from the viewpoint of linguistics professors (see Appendix 6A). Sixteen professors from four national universities in Northern Taiwan participated in this study. The professors are experienced instructors of both general English and linguistics courses. They are all competent English speakers and writers. Most of them received their PhD in an English-speaking country and their major publications were written in English.

The survey aimed to address the following issues: (1) What language(s) is used in class; (2) whether CMI or EMI or mixed language is the appropriate method; (3) what the optimal grade level is for a given instruction language; (4) when the appropriate circumstance is for a given instruction language; (5) how language choice is related to field knowledge; and (6) instructors' views on EMI. Specifically, in the first part of the questionnaire, we inquired about the courses the professors taught, the proportion of time allotted to CMI and EMI, and the optimal timing for using EMI in each individual course (see the background information section in Appendix 6A). In the second part, we asked about the precise circumstances (i.e., lecture, comment, discussion, presentation, or exam) in which EMI would be used. In the third part, the questionnaire asked the professors to self-evaluate the effects of using EMI. They had to rate their level of agreement with the assertion that using EMI increased students' professional knowledge and promoted students' English ability. Finally, an open-ended question was provided for the professors to share their opinions on EMI.

The appropriate proportion of time for EMI in linguistic courses

The linguistics teachers used EMI slightly more in their undergraduate courses (64.18%) than in their graduate courses (62.13%). However, three of the sixteen teachers pointed out that they should decrease the amount of time that English is used in the linguistics courses, particularly for undergraduate students (cf. Kim, 2017). They argued that the linguistic content is challenging for most of the undergraduate students, because they had never learned linguistics as a subject in high schools. The knowledge in this field is new and abstract. Data analysis requires training in logical thinking. Therefore, Chinese would be a better medium of instruction. The following response reflects the opinion of a professor teaching undergraduate linguistics:⁶

(1) I feel that the more abstract or theoretical the discipline is, the less appropriate EMI is. Take Introduction to Linguistics and Formal Semantics. The former contains concrete concepts and examples, making it easier to learn, whereas the latter contains more abstract terms and logic symbols. I believe that using mother tongue in learning logical inference would be beneficial... If using mother tongue can help students to learn abstract or complicated concepts and answer students' questions, then I don't think we have to insist on EMI.

(Professor #3)

As for the optimal timing for EMI to be implemented, the linguistics teachers claimed that juniors or above (ideally the graduate level) would be the better time. This suggests that EMI might not be of great help to beginners in a field when developing content knowledge is more important than improving English listening skill. As will be shown in the following section, the difficulty level of the course content is a factor for students to determine what the preferred instruction language is.

Under what circumstances was EMI used?

The circumstances where EMI has been used included three parts: *lecture*, *discussion*, and *students' performance*. First of all, during the *lecture*, while English is used in elaborating basic concepts, discussing English examples, and addressing linguistics jargon, Chinese is the primary instruction language in explaining complex or new concepts, discussing Chinese examples, and demonstrating linguistic analysis. As mentioned in two teachers' responses in (2–3) below, using EMI may not be effective in helping students acquire professional knowledge. Moreover, the teachers often had to translate the content into Chinese, leading to schedule delay (cf. Hsieh, 2007). Without considering students' level of understanding, using EMI in class could even deteriorate learning performance.

(2) I think how much knowledge students can absorb has to do with whether they understand the lecture. In our graduate program, since not all the students are English majors, using EMI in class is not effective. Teachers typically have to use Chinese to explain complicated content. This can lead to schedule delay and does not help students at all.

(Professor #6)

However, there were professors who maintained that language is just a medium. What is more important, reflected one teacher in their response (3) below, is the teaching style, that is, how to simplify difficult content in a way that students can easily understand.

(3) I think language is just a medium. Whether students can acquire knowledge has nothing to do with instruction language but with how teachers can elaborate the knowledge in a clear way. I have seen teachers teaching in Chinese; however, the students still cannot catch the idea.

(Professor #7)

During the in-class *discussion*, English is typically used when the issues are related to the textbook content. Nonetheless, Chinese serves as the main instruction medium when local issues, mathematical reasoning, or inferential processes are involved. As will also be demonstrated in the following section,

the teachers' responses (4–5) below agree with the students' report about their preferred language in different courses.

As for students' *performance*, final projects are required to be presented orally in English along with English slides or handouts. Students are encouraged to answer questions in English, but are allowed to use Chinese when necessary. As for the written papers and exams, English is mandatory. In other words, most of the linguistics teachers agree that students' presentations (either written or oral) should be presented in English, as English proficiency is also a requirement in the department:

(4) Because linguistics is placed in the Department of English, students have to fulfill the requirement of English proficiency. Therefore, students have to use English to present and write their theses. As for instruction language, because the goal is to help students acquire linguistics knowledge and complex concepts, teachers may consider using Chinese. As for assignments and oral presentations, English is required for the sake of language training.

(Professor #5)

(5) Additionally, as to whether final projects should be written in English, my opinion is it depends on course objectives. The courses offered in the Department of English require students to acquire English writing and academic abilities. However, for non-English majors, I would let them choose to present and write presentations in either Chinese or English.

(Professor #4)

In the questionnaire, we particularly asked the teachers to rate whether they agreed that using EMI in linguistics courses would help students increase their linguistics knowledge or improve their English ability. Most of the linguistics teachers held a moderate opinion on whether EMI would be valuable for obtaining professional knowledge (rating score: 2.938 on a 5-point scale, where 1 means strongly disagree and 5 means strongly agree). Even if these professors were competent English speakers, in general, they tended to have reservations about the positive correlation between EMI and learning of content knowledge. On the other hand, most of them agreed that using EMI could boost students' English ability (rating score: 3.813 on a 5-point scale where 1 means strongly disagree and 5 means strongly agree). When English is used, students may pay attention not only to the core content but also to the language use. This may help them fulfill the language proficiency requirement for obtaining the degree.

The findings reported above reflect the linguistics instructors' view toward a moderate approach to EMI. That is, mandatorily implementing EMI without considering the essence of a subject can do harm to HE. English training is incorporated into English textbook readings, oral presentations,

exams, and written term projects, where students build up their subject knowledge and English ability simultaneously. Therefore, the lectures or in-class discussion in HE should aim at ensuring that the students have full understanding of the content instead of training the students to comprehend the instructor's English. The results give further credence to Engelbrecht and Wildsmith's (2010) view on the complementary use of the mother tongue and the target language for instruction of disciplinary knowledge.

So far, we have presented a quantitative and qualitative analysis of linguistics professors' opinions toward the use of EMI. In the next section, we discuss the results of interviews with linguistics majors to see whether students hold the same attitude toward EMI.

Interviews with linguistics MA students

Seven linguistics majors (three in their second year and four in their third year of the graduate program) participated in the interviews undertaken between May and July, 2018. Before these interviews, all the respondents were informed of the research purposes and agreed to be audio-recorded.

The following issues were addressed in the interviews: (1) the strengths and weaknesses of CMI and EMI in linguistics classes; (2) the appropriate time to use CMI and EMI in linguistics classes; (3) whether students have benefited from CMI or from EMI; and (4) whether students have improved their language skills or content knowledge if EMI is beneficial.

All the participants were English majors in college and had taken at least one introductory linguistics course in college using English textbooks. By the time of the interviews, they had taken eight to ten MA linguistics courses, about half of which were conducted in English. In addition, the students were required to pass the High-Intermediate level of the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT), a Taiwan-based standardized English test, before receiving their MA degree. According to the GEPT rubrics (Appendix 6C), these students were further classified into three proficiency levels (see Table 6.1 below).⁷

All the interviews were conducted in Chinese and recorded. On average, each interview lasted between 20 and 40 minutes. The following seven open-ended questions were asked in the interviews given the research objectives listed above.

Table 6.1 The participants' English proficiency levels according to GEPT rubrics

<i>English Proficiency Level</i>	<i>Students</i>
Advanced	S1, S6, S7
High-Intermediate	S3, S4
Intermediate	S2, S5

- When should English be used in the linguistics courses?
- If you think Chinese should be used in the linguistics courses, when should it be used?
- What content knowledge do you benefit from in the English instruction?
- Did you improve your English skills through the EMI courses? If yes, what are they? If not, why?
- What other things did you learn from the EMI courses?
- What are the disadvantages of using English for instruction?
- What are the disadvantages of using Chinese for instruction?

The interviews were then fully transcribed for a thorough qualitative analysis. In the following, we present the students' responses addressing the above questions. The discussion focuses on two central issues: (1) the appropriate language to be used to achieve optimal results in linguistics instruction; and (2) if students are positive about EMI, what other knowledge they have learned from such instruction?

When should English be used?

Most respondents agreed that English is the preferred medium when the learning materials are in English. Since the arguments in the textbooks are in English, using Chinese may cause comprehension breakdown for some advanced students (e.g., response 6). In particular, at the lexical level, when technical terms and related concepts are mentioned, English is preferred, even to lower-level students such as (7) below:

(6) We initially thought that using Chinese in the lecture would facilitate our understanding, particularly for the subjects we did not have much background knowledge about. However, this was not the case. The fact is that you had to do the complex translation between Chinese and English because the teacher lectured in Chinese but you read the teaching materials written in English. This in fact made the learning less efficient...
(S1, Advanced)

(7) Sometimes translating English technical terms into Chinese makes them difficult to understand. If you read the English text, you can understand it without difficulty. I had one course presentation where [the technical terms] were uttered in English but all other content was reported in Chinese. I felt that I couldn't express the ideas clearly.
(S2, Intermediate)

One student related the use of English to later practice in writing:

(8) He [the instructor] used English to provide some examples. This helped me with academic writing because I only had to paraphrase what he said.

If he had used Chinese, then I would have had to translate it myself. I would have had no idea whether the translation was correct. Anyway, it requires an additional step.

(S1, Advanced)

When should Chinese be used?

There were several situations when students thought Chinese should be used instead. First, when the course materials are in Chinese, Chinese should be used in instruction:

(9) I think a better way is to use Chinese both in the slides and in the presentation. The consistency should make the presentation smoother.

(S2, Intermediate)

In addition, most of the interviewees agreed that the proportion of Chinese used is dependent on the degree of students' familiarity with the linguistics knowledge involved. This is particularly true among less proficient students. The courses which require more Chinese instruction include Syntax, Phonology, Corpus/Computational Linguistics, Statistics, and Neurolinguistics. Overall, the students' attitude is congruent with the linguistics professors' report about the proportion of Chinese used. As stated above, these courses involve more knowledge related to the hard sciences (e.g., Phonology, Statistics, and Programming Languages) which have the characteristics of methodological rigor (e.g., Statistics), highly integrated and organized ideas (e.g., Phonology), a high degree of cumulateness of knowledge development (e.g., Corpus/Computational Linguistics), mathematical derivations or logical reasoning (e.g., Programming Languages), or strong theoretical basis for understanding (e.g., Phonology). Responses related to content where CMI is preferred include the following. Note in (10) that teachers would normally switch to Chinese when they found that the lecture was unintelligible to students:

(10) Like in Corpus Linguistics, the instructor lectured in English and the students spaced out. The instructor then translated it into Chinese, and the students got the idea. It was not a good idea to use too much English, because the students had no background knowledge about the subject.

(S6, Advanced)

(11) [This subject] put great emphasis on logical thinking. You learned how to exclude A or B [based on some criteria]. If this lecture was delivered in English, [I] don't think [the students] would have been able to understand it.

(S6, Advanced)

Third, when the instructor has limited English proficiency, the quality of the instruction may be greatly impaired (see also Byun et al., 2011; Lei &

Hu, 2014; cf. the review section of EMI in the disciplines of hard sciences and soft sciences). While such a problem does not exist in the focal university investigated, a student's recall of an EMI course taken at another school previously reveals the importance of instructors' English ability. In that course, the teacher's poor pronunciation and strange intonation had seriously affected the student's comprehension and disrupted the flow of the lecture:

(12) I was taking courses at KT, and some instructors lectured exclusively in English, too. To be honest, I was easily distracted [in those courses] because of the instructors' weird pronunciation. The intonation was a bit awkward, so I got distracted easily. [I felt that] I was wasting time trying to comprehend the teachers' English and I learned nothing from the lecture. So, I'm thinking that if we would like to implement EMI, the instructors' English will be a key concern. Otherwise, students might have no idea of what the teachers are talking about.

(S3, High-Intermediate)

Equally important is the students' English proficiency (Byun et al., 2011; Chang, 2010; Chung & Lo, 2016; Hsieh, 2007). At least two interviewees, who were less proficient and less confident students, revealed that when the professor was teaching a difficult concept or asking them questions, they would not raise hands to clarify an unclear point or they would shun participation in discussions because they were afraid of making mistakes when speaking English (cf. Martirosyan et al., 2015, on the relation between proficiency and academic performance). The following response illustrates the influence of students' proficiency and confidence on class performance:

(13) As an English-major, communicating in English is the basic ability. There is no problem for me to use English in general. However, the graduate courses are tough. The English papers are difficult to understand. Many courses are lectured in English. Sometimes I don't know whether I should blame myself for not having good English to understand the content or whether the papers are way too difficult. If I have to ask the questions in English, I'm afraid I would embarrass myself. It may sound like I can't keep up because my English is too bad. On the other hand, I don't know what questions to ask because I'm completely lost in the reading. Without some basic understanding of the content, I can't make a precise question that the instructor would be able to understand. I can't judge whether it is a good question. I have no confidence. So, I typically discuss with my classmates after class.

(S4, High-Intermediate)

From the interview responses discussed so far, it can be seen that in terms of learning of professional knowledge, even English majors sometimes find it difficult to understand content knowledge in a whole-English environment.

However, with the materials written in English and past training of linguistics in English, pure Chinese may not be the best policy either. A tactful switch between English and Chinese according to the difficulty level of the subject knowledge may be the best policy.

Do students improve their English skills through the EMI courses?

Almost all the interviewees indicated that they had improved their English listening, speaking, reading, or writing skills (Chang, 2010; Chern & Lo, 2017; Wu, 2006, reviewed by Chern & Lo, 2017, p. 115). In particular, by imitating the instructor's English such as correct pronunciation of linguistic terms, transition words used to mark different topics or flow of discourse, expressions used to paraphrase or explain a complex concept, or the logical ways of presenting ideas, the students revealed that they had honed their English-speaking skills. The constant exposure to English also enhanced their listening comprehension. Furthermore, through extensive reading in English, their reading speed was also increased. In terms of writing, the instructional language provided important input for students to use more precise language. The following responses (14–16) illustrate the complex cognitive activities involved in the learning:

(14) So, when I was explaining the articulatory features of a sound, I based my interpretation on my teacher's sentence. This made it clear.
(S6, Advanced)

(15) I feel that I can learn some presentation skills when listening to others' presentations. For example, you may not be familiar with the form language for presentations such as how to make a smooth transition, but you can learn it from your peers.
(S1, Advanced)

(16) At the beginning of the first year of my MA, I found that the content was difficult. I fell behind and got lost sometimes. After roughly one or two months, I finally got on track. EMI facilitated both reading and speaking. I knew how to connect the ideas from different chapters. I learned how to explain an idea in English by imitating the instructors' language. There were many Q&A interactions during the lectures. I think this helped a lot.
(S3, High-Intermediate)

A major learning point emerging from switching into English results from difference between English and Chinese rhetorical patterns, where the former places more emphasis on correct logical flow. If Chinese is used, the students do not have difficulty understanding the content even if there is a lack of logical relations among ideas. By contrast, when English is used, a much

greater cognitive demand is imposed on the students at transitions between ideas because it is a non-native language.

What other knowledge did students learn from EMI?

In addition to subject knowledge, the interviewees also reported on additional knowledge they learned from the EMI courses. First, at least two students explicitly stated that the reading and presentation of English materials enabled them to broaden their knowledge in different domains of linguistics. For example, in a course on functional linguistics, one interviewed student was assigned a paper related to psycholinguistics for oral presentation; in order to give a successful report, he had to read the assigned paper thoroughly and carefully, which expanded his scope of interest beyond functional linguistics and facilitated follow-up reading activities on similar topics. If the assigned papers had been in Chinese, the pool of research available would have been much smaller and therefore reduced the possibility for students to explore interdisciplinary studies.

Similarly, the exploration of different subfields of linguistics by reading diverse English research articles also allows students to make more in-depth analyses for their research, that is, analyzing the speech act of comforting by observing elicited sentences in a course on language acquisition and comparing them to authentic data in a course on interactional linguistics. Vocabulary from other fields of study can also be learned from reading assignments. The benefit of EMI in enhancing students' knowledge of other disciplines or of different cultures can be illustrated by the following example:

- (17) I was doing research on debating at that time. I learned many economics terms which are less common in our daily English usage. When I was writing the research paper, the English readings became helpful because I knew what economics jargon I should use in my research paper.
(S5, Intermediate)

The professors' and the students' responses discussed above demonstrate both commonalities and differences. Regarding English learning, both groups agree that EMI is beneficial to students in boosting their language abilities (Hsieh, 2007). This may explain why the students generally take a favorable attitude toward EMI as all students were informed that they needed to pass a standardized English test before graduation. A second reason is that most of the interviewees were aware that the teachers would always switch to Chinese to explain complex ideas whenever necessary. The anxiety about not being able to comprehend a given idea was thus greatly reduced. As for transmission of linguistics knowledge, the two groups differed in their attitude. To the students, as long as certain knowledge is learned, the amount and degree of complexity of ideas may not be their central concern. To the linguistics professors, however, comprehensible input of professional knowledge

is the goal of the instruction. Using English to teach content that requires abstract, logical reasoning, especially that involves knowledge closer to the hard sciences, usually leads to schedule delay or simplification of input (Byun et al., 2011; Huang, 2018; Kim et al., 2018) because the teachers may need to repeat the ideas in different ways or in simpler language until the message is successfully conveyed. In light of the diverging views, the proportion of English and Chinese used should be adjusted according to students' proficiency levels so that language does not become a barrier in the development of disciplinary literacy.

Discussion and conclusion

In this study, we have reported on the pedagogical practice of EMI in linguistics courses by 16 linguistics professors from four national universities in northern Taiwan. A qualitative interview was also conducted with seven linguistics MA students in a Department of English at one of these universities. The major contributions of this work are as follows. First, we have shown that linguistics as a discipline of social sciences presents a diverse picture in terms of the applicability of EMI (Kuteeva & Airey, 2014), especially in subdomains related to complex thinking processes. Even from the perspectives of English majors and of their professors, a whole-English approach is an *implausible* goal if the course is to provide comprehensible, and hopefully, optimal input of linguistics knowledge, as the transmission of disciplinary knowledge requires more complex language codes, involving careful planning before explicit details are delivered. This observation is also compatible with Bernstein's (1964, 1999) argument on elaborated codes, which characterize instructions in educational settings (see also the review section of EMI in the disciplines of hard sciences and soft sciences).

Second, we have identified a number of crucial factors that may determine the efficacy of EMI. These include:

- instructors' English proficiency, including pronunciation;
- students' English proficiency;
- complexity and nature of course content;
- students' negative affect; and
- students' past EMI experience.

As reported in the literature reviewed (Byun et al., 2011; Lei & Hu, 2014), lack of pronunciation accuracy, the most basic skill of an English instructor, was lamented as a detrimental factor that led to instructional failure. The same problem may hold true for the instructor's mastery of appropriate vocabulary, grammatical structures, and logical coherence among ideas. If even the basic language requirements are not met, it is called into serious question whether teaching professional knowledge can be effective or not. Although support programs (cf. Kim, 2017) to promote academic teaching excellence

have been the recent focus of administrators in charge of the implementation of EMI, whether these programs target the students' needs requires extensive research.⁸ In view of the importance of instructors' oral proficiency, it is suggested that rigorous screening of EMI instructors be conducted to select appropriate instructors with adequate English abilities.

In addition to instructors' English proficiency, the students' proficiency level is highly correlated with the degree of difficulty of a given subject (see also Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Byun et al., 2011; Chern & Lo, 2017; J. Kim et al., 2018; Mahboob, 2014; Yeh, 2013, to name just a few). For higher achievers, input of more difficult subject knowledge in English is more acceptable than those with lower proficiency. This tendency is consonant with the instructors' responses in the questionnaires, which suggest that English is more suitable for juniors and above (see the result section of the questionnaire for linguistics professors).

The third factor concerns the scope of knowledge involved in the linguistics courses. Whereas functionally oriented linguistics allows for more use of English, Chinese is preferred in theoretical linguistics courses such as Syntax and Phonology, which require extensive professional training to carry out the derivations of language structures. Meanwhile, the increasing importance of information technology and computer-literacy skills in higher education (see Chang & Wu, 2017) has added elements of hard sciences to linguistics and thus greatly increased the diversity of knowledge in the discipline of linguistics. As shown in the questionnaires and interviews, such subjects present greater challenges to the students, especially to those with lower proficiency.

How to switch to the right language in classroom instruction, therefore, is an important consideration for EMI teachers. It should be cautioned, however, that constant and repetitive explanation of the same content in two languages may be a waste of time, reducing the amount of input. If, instead, Chinese is used throughout (except for technical terms), the instructor may be able to provide significantly more in-depth input of the same linguistics content. In such cases, the teachers' priority should be the imparting of content knowledge.

Related also to the type of knowledge involved is the language of the professional knowledge that is stored in the learners' mental lexicon. As shown in the interview, students found it easier to process the English lecture if related content was stored in English due to their previous learning experience. For the English majors interviewed in the study, their introductory linguistics knowledge was mainly acquired from English textbooks. Therefore, they had less difficulty processing related concepts. As for mathematical calculation and other hard sciences knowledge, since they were mainly acquired in Chinese in high school and college, Chinese instruction was more acceptable to them.

A fourth factor, which is less frequently noted in the EMI literature, is the difference in students' willingness to participate in classroom interaction. As demonstrated by response (13, S4), students with limited competence in English may avoid participation in class discussion in Q&A series or in

expressing their opinions because they are afraid to make mistakes when speaking English. It is therefore the instructor's responsibility to address this factor by choosing appropriate codes in content knowledge teaching so that different students' needs are satisfied.

A last factor that can influence the effect of learning is students' previous exposure to EMI courses. If the students are immersed in an EMI environment, they need less time to adapt to the class. If not, it may take them at least one to two months to adapt to the EMI context. It follows that in a course teaching specialized knowledge, this is a great waste of time. To less proficient speakers, the processing load entailed in English instruction is even greater. Instructors therefore need to tailor their teaching to suit the different needs of the students.

The above findings and discussion support the contention put forth by previous studies that a successful implementation of EMI involves a moderated approach with a tactful switching between Chinese and English (Butzkamm, 1998; Chung & Lo, 2017; Kim et al., 2018; Tam, 2012). If, however, a radical approach is taken, implementing EMI with the sole aim of practicing bilingual education, one wonders whether the students' language proficiency might be "diluted" since students would end up being good at neither English nor their mother tongue (Engelbrecht & Wildsmith, 2010, p. 125). Following this line of thought, we argue that the practice of EMI cannot be equated with acquisition of language skills. Instead, the development of academic literacy (Lea & Street, 2006) is discipline-specific and it involves a balance between Chinese and English so that disciplinary knowledge can be fully acquired (see also Kuteeva and Airey, 2014).

As a conclusion, we would like to cite the following response by a linguistics professor, which summarizes the core principle of instruction of disciplinary knowledge:

(18) Although students' English ability is important, in higher education, development of professional knowledge and ability is the crucial part [of the education]. If we only pursue the whole-English approach but overlook students' responses and proficiency, this will not achieve the goal of promoting language and professional development and will end up with students learning neither language nor professional knowledge.

(Professor #1)

This study situates linguistics teaching in a Department of English. It is hoped that these findings may provide a significant reference for stakeholders and policy makers in the implementation of EMI.

Notes

- 1 The corresponding author of this chapter.
- 2 According to Neumann et al. (2002, p. 406), examples of "hard pure" sciences include physics and chemistry, "hard applied" sciences are typified by engineering

- subjects, “soft pure” knowledge involves qualitatively based knowledge such as history and anthropology, and “applied soft” includes education and management involving “enhancement of professional practice” with its aim “to yield protocols and procedures.”
- 3 <https://cirn.moe.edu.tw/Upload/file/36/67053.pdf>
 - 4 <https://news.ltn.com.tw/news/life/breakingnews/2470106>
 - 5 Parallel language use is practiced in the Nordic community (Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, and Finnish) (Hultgren, 2016, p. 158). According to the Declaration on Nordic Language Policy by the Nordic Council (quoted by Hultgren, 2016, p. 158; for the original document, see Gunnarsdóttir et al., 2007, pp. 93–95), “[t]he parallel use of language refers to the concurrent use of several languages within one or more areas. None of the languages abolishes or replaces the other; they are used in parallel.”
 - 6 For the original/non-translated text in Mandarin, see Appendix 6B.
 - 7 See https://lttc.ntu.edu.tw/E_LTTC/E_GEPT.htm#AMenu1 [URL inactive] for a full description of the proficiency levels. The students’ levels were evaluated and determined by two linguistics professors according to the GEPT level descriptions. They were also the participants of our questionnaire survey, have been English language teachers for over ten years, are familiar with the GEPT rubrics, and were these interviewees’ instructors at the focal MA program. Therefore, they had opportunities to observe the students’ proficiency from their written assignments and oral presentations. According to the two professors, the level of writing skill of each student was congruent with that of their speaking skill.
 - 8 For example, various programs have been offered at one national university for teaching excellence: <https://ctld.ntnu.edu.tw/%E6%9C%80%E6%96%B0%E6%B6%88%E6%81%AF%E6%95%99%E5%B8%AB%E5%B0%88%E6%A5%AD%E7%99%BC%E5%B1%95/8888>

References

- Airey, J. (2011). The disciplinary literacy discussion matrix: A heuristic tool for initiating collaboration in higher education. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(3), 1–9. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/clil/airey.cfm>
- Bernstein, B. (1964). Elaborated and restricted codes: Their social origins and some consequences. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), Part 2, 55–69. doi:10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00030
- Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and horizontal discourse: An essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 157–173. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org/stable/1393106>
- Bolton, K., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). English as an academic language at a Swedish university: Parallel language use and the ‘threat’ of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33, 429–447. doi:10.1080/01434632.2012.670241
- Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1(2), 81–99.
- Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education*, 62(4), 431–449. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9397-4

- Central News Agency. (2018, June 26). 推英語成第二官方語言教部從教學評量先改變 [Promoting English as an official language: Ministry of Education says we should start from changing the evaluation method]. *United Daily News*. Retrieved from https://udn.com/news/story/6885/3220232?from=udn-hotnews_ch2
- Chang, C. H., & Wu, P. M. (2017, September 6). 明年試辦程式設計納入申請門檻一張表看有哪些科系 [The first attempt to include programming in admission screening starting from next year—A summary table of the departments that use this criterion]. *United Daily News*. Retrieved from <https://udn.com/news/story/6925/2684896>
- Chang, M.-H. (2018). *Reflection on English as a second official language: Feasibility, adequacy and its threat to the local languages*. Paper presented at the Forum among Linguists: Reflections on English as a Second Official Language, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.
- Chang, Y.-Y. (2010). English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reactions from Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Taiwan International ESP Journal*, 2(1), 53–82. doi:10.6706/tiespj.2010.2.1.3
- Chapple, J. (2015). Teaching in English is not necessarily the teaching of English. *International Education Studies*, 8, 1–13.
- Chern, C.-L., & Lo, M.-L. (2017). Instructional activities that motivate learners in tourism program. In W. Tsou & S.-M. Kao (Eds.), *English as a medium of instruction in higher education* (pp. 115–128). Singapore: Springer.
- Chung, C.-L., & Lo, M.-L. (2016). Prospect and case study of English-medium instruction of transportation courses in Taiwanese universities. *English Teaching & Learning*, 40(3), 87–121. doi:10.6330/ETL.2016.40.3.04
- Chung, C.-L., & Lo, M.-L. (2017). Investigation of English-medium instruction indicators and chronic teaching evaluation on English transportation courses. *Journal of the Chinese Institute of Transportation*, 29(3), 233–254.
- Engelbrecht, C., & Wildsmith, R. (2010). Exploring multilingualism in a problem-based learning setting: Implications for classroom and clinical practice in the nursing discipline. *Alternation*, 17(1), 108–137.
- Galloway, N., Kriukow, J., & Numajiri, T. (2017). *Internationalisation, higher education and the growing demand for English: An investigation into the English medium of instruction (EMI) movement in China and Japan*. Retrieved from https://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/attachments/h035_eltra_internationalisation_he_and_the_growing_demand_for_english_a4_final_web.pdf
- Gunnarsdóttir, Þ. K., Djupedal, Ø., Haarder, B., Pagrotsky, L., Kalliomäki, A., Jakobsen, D., & Lakjuni, J., Gunell, C. (2007). *Deklaration om nordisk språkpolitik* [Declaration on a Nordic language policy]. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden.org:diva-607>
- Her, O.-S. (2018a). *The true issue of “first official language” in the disguise of English as a second language*. Paper presented at the Forum among Linguists: Reflections on English as a second official language, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.
- Her, O.-S. (2018b). 笨蛋，台灣有第一官方語嗎? [Does Taiwan have the first official language?]. *Opinion@CommonWealth*. Retrieved from <https://opinion.cw.com.tw/blog/profile/351/article/6632>
- Hou, A. Y. C., Morse, R., Chiang, C.-L., & Chen, H.-J. (2013). Challenges to quality of English medium instruction degree programs in Taiwanese universities and the role of local accreditors: A perspective of non-English-speaking Asian country. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 14(3), 359–370. doi:10.1007/s12564-013-9267-8

- Hsieh, S.-H. (2007). *Effectiveness and strategies of English-medium education in engineering subjects*. Retrieved from http://ctld.ntu.edu.tw/rp/rp_01_01_96.php
- Huang, Y.-P. (2018). Learner resistance to English-medium instruction practices: A qualitative case study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(4), 435–449. doi:10.1080/13562517.2017.1421629
- Hultgren, A. K. (2016). Parallel language use. In A. Linn (Ed.), *Investigating English in Europe: Contexts and Agendas* (pp. 158–163). Berlin: Mouton.
- Jensen, H. P., & Johannesson, H. (1995). Engineering courses taught in English: An experience from Denmark. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 20(1), 19–23. doi:10.1080/0304379950200103
- Kang, S., & Park, H. (2004). Instructor beliefs and attitudes about English medium instruction: Report of questionnaire study. *Studies on Engineering Education*, 7(1), 87–96.
- Kim, E. G. (2017). English medium instruction in Korean higher education: Challenges and future directions. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy* (pp. 53–64). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Kim, J., Kim, E. G., & Kweon, S.-O. (2018). Challenges in implementing English-medium instruction: Perspectives of humanities and social sciences professors teaching engineering students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 51, 111–123. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2018.03.005
- Kirkpatrick, R., & Bui, T. T. N. (2016). Introduction: The challenges for English education policies in Asia. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 1–23). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Kuteeva, M., & Airey, J. (2014). Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: Reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 533–549. doi:10.1007/s10734-013-9660-6
- Lai, H.-L. (2018). *English as a second official language: Grasp all, lose all*. Paper presented at the Forum among Linguists: Reflections on English as a second official Language, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (2006). The “academic literacies” model: Theory and applications. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(4), 368–377. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org/stable/40071622>
- Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2014). Is English-medium instruction effective in improving Chinese undergraduate students’ English competence? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 99–126. doi:10.1515/iral-2014-0005
- Li, K.-H. (2018). *English as the official language? Are you kidding me?* Paper presented at the Forum among Linguists: Reflections on English as a second official Language, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.
- Lin, Z. C. (2017, October 11). 多益成績吊車尾台慘輸大陸南韓 [Students barely got by the TOEIC passing score. Taiwanese students got beaten by Chinese students and Korean students.]. *China Times*. Retrrieved from www.chinatimes.com/newspapers/20171011000369-260114?chdtv
- Lindblom-Ylänne, S., Trigwell, K., Nevgi, A., & Ashwin, P. (2006). How approaches to teaching are affected by discipline and teaching context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 285–298. doi:10.1080/03075070600680539
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76. doi:10.1017/S0261444817000350

- Mahboob, A. (2014). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education in Hong Kong. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 183–203. doi:10.1515/iral-2014-0008
- Manakul, W. (2007). Role of English in internationalization of higher education: The case of the graduate school of engineering. *Journal of Higher Education and Lifelong Learning*, 15, 155–162.
- Manh, L. D. (2012). English as a medium of instruction at tertiary education system in Vietnam. *The Journal of Asia TESL*, 9(2), 97–122.
- Martirosyan, N. M., Hwang, E., & Wanjohi, R. (2015). Impact of English proficiency on academic performance of international students. *Journal of International Students*, 5, 60–71.
- Neumann, R., Parry, S., & Becher, T. (2002). Teaching and learning in their disciplinary context: A conceptual analysis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(4), 405–417. doi:10.1080/0307507022000011525
- Sapir, E. (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. *Language*, 5(4), 207–214. doi:10.2307/409588
- Tam, A. C. F. (2012). Teachers' misconceptions and questionable practices when using Putonghua as the medium-of-instruction: A case study of Hong Kong. *Teachers and Teaching*, 18(6), 655–673. doi:10.1080/13540602.2012.746500
- Tiun, H.-K. (2013). Singapore's language status planning and its impact on family mother tongue maintenance. *Taiwan International Studies Quarterly*, 9(1), 1–32.
- 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.
- Yeh, C.-C. (2013). Instructors' perspectives on English-medium instruction in Taiwanese universities. *Curriculum and Instruction Quarterly*, 16(1), 209–231.
- Yeh, M. (2018). *Can we move on when we have lost our spirit? Reflections on English as a second official language*. Paper presented at the Forum among Linguists: Reflections on English as a second official Language, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.

APPENDIX 6A

EMI questionnaire for linguistics professors

EMI在語言學專業課程之授課情況調查

All questions contained in this questionnaire are strictly confidential.

Background information

請列舉您教授之語言學專業課程(包含大學部及研究所)

課程一：

課程二：

課程三：

課程四：

課程五：

以下問題請依照您個別課程的情況回答：

課程名稱	問題	中英文比例
課程一：	您在該課堂使用中英文的比例為何？	中文_____ % 英文_____ %
課程二：	您在該課堂使用中英文的比例為何？	中文_____ % 英文_____ %
課程三：	您在該課堂使用中英文的比例為何？	中文_____ % 英文_____ %
課程四：	您在該課堂使用中英文的比例為何？	中文_____ % 英文_____ %
課程五：	您在該課堂使用中英文的比例為何？	中文_____ % 英文_____ %

針對每個學科，您認為什麼時間點是比較適合使用EMI授課？

學科名稱	時程
	☐ 大一 ☐ 大二 ☐ 大三 ☐ 大四 ☐ 碩士班 ☐ 博士班
	☐ 大一 ☐ 大二 ☐ 大三 ☐ 大四 ☐ 碩士班 ☐ 博士班
	☐ 大一 ☐ 大二 ☐ 大三 ☐ 大四 ☐ 碩士班 ☐ 博士班
	☐ 大一 ☐ 大二 ☐ 大三 ☐ 大四 ☐ 碩士班 ☐ 博士班
	☐ 大一 ☐ 大二 ☐ 大三 ☐ 大四 ☐ 碩士班 ☐ 博士班

How is EMI conducted?

以下問題請依照您個別課程的情況回答：請問您在教授(lecture)本課程的時候，什麼情況下會使用英文？什麼情況下會使用中文？

課程名稱	使用英文的情況	使用中文的情況
課程一：		
課程二：		
課程三：		
課程四：		
課程五：		

以下問題請依照您個別課程的情況回答：請問您在給予學生講評(comment)的時候，什麼情況下會使用英文？什麼情況下會使用中文？

課程名稱	使用英文的情況	用中文的情況
課程一：		
課程二：		
課程三：		
課程四：		
課程五：		

以下問題請依照您個別課程的情況回答：請問您和學生互動討論(discussion)的時候，什麼情況下會使用英文？什麼情況下會使用中文？

課程名稱	使用英文的情況	用中文的情況
課程一：		
課程二：		
課程三：		
課程四：		

課程五：

以下問題請依照您個別課程的情況回答：請問學生報告 (oral or written presentation) 的時候，什麼情況下會使用英文？什麼情況下會使用中文？

課程名稱 使用英文的情況

用中文的情況

課程一：

課程二：

課程三：

課程四：

課程五：

以下問題請依照您個別課程的情況回答：請問考試 (quiz or exam) 的時候，什麼情況下會使用英文出題或作答？什麼情況下會使用中文出題或作答？

課程名稱 使用英文的情況

用中文的情況

課程一：

課程二：

課程三：

課程四：

課程五：

Self-evaluation of EMI

您認為整體而言使用英文授課會獲得較高的教學評鑑分數嗎？

☐非常不同意
☐不同意
☐普通
☐同意
☐非常同意

您認為整體而言使用中文授課會獲得較高的教學評鑑分數嗎？

☐非常不同意
☐不同意
☐普通
☐同意
☐非常同意

您認為使用英文授課 (EMI) 可以增進學生對專業領域的知識嗎？

☐非常不同意
☐不同意
☐普通
☐同意
☐非常同意

您認為使用英文授課 (EMI) 可以提升學生的英語能力嗎？

☐非常不同意
☐不同意
☐普通
☐同意
☐非常同意

您是否同意不管授課語言為何，學生的期末報告都必須以英文撰寫或進行？

☐非常不同意
☐不同意
☐普通
☐同意
☐非常同意

最後，您對於EMI有無任何其他的想法願意跟我們分享？

APPENDIX 6B

The professors' and the students' opinions on EMI (written or transcribed in Mandarin)

- (1) 我認為專業學科領域愈為抽象及理論，則愈不適合使用全英語授課。以語言學概論與形式語意學兩個學科為例，前者的概念實例等都非常具體，學習起來較容易抓住概念，而形式語意學比形式句法學更為抽象，有更多的邏輯符號形式，我相信在邏輯推導過程中，若使用母語為媒介，絕對有助於學習。...若適時使用母語可以幫助學生學習抽象概念，特別是講解複雜概念，或解答學生實在無法聽懂的部份時，那麼我認為實在不需要為了堅持全英語授課而堅持。(教授#3)
- (2) 我自己覺得學生的專業知識吸收與他聽不聽得懂授課內容有關，研究所的課程，因為學生並不都是外文相關科系畢業，英語授課的成效並不大，常常需要轉換成中文來講解複雜的內容，常會拖到進度，對學生的幫助也不大。(教授#6)
- (3) 我認為語言只是個媒介，學生是否能習得專業知識，不在於老師使用何種語言授課，而是老師是否能將專業知識以淺顯易懂的方式與學生分享。我看過老師以中文授課，但學生還是聽的霧煞煞，不知所云。(教授#7)
- (4) 因語言組是在英語系下，學生也有語言能力檢定之門檻要求，因此在規定上，報告和論文須用英文。授課語言，因含有複雜難懂的概念，因授課目的是為了使學生了解語言學專業知識，雖然在英語系下，教師仍會視需要使用中文，使學生理解。至於學生作業及口頭報告，為了訓練英語能力，因此規定只能用英文。(教授#5)
- (5) 另外，關於期末報告是不是必須以英文撰寫，我的看法是以開課性質而定。在英語系開課就會要求學生有英文寫作及學術能力。但對於外系大學部學生，則我讓他們自選要中文或英文撰寫報告及口頭報告。(教授#4)
- (6) 其實一開始我們都想說如果可能自己比較不懂的科目，老師用中文可能你會理解快一點，但是其實事實上沒有，因為其實你還要就是一直在那邊很複雜的轉換，老師用中文講可是你又看英文，其實反而有時候會比較慢... (學生#1，高級)
- (7) 有時候其實一些專有名詞硬翻成中文反而會更難理解它的意思。然後用原文的話看，反而比較能理解，他有時候解釋會比用中文解還更明白這樣子....我另外一堂課就是我們一邊介紹英文，可是用中文報告，就覺得這樣子有時候更難去講明白。(學生#2，中級)
- (8) 他會直接英文跟你舉例說你就是大概這樣，那就是之後對你整個寫作也是比較有幫助，你只要稍微 paraphrase 一下就好，可是你如果用中文就是，就是你自己翻，你也不知道對不對，就是都要多一層轉換。(學生#1，高級)

- (9) 就是我在做ppt的時候就是用中文做，那我講中文，可能會比較順。
(學生#2, 中級)
- (10) 像corpus linguistics...之前老師就幾乎都用全英...大家就會一片放空，然後他就會再轉成中文再講一次，大家就懂了...就沒有辦法太多，因為那離我們的，專業的部分太多。(學生#6, 高級)
- (11) 因為那很注重邏輯，因為你要排除A，排除B，用英文講就霧煞煞，聽不懂。(學生#6, 高級)
- (12) 在KT修課，也是有老師用全英文授課。但是其實我還蠻容易...分神的...因為，我...覺得老師的發音可能不是很好。就是，老師的音調... intonation, 有點...怪...就很容易...<x專注力就不見了x> (uncertain hearing), 因為根本就...太費神...然後整堂課下來不知道老師上了甚麼...所以我剛就在想，所以要英文授課，老師也很重要，學生會覺得不知道你在說甚麼... (學生#3, 中高級)
- (13) 身為英語系/所本科的學生，能用英文對答是基本的能力，一般的語言應用都沒有問題...研究所課程較艱難...有時 paper 的內容的概念艱難加上又有非母語的限制... 常常一知半解...又因許多課程都是全英語授課，有時會搞不清楚到底是自己語言能力差不能理解內容還是讀的文章真的太難...若用非母語來問自己不懂的知識...一來會怕是自己“語言”能力不足才讀不懂，問出來怕丟臉...二來因為無法理解內容不知從何問起，用英文問問題時無法很精確的用字、表達自己的意思，老師也許也聽不懂自己要問的問題...對問-題的確會猶豫、沒有自信，通常都是私下再找同學討論。(學生#4, 中高級)
- (14) 所以我在解釋這個語音的一些位置特色，就是引用老師的句型，然後來闡述，所以就會很清楚。(學生#6, 高級)
- (15) 我覺得其實你用英文，比如說你present好了，或者你聽別人present，其實你可以學到一些presentation的那些 form, language, 比如說你自己可能不是很熟，但是比如說其他人可能transition做得非常好，對，那些就是都是你可以學到的...(學生#1, 高級)
- (16) 一年級剛進來的時候...會有一點困難...然後有時候甚至會，lost...大概過了...一兩個月之後就可以慢慢進入狀況了。然後...對閱讀啊，各方面，就是，幫助的很大...然後跟那個-章節，就是會連接起來...吸收的比較好...Speaking, 也有幫助。就會學老師怎樣去解釋一個東西，學習老師用字之類的...像我們上的很多課，老師會用問答方式...這樣對互動幫助很大。(學生#3, 中高級)
- (17) 像我那個時候是研究debate，然後我就學到很多有關經濟學的詞，然後就是我覺得這個這些詞是平常比較不會碰到的種類，就是我要寫paper的時候可以藉由reading然後寫的東西就有偏更為經濟學的。
(學生#5, 中級)

- (18) 學生的英語文能力固然重要，但在高等教育中，專業知識與能力的培養更是關鍵的一環。若是一昧追求全英文授課，而忽略了學生的反應與程度問題，這樣以英語做專業科目的授課，非但不能達到外語與專業同時並進的效果，反而可能讓學生落入兩頭空的困境。(教授#1)

APPENDIX 6C

GEPT level descriptions

(https://lttc.ntu.edu.tw/E_LTTC/E_GEPT.htm#AMenu1)

Advanced

Skill	Level Description
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• can summarize articles on general and professional topics• can write well-organized and coherent essays, with appropriate lexical and grammatical usage• can express their opinions on a range of topics and discuss them in depth
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• can participate in discussions on abstract topics or issues• can fluently express their opinions about social issues

High-Intermediate

Skill	Level Description
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• can write about topics related to daily life• can write about personal viewpoints on current events
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• can express their opinions on topics they are interested in• can express their personal thoughts and opinions in social settings and workplaces without much difficulty

Intermediate

Skill	Level Description
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• can use simple English to write feedback and comments• can write about their own experiences or about topics with which they are familiar
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• can make inquiries and conduct conversations on daily life topics• can discuss or describe personal experiences in general