

2018

# Supporting non-native university lecturers with English-medium instruction

Tuomainen

Emerald

---

Tieteelliset aikakauslehtiartikkelit

© Emerald Publishing Limited

All rights reserved

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-03-2017-0022>

---

<https://erepo.uef.fi/handle/123456789/6905>

*Downloaded from University of Eastern Finland's eRepository*



**Supporting non-native university lecturers with English-medium instruction**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education</i>
Manuscript ID	JARHE-03-2017-0022.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	English-medium instruction, University education, Higher education teaching, English for academic purposes

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Supporting non-native university lecturers with English-medium instruction

### Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to describe a support course for English-medium instruction (EMI) which continues to expand in European higher education. While the phenomenon of teaching through English is not novel, support for university teachers appears to remain limited despite recognized challenges of EMI such as language proficiency and pedagogical considerations.

**Design/methodology/approach** – In the course, non-native university lecturers in Finland were able to provide a course to practice various elements of English for academic purposes and receive feedback on their teaching. A pre-course needs analysis was used to determine the main causes for EMI concerns with the non-native lecturers with EMI, and which elements of English they wished to develop during the course. The course itself consisted of six joint meetings, followed by individual teaching demonstrations, and concluded with a post-course analysis.

**Findings** – Findings suggest that pre-course Finnish university lecturers were pre-course most concerned about the accuracy, fluency and pronunciation of their academic English. Based on the post-course analysis, the most beneficial elements of the EMI support course were the reflective discussions about EMI, the language practice and receiving individual feedback.

**Practical implications** – The study suggests that support courses for university lecturers involved with EMI should not cover only language but allow lecturers to share their concerns and experiences and to practice in authentic teaching situations in English.

**Originality/value** – This study describes a pedagogically effective method to assist and encourage lecturers in higher education to the use of English in their instruction.

**Keywords** English-medium instruction, University education, Higher education teaching, English for academic purposes

**Paper type** Research paper

### Introduction

While English language teaching is a global phenomenon, present in various educational levels and provided by trained language teachers, teaching through English is also an increasingly common mode of instruction in higher education institutions. The difference, however, is that higher education instructors, such as university lecturers, teachers or professors, typically have little formal pedagogical education to support their teaching or advanced language training to support their use of English as the language of instruction.

Although the internationalisation of European higher education (HE) has been a staple of universities, their policies and even national higher education policies (Teichler, 2003; Wächter and Maiworm, 2014), the support and guidance provided for university instructors who are required, asked or volunteer to teach through English remains varied. However, because university courses with English as the medium of instruction have tripled in the last decade in continental Europe (Smit and Dafouz, 2012), this rise of English as a language for teaching and studying in European higher education HE has led to an increased need for support systems for university teachers (Ball and Lindsay, 2013).

English-medium instruction does have an extensive history in European **higher education**HE, with various levels of implementation. There is a long history of teaching in English because of the dominant role of English as the language of science (Mortensen and Haberland, 2012) and the mobility of foreign lecturers and international students, even well before the Bologna Process expedited and facilitated the globalisation and internationalisation of universities (Fortanet-Gómez, 2013). Internationalisation can be said to affect all areas of HE but it is most significantly connected to knowledge transfer, international education and research, and border-crossing communication and discourse (Horsdal, 2007). These fundamental elements of academia have therefore generated the demand, exchange and development of knowledge, ideas and academics across borders and boundaries but primarily with one common language, English (Alastrué, 2015; Hultgren et al., 2015).

The majority of EMI-related research tends to focus on either student perceptions of the instruction (Airey and Linder, 2007; Argondizzo et al., 2007; Bolton and Kuteeva, 2012; Hauge, 2011; Knapp, 2011; Margic and Zezelic, 2015), the language proficiency of the students (Doiz et al., 2013; Kim and Tatar, 2017; Panday et al., 2007; Richter, 2014; Symon and Weinberg, 2014) or the policy implications of EMI (Bolton et al., 2017; Buyn et al., 2011; Lasagabaster, 2015; Jenkins, 2014; Saarinen and Nikula, 2013; Santulli, 2015; Soler-Carbonell, 2015; ~~---~~). In connection ~~to~~with university teachers, instructors or professors, previous studies on EMI have indicated that many non-native instructors feel ill-prepared for EMI (Cots, 2013; Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011) or that some have refused to teach in English despite having good English competence (Pulcini and Campagna, 2015). EMI instruction has also been seen to decrease the instructors' ability ~~to~~of **expressing** academic content matter fully and accurately (Jensen et al., 2011; Kling, 2015; Pulcini and Campagna, 2015; Sert, 2008; Tange, 2010; Vinke et al., 1998), and that EMI increases the workload for the instructors (and students) (Gürtler and Kronewald, 2015; Sercu, 2004).

Hence there is still a need for a more comprehensive examination of support provided for the language concerns and pedagogical considerations of university staff involved with EMI. Support for EMI offered in universities has been limited, ~~but~~ with some courses **provided** with the English language primarily in focus (Ball and Lindsay, 2013; Westbrook and Henriksen, 2011) or support provided for creating English-language teaching materials (Gürtler and Kronewald, 2015). Some **HEIs**higher education institutions (HEIs) have provided courses where EMI has been approached more pedagogically through workshops, discussions, presentations and peer coaching (Ball and Lindsay, 2013; Klaassen and de Graaff, 2001), which can be seen as an effective way to encourage non-native instructors ~~with EMI~~, yet the overall levels of pedagogical or collegial support for EMI appear to remain very minimal (Tange, 2010).

Therefore, to introduce further implementations of pedagogically oriented EMI support, the purpose of this paper is to describe Finnish non-native university teachers' perceptions of English-medium instruction, and their concerns and expectations before and after a support course **organised** for them. Additionally, the paper describes how tailored, specific language and teaching practice can encourage non-native university teachers to embrace both the language and the teaching practices and forgo insecurity about the use of English for academic and field-specific instruction.

## Teaching in English at universities

Teaching in English at European universities has seen a development not only in prevalence but also conceptually. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, teaching academic content in English (TACE) was a growing phenomenon (Airey, 2015) and in the early 2000s, the term Teaching through English (TTE) began to gain ground and it is used intermittently even today (Ljosland, 2010). Yet as national and European language policies began to develop more fervently after the Bologna Declaration, even ~~higher education institutions (HEIs)~~ HEIs and research saw the implementation of the term content and language integrated learning (CLIL) (Smit and Dafouz, 2012).

In the past decade, however, HE policies have sought to distinguish the teaching and instruction provided in universities from the CLIL in many other educational levels by adopting the term English-medium instruction (EMI) (Holdsworth, 2004; [Murata and Iino, 2017](#)), which is also the term used in this article. One of the main reasons for the term EMI in universities has been that the focus of the university EMI teaching has rarely been on the language, as in CLIL, but instead heavily on the content and academic subject knowledge, even to the extent that scholars claim they do not 'teach language' when they engage in EMI (Airey, 2012).

However, despite such claims, it can be argued that successful teaching in English at university level is in fact a combination of four main elements (Fortanet-Gómez, 2013):

- The language component,
- The pedagogical component,
- Cultural consideration, and
- The human factor.

Therefore, according to Fortanet-Gómez, ~~a~~ non-native university lecturers providing teaching in English must pay attention to the language they use, so that the content and message are transmitted and received to their maximum effect. Yet the lecturer also has to consider the most effective methods of teaching and instruction so that the courses or lectures are as pedagogically viable and learning-intensive as possible (also Dimová and Kling, 2014). In addition to these, there may be a cultural element at play, especially if the courses taught in English are attended by international students of various cultural backgrounds (also Wilkinson, 2013). Finally, Fortanet-Gómez (2013) maintains, that as in any communication, the human factor can be seen to reflect the lecturer's ability to approach each teaching situation by considering the students and their challenges, while also accepting his or her own potential limitations with the language ~~in using EMI~~ to express academic and professional expertise.

Mastering all these elements can make any EMI situation daunting, especially if the non-native lecturer feels ~~uneasy-apprehensive~~ with any of the four. What is also disconcerting with the overt internationalisation of the EHEA, is that the implementation of programmes taught in English in European HE is both demanding and often sparsely resourced so the instructors, as non-native English speakers, are not always provided training or preparation for their English-medium instruction (Fortanet-Gómez, 2014; Hahl et al., 2014; Tange, 2010). ~~In-Regarding~~ the potential problems with English-medium instruction, issues typically in the forefront include inadequate language skills of staff and students, ideological objections against the use of English, lack of interest for English-medium courses and loss of confidence among students (Bolton and Kuteeva, 2012; Hauge, 2011; Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011; Smith, 2004).

## Language concerns of EMI

The quality of the language ~~with-of~~ both the teaching staff and the students has indeed long been one of the main concerns with EMI (Wilkinson, 2013). Lecturing staff may feel pressure to communicate effectively in a language other than their L1, including accurate pronunciation of academic and field-specific terminology (Ball and Lindsay, 2013). The lecturers and teachers with EMI are often expected to be both experts in their field and fluent communicators in English, and ideally, the language levels of both the teacher and the students would match ~~for-in~~ meaningful teaching ~~to-transpire~~ and learning (Doiz et al., 2013). Some universities do apply oral proficiency testing on EMI instructors as a measure of quality assurance (Dimová and Kling, 2014), or require EMI instructors to have at least C1-level language proficiency on the European framework of reference for languages (Ball and Lindsay, 2013).

To consider some scenarios (cf. Grandinetti et al., 2013; Jenkins, 2014), possibly familiar in many European universities with EMI programmes, if both the lecturer and the students are relatively fluent in academic English, this naturally has high potential to result in meaningful learning and a sense of achievement from the lecturer's perspective. However, if the instructor is fluent in academic English but finds the students relatively limited, this undoubtedly will result in challenges in the teaching, instruction and assessment of the learning outcomes.

Another scenario can see both the lecturer and the students with limited English skills, which inevitably will create frustration ~~in everyone~~, particularly if EMI has been implemented in the programme or module against the wishes of the staff and/or students (cf. Shohamy, 2013). Finally, ~~a-one~~ scenario ~~that~~ may be increasingly familiar in many universities with so-called Millennial students born after 1995 and heavily exposed to English throughout their lives. If the lecturer is or feels limited in his or her language skills and the students in turn are fluent, this type of professional situation on a regular basis has the potential to be highly stressful for the EMI lecturer (Hauge, 2011; Westbrook and Henriksen, 2011).

Yet the role of English as a lingua franca, i.e. the language of communication around the world, is recogniz~~s~~ed also in Europe and the language proficiency of non-native speakers is not expected to be equivalent of native speakers (Jenkins, 2014). However, for many highly educated professionals and scholars at the peaks of their respective fields, having to reconcile with a relative weakness with their L2 skills can be part of the challenge of EMI (Jensen et al., 2011; Kling, 2015; Pulcini and Campagna, 2015; Sert, 2008; Tange, 2010; Vinke et al., 1998). In Finland, for instance, individual expectations of foreign language skills, especially with English, are often demanding and self-critical, especially with oral skills (Leppänen et al., 2011). EMI instructors in Finnish universities have held negative perceptions of strong accents and emphasised clarity (Pilkington-Pihko, 2013), and have wanted support particularly for their oral skills, discussion skills and speaking in lectures and seminars (Lehtonen et al., 2003). Therefore, while academic English language skills in reading and writing among Finnish university teaching staff may be fluent, the insecurity is most often reflected in the main component of teaching: speaking.

## The Finnish context

The internationalisation of education has long been one of the focuses of Finnish universities, and currently Finland has one of the highest numbers of English-taught programmes in European

~~higher education~~HE (Airey et al., 2017; Niemelä et al., 2012; Saarinen and Nikula, 2012). This has been facilitated by the principles of Finnish language education, whereby language learning is a lifelong process that develops through personal experience, social interaction and reflection and thus enhances intercultural competences and strategic skills for internationalisation and globalisation (Hildén and Kantelinen, 2012). In the Finnish academic context effective communication for study, professional and research purposes also demands the effective use of foreign languages ~~for academic and field-specific purposes~~, i.e. languages for specific purposes (LSP), and most commonly English for academic purposes (EAP) (Mauranen, 2012).

In Finland, the teaching of English at secondary and upper secondary school levels and the overall positive attitudes towards English in society have created a firm foundation for the use, acquisition and development of English as the most common foreign language (Hyrkstedt and Kalaja, 1998; Leppänen and Nikula, 2007), which consequently facilitates the efficient teaching and development of EAP at university level. The comprehensive approach to English prior to HE studies has allowed most students to enter university studies with generally good English language competence, developed during their formal education years and additionally in various non-formal, informal and lifelong language learning environments (Tuomainen, 2014).

However, in contrast to the students, the university lecturers, professors and other instructors who teach university courses through English, may have completed their Master's and PhD degrees and requisite academic English courses a decade or several decades ago and have had various levels of exposure to English in their work since then (Pilkington-Pihko, 2013). Yet to support university lecturers with EMI, Finnish university language centres have provided courses for instructors to share their concerns and to practice EMI with authentic teaching situations but in a safe environment.

### **The course 'Support for teaching in English'**

To assist Finnish university lecturers with their upcoming EMI courses, a mid-sized multidisciplinary science university located in three campuses in eastern Finland commissioned a course from the university Language Centre entitled 'Support for teaching in English' (2 ECTS credits). The purpose of the course was to address any concerns of the teaching staff regarding EMI, ~~to~~ allow the participants to practice English for academic purposes in a collaborative learning environment and to obtain detailed feedback on their language use and teaching to assist them in the development of their EMI instruction. The course implementation was requested to be as flexible and tailored as possible for the participants. The course in the spring semester of 2016 was organized for the teaching staff on one campus where the emphasis of the degree programmes and research is on Health Sciences (such as Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Biomedicine, Medical Physics and Nursing Science).

### **Course implementation**

#### ***Participants***

In the spring semester of 2016, the course was attended by nine participants (seven women, two men), all of whom had Finnish as their mother tongue. The nine participants represented the School of Dentistry (n=4), the Medical School (n=2), ~~the~~ R&D office (n=2) and the university

1  
2  
3 library (n=1). The School of Dentistry was in the process of expanding their curriculum to cater  
4 to more international degree or exchange students, which showed in their active participation.

5 The age range of the participants was from 34 to 56 years, and they had accumulated  
6 university teaching experience from 1.5 years to 15 years. One participant had already taught in  
7 English but the other eight had no previous experience of EMI. Table 1 presents a more detailed  
8 overview of the participants.  
9

10  
11 [INSERT TABLE I]  
12

### 13 *Pre-course needs analysis*

14 To determine the participants' perceptions about EMI, a pre-course needs analysis was  
15 conducted via a questionnaire and discussion in the first meeting. In the questionnaire, the  
16 participants were asked in open-ended questions:  
17  
18

- 19 (1) What types of teaching situations in English are you involved in?
  - 20 (2) What are some of your main concerns about teaching through English?
  - 21 (3) Which English skills do you wish to improve?
  - 22 (4) Which are your preferred methods for learning in class?
  - 23 (5) What is your most important goal in this course?
- 24  
25  
26

27 In addition to filling in the questionnaire, in the first meeting the participants discussed about  
28 their experiences and concerns in small groups ~~their experiences and concerns~~, and other course-  
29 specific requests or personal preferences were discussed together with the entire group. The  
30 purpose of the needs analysis, as with any other EAP teaching (Flowerdew, 2013), was to  
31 determine the specific focus of the participants in the development of their EAP and EMI skills  
32 and to assist in the tailoring of the course content and materials to best encourage ~~and facilitate~~  
33 meaningful learning ~~and development during the course~~.  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *Course programme*

38 The first meeting of the course was followed by five other joint meetings, each of which had a  
39 specific focus based on the participants' wishes. The course programme for the six joint  
40 meetings (each two hours) is itemised in table 2.  
41  
42

43 [INSERT TABLE II]  
44

45  
46 The meetings consisted of a variety of tasks, including persistent use of pair and group  
47 discussion to activate the participants' oral skills. The participants were able to discuss the  
48 various themes from their own field-specific perspectives and in relation to their work and  
49 teaching ideologies. Pronunciation practice included the use of a language lab and focused on  
50 English academic and field-specific words often challenging for Finnish L1 speakers. The  
51 participants were also able to activate classroom language in small groups in role-play exercises,  
52 and to practice listening skills with recorded lectures with the language lab system.  
53

54 As per the participants' wishes, the course meetings also included written activities, with  
55 the focus particularly on developing written language into a more formal style, in both future  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



EMI written instructions and course assignments. Cross-cultural considerations were also discussed as cultural awareness is considered an integral part of EMI (Fortanet-Gómez, 2013; Hauge, 2011; Tange, 2010). In that session, the participants discussed their experiences with international students or being abroad and were provided example situations where communication had stalled or become strained, to discuss potential reasons for the cultural or communication clashes.

The last session of the course focused most on the pedagogical implications of teaching through English, with a brief lecture followed by discussions about individual teaching styles and ideologies, and whether changes or adaptations were required in each individual's teaching when transitioning the same content into English. Following these six meetings (12 hours), the course was continued with tailored individual sessions (1-2 hours each) where each participant could determine the contents of the meeting. Based on the participants' wishes (P1-8, one participant elected not to have ~~an the~~ individual session), the ~~individual~~ sessions included:

- Checking the written instructions and materials for an online course (P1)
- A teaching demonstration (P2, P3)
- An example lecture (P4, P5)
- A simulated introduction lecture for an online course (P6)
- Reading and providing feedback on a journal article (P7)
- A general discussion of English and the participant's future development of English (P8).

### ***Post-course analysis***

Following these individual sessions, the course 'Support for teaching in English' was concluded online with a post-course analysis. The URL link to the electronic form was sent to the course participants by email. The participants were asked to answer three open-ended questions: (1) if they had been able to achieve the goals they had set at the beginning of the course, (2) what was most beneficial for them in the course, and (3) if they still had any concerns about teaching in English. Seven of the nine participants answered the post-course analysis.

### ***Data analysis***

The pre-course needs analysis answers and the post-course analysis answers were all open-ended qualitative data and corresponding data analysis was applied. Owing to the small number of participants, the data analysis involved reading the data several times to distinguish both individual and collective themes regarding EMI instruction, course goals, EMI concerns and their development on the course. Initial coding was applied to determine frequent categories, which will be narrated next in more detail and with indicative direct quotations from the data.

### **Results**

In the pre-course needs analysis the participants of the course listed a number of future teaching situations in English, including lectures, online teaching, clinical instruction, presentations for foreign visitors and mentoring international Master's or PhD students. Consequently, many of these were also the subject of the participants' individually tailored meeting, as discussed in the previous chapter. This variety illustrates the plethora of teaching situations in modern

1  
2  
3 | universities and consequently ~~also~~ highlights the challenges lecturers and instructors face in  
4 switching to EMI from teaching in their L1.

5 In the pre-course questionnaire the participants were also asked to list any concerns they  
6 may have had about the use of English in their teaching, the most frequently mentioned issues  
7 can be seen in table 3.  
8

9  
10 [INSERT TABLE III]  
11

12 As previously studied with Finnish university teaching staff (Lehtonen et al., 2003; Pilkington-  
13 Pihko, 2013), ~~the~~ oral components of English such as fluency, clarity, accuracy and  
14 pronunciation were also highlighted in the concerns of the lecturers on this course. In effect,  
15 while lecturers and scholars tend to have a good command of EAP reading and writing, the oral  
16 component does not receive the same practice and attention with most non-native academics, and  
17 therefore many may feel apprehensive about their speaking and pronunciation of advanced field-  
18 specific terminology. Pronunciation has been a concern also in other European universities with  
19 non-native EMI instructors (Ball and Lindsay, 2013; Jensen et al., 2011; Westerbrook and  
20 Henriksen, 2011).  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Course benefits**

26 As mentioned in the previous chapter, the course meetings included a versatile focus on the  
27 concerns and wishes of the participants so that each meeting with its particular theme would  
28 include practice on vocabulary, activities on language and cultural awareness, discussions,  
29 pedagogical contemplation and pronunciation practice using a language lab. Although the time  
30 for the joint meetings was limited at 12 hours, ~~the activity and enthusiasm shown by the~~  
31 ~~participants in~~ the sessions appeared to ~~indicate that the meetings encouraged~~ the participants to  
32 practice English related to their own specific fields, including pronunciation ~~practice for field-~~  
33 ~~specific and academic English terminology~~ (“*Discussion and pronunciation practice were good,*  
34 *I needed the practice*”; female, 56). To further develop pronunciation, in the individual meetings  
35 each participant received feedback on their pronunciation if they delivered a sample lecture or an  
36 oral presentation.  
37  
38  
39

40 In the post-course analysis, collected online after the individual sessions had been  
41 concluded, the support course was perceived to have been useful and beneficial for the  
42 development of EMI by all seven respondents, and that the participants’ personal goals for the  
43 course had mostly been met (Yes=5, To some extent=2, No=1). One participant, who had not  
44 wanted ~~an~~ the individual session, felt the timing of the course was not optimal for him, as he had  
45 no specific upcoming courses in English which to practice and reflect on during the course.  
46 Instead, his main aim had been to brush up on his general English with the course meetings.  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **Course challenges**

51 One of the challenges of the course, as mentioned by the participants in the end analysis and  
52 noted during the course meetings, was the significant variance in the English proficiency of the  
53 participants. This is a common challenge with most language courses but here it also created  
54 discomfort especially during pair or group discussions (“*I don't have very good conversation*  
55 *skills and of course when we discussed on the course I could not discuss so much and I feel it*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 | *was not so usefull* [sic]"; female, 54). Some participants were very fluent with English, certainly  
4 C1 or C2 levels on the European framework of reference for languages, while some others  
5 | struggled with basic language use, and thus found the activities on academic vocabulary and the  
6 more formal language use very challenging.

7  
8 Another issue considered a challenge by some of the participants was the division between  
9 lecturers and clinical instructors, especially among the Dentistry participants. While some PhD  
10 lecturers were both fluent in English and could discuss their pedagogical considerations for  
11 | teaching and lecturing situations quite elegantlybroadly, some clinical instructors were mostly  
12 focused on the language and terminology of their practical teaching situations. This meant some  
13 participants found the pedagogical and educational discussions irrelevant for their own practical  
14 work ("*I need more vocabulary for my work, not to talk about how I teach, I don't have the*  
15 | *words for that*"; female, 34).

### 19 **Overall usefulness**

20 However, despite the differences in language proficiency and pedagogical orientation, an issue  
21 each of the participants appeared to agree with in the post-course analysis was that the individual  
22 sessions, the feedback received and even the discussions which were challenging at times, were  
23 considered the most supportive and beneficial methods to develop the EMI considerations of the  
24 participants. Participant comments in the post-course analysis highlighted vocabulary (P1),  
25 discussion (P2), pronunciation (P3, P4), and instructions on preparing lectures and presentations  
26 (P5).

27  
28 Additionally, the ~~The~~-tailored individual sessions, in particular, for the eight who took  
29 part, were considered the most effective way to develop the language. In the individual sessions,  
30 each participant could practice a simulation, demonstration or sample situation-whichsituation  
31 that was specific to the needs of each participant. Each ~~and they~~ could practice the language and  
32 content in a safe environment and obtain feedback on the teaching and the language use ("*The*  
33 *detailed feedback on my lecture demonstration was really beneficial and gave me new tools for*  
34 *the future*"; female, 51). This type of tailored and individual attention seemed to elicit the most  
35 positive reaction from the participants, and the feedback provided on the teaching and the  
36 language use was considered very helpful.

### 41 **Discussion**

42 EMI continues to expand in most European universities and more robust support systems are  
43 needed for non-native lecturers, instructors and teachers who teach academic content through  
44 English. Yet while the task of EMI can be challenging, there are naturally also non-native  
45 teaching staff who do not feel the need to develop their language or pedagogical considerations  
46 for EMI (e.g. Airey, 2012; Bolton et al., 2017; Kim and Tatar, 2017), as was also evident in the  
47 small number of participants in the support course described in this study. The number of  
48 participants remained very low despite rigorous marketing for the course and efforts to make the  
49 course implementation as flexible and tailored as possible. This may be an indication that either  
50 many lecturers with teaching in English perceived no need for a support course, had conflicting  
51 schedules to attend the course, or felt apprehensive about practicing their skills with peers and/or  
52 in essence admitting to needing more practice, possibly considered by some as a sign of  
53 weakness in the academic community.

1  
2  
3 However, if non-native university lecturers teaching in English are provided specific and  
4 collaborative professional development opportunities with EMI, as Ball and Lindsay (2013) and  
5 Klaassen and de Graaff (2001) have ~~also previously~~ demonstrated, they can share and compare  
6 their experiences, concerns and expectations to facilitate the transition to English-medium  
7 teaching. This manner of collective reflection and discussion can be considered an effective way  
8 to encourage lecturers and instructors to be more at ease and less critical of their language skills,  
9 an issue particularly with Finnish university lecturers (Pilkington-Pihko, 2013) but undoubtedly  
10 experienced throughout higher education.

11  
12 As was evident with the course ‘Support for teaching in English’, Finnish university  
13 lecturers were ~~pre-course~~ most concerned about the accuracy, clarity and pronunciation of their  
14 English in teaching situations at the beginning of the course. Despite the role of English as an  
15 academic lingua franca (Mauranen, 2011), the so-called myth of the perfect speaker (Hahl et al.,  
16 2012) appears to persist with many Finnish university teachers and lecturers so that rather than  
17 accepting the natural mistakes one might make in L1 communication, the same errors are  
18 ~~frowned upon and worried about/disapproved~~ in L2-EMI instruction.

19  
20 However, a tailored support course where current or future EMI lecturers can share  
21 experiences and concern and practice the language required for their own specific teaching  
22 situations can be a useful process to prepare for teaching through English. Therefore more  
23 opportunities should be provided for teaching staff to develop both their language proficiency  
24 and pedagogical awareness. Although this study had limited scope and the development  
25 outcomes of the participants were open-ended qualitative data and therefore not measurable or  
26 generalisable, the results seem to indicate a positive development in the preparation for EMI  
27 with a course which combines language and pedagogy in a collaborative manner.

28  
29 As was reflected by the course participants’ post-course analysis, non-native teaching staff  
30 can be encouraged and prepared for EMI particularly through small group practice and tailored  
31 individual meetings. Thus more support courses, organised in a flexible and convenient manner,  
32 should be provided for EMI instructors across the HE spectrum. Most ~~ESP and~~-EAP language  
33 practice asks students to envision the situations they will find themselves in and to practice for  
34 those situations in advance; the same practice is equally relevant for university teaching staff to  
35 help them prepare for their lectures, presentation and other teaching situations with English.

## 40 41 42 **References**

- 43 Airey, J. (2012), “I don’t teach language”: The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in  
44 Sweden”, in Smit, U. and Dafouz, E. (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher*  
45 *education*. AILA Review 25, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 64-79.
- 46 Airey, J. (2015), “From stimulated recall or disciplinary literacy: Summarizing ten years of  
47 research into teaching and learning in English” in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen,  
48 C. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education*. De Gruyter Mouton,  
49 Berlin, pp. 157-176.
- 50 Airey, J., Lauritsen, K.M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L. and Schwach, V. (2017), “The expansion of  
51 English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language  
52 policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals?” *Higher Education* Vol. 73, No.  
53 4, pp. 561-576.
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Airey, J. and Linder, C. (2007), "Disciplinary learning in a second language: A case study from  
4 university physics" in Wilkinson, R. & Zegers, V. (Eds.) *Researching content and*  
5 *language integration in higher education*. Maastricht University Language Center,  
6 Maastricht, pp. 161-171.
- 7  
8 Alastrué, R.P. (2015), "Debates and discourses on English as an academic and research  
9 language" in Alastrué, R.P. and Pérez-Llantada, C. (Eds.), *English as a scientific and*  
10 *research language*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 3-8.
- 11  
12 Argondizzo, C., De Bartolo, A.M. and Ting, Y.L.T. (2007), "ICLHE: Are those who might,  
13 willing and prepared? A quantitative survey and an in-depth qualitative analysis of case  
14 studies of ICL in the university context" in Wilkinson, R. and Zegers, V. (Eds.),  
15 *Researching content and language integration in higher education*, Valkhof Pers,  
16 Nijmegen, pp. 48-67.
- 17  
18 Ball, P. and Lindsay, D. (2013), "Language demands and support for English-medium  
19 instruction in tertiary education. Learning from a specific context" in Doiz, A.,  
20 Lasagabaster D. and Sierra J.M. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global*  
21 *challenges*. Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 44-61.
- 22  
23 Bolton, K., Botha, W. and Bacon-Shone, J. (2017), "English-medium instruction in Singapore  
24 higher education: policy, realities and challenges", *Journal of Multilingual and*  
25 *Multicultural Development* [online], Available at  
26 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1304396> [Accessed 7 May 2017].
- 27  
28 Bolton, K. and Kuteeva, M. (2012), "English as an academic language at a Swedish university:  
29 parallel language use and the 'threat' of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural*  
30 *Development* Vol 33, No. 5, pp. 429-447.
- 31  
32 Buyn, K., Chu, H., Kin, M., Park, I., Kim, S. and Jung, J. (2011), "English-medium teaching in  
33 Korean higher education: policy debates and reality", *Higher Education* Vol. 62, No. 4, pp.  
34 431-449.
- 35  
36 Cots, J.M. (2013), "Introducing English-medium instruction at the University of Lleida, Spain:  
37 Intervention, beliefs and practices" in Doiz, A., Lasagabaster D. and Sierra J.M. (Eds.),  
38 *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*, Multilingual Matters,  
39 Bristol, pp. 106-128.
- 40  
41 Dimová, S. and Kling, J. (2014), "Lecturers' English proficiency and university language  
42 policies for quality assurance", in Wilkinson, R. and Walsh, M. L. (Eds.) *Integrating*  
43 *content and language in higher education*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 61-74.
- 44  
45 Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J.M. (2013), "English as L3 at a Bilingual University in  
46 the Basque Country, Spain", in Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J.M. (Eds.) *English-*  
47 *medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp.  
48 84-105.
- 49  
50 Flowerdew, L. (2013), "Needs analysis and curriculum development in ESP", in Paltridge B. and  
51 Starfield, S. (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes*, John Wiley & Sons  
52 Inc., Malden, pp. 325-346.
- 53  
54 Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2013), *CLIL in higher education: Towards a multilingual language policy*,  
55 Multilingual Matters, Bristol.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2014), "The implementation of a multicultural language policy in a time of economic restrictions", in Wilkinson, R. and Walsh, M. L. (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher education*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 75-87.
- Grandinetti, M., Langellotti, M. and Ting, Y.L.T. (2013), "How CLIL can provide a pragmatic means to renovate science education – even in a sub-optimally bilingual context", *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 354-374.
- Gürtler, K. and Kronewald, E. (2015), "Internationalization and English-medium instruction in German higher education" in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C. (Eds.) *English-medium instruction in European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 88-114.
- Hahl, K., Järvinen, H. and Juuti, K. (2014), "Accommodating to English-medium instruction in teacher education in Finland", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 291-310.
- Hauge, T. (2011), "Language excellence – A necessary skill? University lecturers' dilemmas in teaching content courses in English as an international language", in Cancino, R., Dam, L. and Jaeger, K. (Eds.) *Policies, principles, practices: New directions in foreign language education in the era of educational globalization*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, pp. 161-187.
- Hildén, R. and Kantelinen, R. (2012), "Language education – foreign languages" in Niemi, H., Toom, A. and Kallioniemi, A. (Eds.), *Miracle of education: The principles and practices of teaching and learning in Finnish schools*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, pp. 161-176.
- Holdsworth, P. (2004), "EU policy on language learning and linguistic diversity as it relates to content and language integrated learning and higher education" in Wilkinson, R. (Ed.), *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenge of a multilingual higher education*, Maastricht Universitaire Pers, Maastricht, pp. 20-27.
- Horsdal, M. (2007), "The discourses of lifelong learning in a knowledge economy" in Rinne, R., Heikkinen, A. and Salo, P. (Eds.), *Adult education – liberty, fraternity, equality? Nordic views on lifelong learning*. Finnish Educational Research Association, Helsinki, pp. 33-45.
- Hultgren, A.K., Jensen, C. and Dimova, S. (2015), "English-medium instruction in European higher education: From the north to the south" in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 1-15.
- Hyrkstedt, I. and Kalaja, P. (1998). Attitudes toward English and its functions in Finland: A discourse-analytic study, *World Englishes* Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 345-357.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: the politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge, Abingdon.
- Jensen, C., Denver, L., Mees, I.M. and Werther, C. (2010), "Students' and teachers' self-assessment of English language proficiency in English-medium higher education in Denmark: A Questionnaire study" in Preisler, B., Klitgård, I. and Fabricius, A.H. (Eds.), *Language and learning in the international university: From English uniformity to diversity and hybridity*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 19-38.
- Jensen, C. and Thøgersen, J. (2011), "Danish university lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction, *Ibérica* No. 22, pp. 13-33.

- 1  
2  
3 Kim, J. and Tatar, B. (2017), "Nonnative English-speaking professors' experiences of English-  
4 medium instruction and their perceived roles of the local language, *Journal of Language,*  
5 *Identity & Education* [online], Available at  
6 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1295811> [Accessed 7 May 2017].
- 7  
8 Klaassen, R.G. and de Graaff, E. (2001), "Facing innovation: preparing lecturers for English-  
9 medium instruction in a non-native context", *European Journal of Engineering Education*  
10 Vol 26, No. 3, 281-289.
- 11  
12 Kling, J. (2015), "'You try with a little humor and you just get on with it': Danish lecturers'  
13 reflections on English-medium instruction" in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C.  
14 (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton,  
15 Berlin, pp. 201-222.
- 16  
17 Knapp, A. (2011), "When comprehension is crucial: Using English as a medium of instruction at  
18 a German university" in De Houwer, A. and Wilton, A. (Eds.), *English in Europe Today*,  
19 John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 51-70.
- 20  
21 Lasagabaster, D. (2015), "Multilingual language policy: Is it becoming a misnomer at university  
22 level?" in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in*  
23 *European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 115-134.
- 24  
25 Lehtonen, T., Lönnfors, P. and Virkkunen-Fullenwider, A. (2003), "Teaching through English: A  
26 university case study" in van Leeuwen, C. and Wilkinson, R. (Eds.), *Multilingual*  
27 *approaches to university education: Challenges and practices*. Valkhof Pers, Nijmegen,  
28 pp. 103-118.
- 29  
30 Leppänen, S. and Nikula, T. (2007), "Diverse uses of English in Finnish society: Discourse-  
31 pragmatic insights into media, educational and business contexts", *Multilingua: Journal of*  
32 *Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 333-380.
- 33  
34 Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A. and Nikula, T. (2011), *National survey on the English*  
35 *language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes*, Research Unit for Variation, Contacts  
36 and Change in English, Helsinki.
- 37  
38 Ljosland, R. (2010), "Teaching through English: Monolingual policy meets multilingual  
39 practice. *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, No. 45, 99-113.
- 40  
41 Margic, B.D. and Zezelic, T. (2015), "The implementation of English-medium instruction in  
42 Croatian higher education: Attitudes, expectations and concerns" in Alastrué, R.P. and  
43 Pérez-Llantada (Eds.), *English as a Scientific and Research Language*, De Gruyter, Berlin,  
44 pp. 311-332.
- 45  
46 Mauranen, A. (2011), "English as the lingua franca of the academic world", in Belcher, D.,  
47 Johns, A.M. and Paltridge, B. (Eds.), *New directions in English for specific purposes*  
48 *research*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 94-117.
- 49  
50 Mauranen, A. (2012), *Exploring EFL: Academic English shaped my non-native speakers*,  
51 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 52  
53 Mortensen, J. and Haberland, H. (2012), "English - the new Latin of academia? Danish  
54 universities as a case, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 2012, No.  
55 216, pp. 175-197.
- 56  
57 Murata, K. and Iino, M. (2017), "EMI in higher education", in Jenkins, J., Baker, W. and Dewey,  
58 M. (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook on English as a lingua franca*, Routledge, London, pp.  
59 400-412.
- 60

- 1  
2  
3 Niemelä, J., Ahola, S., Blomqvist, C., Juusola, H., Karjalainen, M., Liljander, J-P., Mielityinen,  
4 I., Oikarinen, K., Moitus, S. and Mattila, J. (2012), *Evaluation of the Bologna process*  
5 *implementation in Finland: Part I Evaluation of the degree reform*, Publications of the  
6 Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council 6, Helsinki.
- 7  
8 Panday, R.G., Hajer, M. and Beijer, J. (2007), “Challenges in integrating academic and  
9 professional language competencies in the curriculum in higher education” in Wilkinson,  
10 R. and Zegers, V. (Eds.), *Researching content and language integration in higher*  
11 *education*, Valkhof Pers, Nijmegen, pp. 99-107.
- 12  
13 Pilkinton-Pihko, D. (2013), *English-medium instruction: Seeking assessment criteria for spoken*  
14 *professional English*, University of Helsinki, Helsinki.
- 15  
16 Pulcini, V. and Campagna, S. (2015), “Internationalisation and the EMI controversy in Italian  
17 higher education” in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C. (Eds.), *English-medium*  
18 *instruction in European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 64-87.
- 19  
20 Richter, K. (2014), “EMI and pronunciation – Outline of a longitudinal case study” in  
21 Wilkinson, R. and Walsh, M. L. (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher*  
22 *education*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 275-290.
- 23  
24 Saarinen, T. and Nikula, T. (2012), “Implicit policy, invisible language: Policies and practices of  
25 international degree programmes in Finnish higher education” in Doiz, A., Lasagabaster,  
26 D. and Sierra, J.M. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*,  
27 *Multilingual Matters*, Bristol, pp. 131-150.
- 28  
29 Santulli, F. (2015), “English in Italian universities: The language policy of PoliMi from theory to  
30 practice” in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction*  
31 *in European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 269-290.
- 32  
33 Sercu, L. (2004), “The introduction of English-medium instruction in university: A comparison  
34 of Flemish lecturers’ and student’ language skills, perceptions and attitudes” in Wilkinson,  
35 R. (Ed.), *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenge of a multilingual higher*  
36 *education*. Maastricht Universitaire Pers, Maastricht, pp. 547-555.
- 37  
38 Sert, N. (2008). “The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context”. *An International*  
39 *Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics* Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 156-171.
- 40  
41 Shohamy, E. (2013), “A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at  
42 universities” in Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J.M. (Eds.), *English-medium*  
43 *instruction at universities: Global challenges*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 196-210.
- 44  
45 Soler-Carbonell, J. (2015), “Language policy in Estonian higher education: Internationalisation  
46 and the tension over English” in Dimova, S., Hultgren, A.K. and Jensen, C. (Eds.),  
47 *English-medium instruction in European higher education*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp.  
48 247-268.
- 49  
50 Smit, U. and Dafouz, E. (2012), “Integrating content and language in higher education” in Smit,  
51 U. and Dafouz, E. (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher education*, AILA  
52 Review 25, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1-12.
- 53  
54 Smith, K. (2004), “Studying in an additional language: What is gained, what is lost and what is  
55 assessed?” in Wilkinson, R. (Ed.), *Integrating content and language: Meeting the*  
56 *challenge of a multilingual higher education*, Universitaire Pers, Maastricht, pp. 78-93.
- 57  
58 Symon, M. and Weinberg, L. (2014), “Introducing EMI instruction in an EFL context: Can the  
59 integration and language in higher education improve students’ English proficiency?” in  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Wilkinson, R. and Walsh, M. L. (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher*  
4 *education*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 309-322.
- 5 Tange, H. (2010), "Caught in the Tower of Babel: University lecturers' experiences with  
6 internationalisation". *Language and Intercultural Communication* Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 137-  
7 149.
- 8  
9 Teichler, U. (2003), "Internationalisation of higher education in Europe" in Aittola, H. (Ed.),  
10 *€KKG? Eurooppa, korkeakoulutus, globalisaatio?* Finnish Institute for Educational Research,  
11 Jyväskylä, pp. 37-52.
- 12  
13 Tuomainen, S. (2014), "Using exemption examinations to assess Finnish business students' non-  
14 formal and informal learning of ESP: A pilot study", *Language Learning in Higher*  
15 *Education* Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 27-42.
- 16  
17 Vinke, A.A., Snippe, J., and Jochems, W. (1998), "English-medium content courses in non-  
18 English higher education: A study of lecture experiences and teaching behaviours".  
19 *Teaching in Higher Education* Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 383-394.
- 20 Westbrook, P. and Henriksen, B.  
21 (2011), "'Bridging the linguistic and affective gaps' – The impact of a short, tailor-made  
22 language course on a Danish university lecturer's ability to lecture with confidence in  
23 English" in Cancino, R., Dam, L. and Jaeger, K. (Eds.), *Policies, principles, practices:*  
24 *New directions in foreign language education in the era of educational globalization.*  
25 Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, pp. 188-212.
- 26  
27 Wilkinson, R. (2013), "English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and  
28 pitfalls" in Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J.M. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction*  
29 *at universities: Global challenges*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 3-24.
- 30  
31 Wächter, B. and Maiworm, F. (2014), *English-taught programmes in European higher*  
32 *education: The state of play in 2014.* ACA Papers on International Cooperation in  
33 Education. Lemmens, Bonn.
- 34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table I.** Overview of the participants (N=9)

Participant	Gender	Age	Title	Teaching experience	EMI experience
1	Male	55	Project coordinator	4 years	none
2	Female	56	Lecturer	8 years	one course
3	Female	51	Clinical instructor	7 years	none
4	Female	35	Clinical instructor	6 years	none
5	Female	54	Clinical instructor	6 years	none
6	Female	48	PhD student	2 years	none
7	Male	34	PhD student	1.5 years	none
8	Female	51	Senior lecturer	15 years	none
9	Female	39	Information specialist	5 years	none

**Table II.** Course programme for joint meetings

---

1	1	Introductions and planning
2	2	Discussions on education, pronunciation practice
3	3	Language for the classroom, listening practice
4	4	Increasing formality in English (in speaking and writing)
5	5	Cross-cultural considerations of teaching in English
6	6	Pedagogical aspects of EMI and booking individual meetings

---

**Table III.** Pre-course concerns regarding EMI

Concern mentioned by participants	Frequency
Fluency and clarity of English	9
Accurate grammar in the teaching slides and texts	8
Correct use of politeness phraseology	5
Terminology and correct pronunciation	3
Self-confidence	3