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Introduction

Patrick STUDER
ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften
Theaterstrasse 17, 8400 Winterthur, Switzerland
patrick.studer@zhaw.ch

The higher education landscape of Switzerland is complex and has been changing constantly over the past decades. New university types have been established; traditional universities have adapted their focus to address trends brought forward by the Bologna process. One key development in recent years has been the increase in student and staff mobility through exchange and co-operation programmes and initiatives. This development has led to the establishment of internationalization as a key policy area in higher education, which has resulted in the creation of internationalized learning environments aimed at equipping students with skills they need in a globalized world.

In this context, an international research community has formed that has conceptualized policy areas with which this development can be described and addressed, such as *internationalization at home*, *comprehensive internationalization* or *internationalization of the curriculum*. While these terms cannot be used interchangeably, they all encompass a vision of higher education institutions in which internationalization is practised as "a commitment, confirmed through action" (Hudzik 2011: 6) that runs throughout all the mission areas of a university and which results in a fundamental transformation of practices in teaching and learning in higher education.

While this vision may seem straightforward in theory, it presents major difficulties in practice as it requires universities to set new priorities and to redefine their understanding of quality in research and education. This is a difficult task to accomplish, if we take into account the fundamental principles of quality we associate with higher education. Looking at internationalization from the perspective of higher education rankings, for example, we notice that the international outlook of institutions tends to be measured on the basis of a limited set of indicators, emphasising the international mix of faculty and students as well as international research co-operation. And when we look at the methodology of key ranking systems, we realise that internationalization, if it figures at all, counts little towards the overall reputation of a university. This limited perception and importance of internationalization in higher education not
only stands in contrast to the desiderata stated by the research community but also to the vision expressed by higher education policy-makers (European Commission 2013; de Wit et al. 2015).

One important reason for this reduced vision of internationalization in higher education rankings lies in the vagueness of terms such as 'comprehensive', 'at home' or 'internationalized'. And this vagueness, in turn, is rooted in internationalization as a phenomenon itself, which is primarily concerned with policy-making and not with the impact of policies on actors (Green & Whitshed 2015: 5). Yet it is programme directors, teachers and students who, in the end, 'live' the spirit of internationalization through their curricula, teaching performance and learning experiences. This is where the present edition comes in. It sheds light on the issue of quality in internationalized teaching and learning by thinking about how internationalization, in a comprehensive sense, can be translated on the ground, given institutional constraints and stakeholder views.

The papers in this edition summarize findings from an interdisciplinary research project that was carried out in Switzerland from 2016 to 2017. Two Swiss Universities of Applied Sciences (BFH and ZHAW) jointly submitted a proposal to a call by swissuniversities (2014) entitled Internationalization of Swiss Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts. The call was aimed strategically at proposals that sought to enhance the visibility of Swiss universities of applied sciences across borders through "purposeful measures" in their internationalization efforts. In particular, swissuniversities called for participating universities to establish "new and promising cooperative ventures" between Swiss higher education institutions and institutions abroad that would serve as "models for developing and positioning universities of applied sciences across borders". With this explicit focus on universities of applied sciences as a case in point, swissuniversities acknowledged that efforts needed to be made, particularly in newer and regional universities in Switzerland, to develop their international expertise.

The project that was funded as a result of this call focused on the development of quality management parameters for international profiles. International profiles were defined, broadly, as internationalized study programmes, parts of programmes or optional elements in study programmes that, in line with European policy on internationalization (European Commission 2013: 6), were aimed at exposing "the non-mobile student majority to international approaches." Particular focus was placed on two areas of internationalization at home: First, emphasis was placed on study programmes in English, or English-taught programmes (ETPs), as English was assumed to constitute a "de facto part of any internationalisation strategy for learners, teachers and institutions" (European Commission 2013: 6). The second focus identified for further study was the systematic integration of a global dimension into study programmes (Hunter, White & Godbey 2006; Deardorff & Hunter 2006). Since English-taught
programmes are particularly common in the Swiss higher education landscape (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 38-39), however, much of the project's research effort was directed toward defining quality parameters in study programmes in which the primary element of internationalization was a change of the medium of instruction to English.

The project, which was managed jointly by ZHAW and BFH, foresaw the collaboration with partner institutions that brought specific expertise to the research themes and envisaged the creation of a sustainable network of institutions committed to the enhancement of quality in internationalization. Original partner institutions were the Albert Ludwig University of Freiburg (Germany) and Università degli Studi di Padova (Italy). In the course of the project, other partner institutions joined the network, such as FH Joanneum Graz (Austria), Hochschule München (Germany), Seinäjoki University of Applied Sciences (Finland), Universitatea de Vest din Timișoara (Romania), Universitat de Vic (Spain), and Xi'an Jiaotong – Liverpool University (China), resulting in a balanced mix of participating institutions, representing different university types, traditions, educational cultures and specialisations.

Focusing on English-taught programmes and, more broadly, on English as a lingua franca in higher education, the papers in the present edition, in particular, deal with questions of quality at the interface of internationalization and English as a medium of instruction and institutional use. Quality in higher education, as it pertains to the use of English, is conceptualized in this edition from different angles, ranging from policy-making, measuring and describing teaching performance, curricular implications, to student perceptions and the use of a different language in administrative contexts.

The authors of the papers in this volume have made use of various data from their respective cultural and institutional contexts. In addition, field research in one particular higher education institution in Switzerland was conducted that would serve as a joint data basis for analysis. The joint field research was carried out at Bern University of Applied Sciences (BFH) in the autumn semester of 2016/17. The programme studied in this field research, a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration programme, served as a case in point that would allow for illustration of how English-taught study programmes are run, structured and taught in Switzerland.

Bob Wilkinson's opening article sets the groundwork for understanding the complex interconnections between quality in higher education, internationalization and language from a policy perspective. Wilkinson (this volume) highlights in particular "aspects and factors that could be measured theoretically to monitor the quality of an internationally profiled EMI programme". Patrick Studer continues Wilkinson's discussion by focusing on the translation of some of these ideas into quality parameters for teaching in a comprehensively internationalized environment. Studer describes the process involved in defining
and applying teacher observation parameters using data from the BFH Bachelor of Science in Business Administration. Sarah Khan explores a different facet of the discussion, looking more specifically at the range of lecturing strategies employed by the teachers involved in the field research and the implications these strategies may have for teacher training. In particular, Khan focuses on prompting, eliciting, signposting, emphasising, paraphrasing, evaluating, defining, checking comprehension and indicating prior learning.

While Studer and Khan look at the quality of teaching in English through the lens of experts observing teaching practices in internationalized study programmes, Gautschi, Pinyana and Ali-Lawson & Bürki shift their perspective to the perception of quality by teachers, students and the institution itself. Curtis Gautschi highlights the importance of students involved in the internationalized study programme as the central stakeholder in the classroom. In his paper, Gautschi compares student perceptions of quality to teacher observation parameters by experts, looking for common ground and divergence. Ángels Pinyana emphasizes the perspective of the lecturer involved in quality evaluation, analysing how lecturers perceive quality parameters in an English-taught programme, and whether these parameters can be observed in class. Both Gautschi and Pinyana use data from the joint field research at BFH. Debra Ali-Lawson and Jacqueline Bürki present institutional considerations made in the run-up and development of the English-taught programme in Business Administration at BFH. Ali-Lawson & Bürki show how higher education institutions may typically respond when they are put under pressure to internationalize their operations.

The research presented in this volume has been inspired further by previous research activities at the intersection of internationalization, quality and English as a language of instruction. Previous research activities presented in this edition were conducted in the framework of the LEAP (Learning English for Academic Purposes) project at the University of Padova and the EMIQM project at the University of Freiburg (Germany). Caroline Clark and Marta Guarda, in their critical review of findings from the LEAP project in Italy, point to the importance of support mechanisms for lecturers that facilitate student-centred learning and the need for the systematic inclusion of students into questions concerning the quality of English-medium instruction. Susanne Gundermann and Gregg Dubow extend the discussion to quality management by presenting an innovative approach to assuring the quality of English-taught programmes at the University of Freiburg. In Freiburg, English-taught programmes can undergo a university-internal certification process based on individual lecturers' teaching performance leading to a quality seal.

Stuart Perrin and Michaela Albl-Mikasa, in a co-operation project between Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University and ZHAW, conclude the discussion by looking at the use of English as a lingua franca in an institution's administration. Using the
example of minute-taking in relevant committee meetings in an all English-speaking university in China, the paper emphasizes the importance of operational and structural processes guiding the use of language in lingua franca settings in higher education.
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Quality, internationalization, and English-medium instruction: a Dutch perspective of higher education

Robert WILKINSON
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bob.wilkinson2010@gmail.com

Des changements marquants dans le contexte de l'enseignement supérieur conduisent à des modifications de la conception de la qualité. Un de ces changements a été l'internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur en réponse à la mondialisation. Des programmes à profil international ont été établis, souvent enseignés dans une autre langue. Les étudiants, les enseignants et les autres parties prenantes ont intérêt à démêler la qualité de ces programmes. La qualité elle-même, cependant, est un concept insaisissable, en fonction de l'acteur concerné. Sur la base d'exemples provenant des Pays-Bas, diverses conceptualisations de la qualité sont discutées, conduisant à un modèle de qualité qui est appliqué aux programmes profilés au niveau international. Deux risques principaux apparaissent. Au fur et à mesure que les critères de contrôle de qualité deviennent plus nombreux et plus précis, la praticabilité de la gestion de la qualité est entravée. Plus les critères de qualité deviennent transnationaux, moins les parties prenantes nationales concernées peuvent les percevoir localement.
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1. Introduction

The higher education landscape has changed dramatically over the past half-century, entailing a significant change in what quality means. It is valuable to remind ourselves of these changes as they impact on how quality may be construed with respect to international profiles, especially where educational programmes are delivered through an additional language. Moreover, we readily use terms without always being clear about what we mean, such as "international profile" or "additional language". We may unwittingly assume that our interlocutors share our own fuzzy conception. I shall return to the definitional dilemmas with respect to quality later.

Until the middle of the twentieth century, higher education could be seen as the exclusive domain of an established aristocratic and profession class that, while pursuing enlightened scientific knowledge, was able to perpetuate the elitist system. Even though the nineteenth century had seen a broadening to the professional classes (the creation of "red brick" universities in the UK, for

---

1 The author is most grateful to the editors and two anonymous reviewers for their painstaking diligence and their insightful comments on the manuscript.
example), and the establishment of the research university, such as on the Humboldtian model, higher education remained exclusive. Attempts to expand further to other sectors of the population would entail a dilution of the quality, if indeed the term quality was used in this context (see Altbach et al. 2009; Trow 2007).

The massive expansion of higher education since the mid-twentieth century progressively led to a steadily greater proportion of young people enjoying the right to higher education, with some countries even making it an automatic right if students had the appropriate secondary-school leaving qualifications (e.g. France, see Duru-Bellat 2015; Picard 2009). Meanwhile, the older established universities could retain their elitist perception and preserve the exclusive conception of quality.

The landscape of tertiary education is affected by numerous economic and social factors, such as globalization, competition and marketization (Harvey & Williams 2010: 4). Universities are challenged to cope with the consequences (see Knight 2008; Marginson & van der Wende 2007). Part of their response is to demonstrate the quality of their education.

Quality has been described as an 'elusive' concept (e.g. Neave 1994: 115) and its interpretation will vary according to who perceives it. This contribution attempts to unravel different conceptions of quality regarding higher education. In doing so, it focuses on quality with respect to the education that universities provide. Except occasionally, it does not consider quality in relation to universities' other function, research. This paper contributes to a volume concerned with internationalization, in particular the quality management of international profiles of higher education institutions. I draw upon the Dutch context as the Netherlands-Flemish Accreditation Organization (NVAO) was among the first to offer, alongside its accreditation process for Dutch and Flemish universities, a distinctive quality feature for internationalization. I take as an assumption that the procedure for the award of the distinctive feature may be relevant for other countries, including Switzerland. In the Netherlands and Flanders, the distinctive feature may be awarded at programme or institutional level. In this regard, the example of Maastricht University is presented as it was one of the first to be awarded the distinctive feature internationalization at institutional level.

2. Quality

2.1 What is quality in higher education?

Quality in higher education is concerned with both the two core roles of universities (Green 1994: 8), the provision of education and the conduct of research. As mentioned above, since this paper is concerned with education,
much of the following discussion regarding quality may not apply to universities' research role.

In their education role, universities are concerned with teaching and learning. In order to assess quality, it is necessary to take account of inputs and outputs, as well as the processes of teaching and learning. Universities are likely to have to meet the conditions of national and transnational quality assurance systems, which may entail meeting different, even conflicting requirements. Moreover, the cost involved may also be a cause for concern. In some cases, e.g. Maastricht University, individual faculties may be encouraged to seek international accreditation, on the grounds that national (re-)accreditation becomes "less intense" (Jan Vijge, Maastricht University internal audit, personal communication, 12 May 2016). A second concern is that quality is "an elusive concept" (Green 1994: 12): How can we measure quality objectively if we do not know what it is?

Before attempting to clarify the concept of quality, I should briefly touch on a broad distinction that sometimes confuses discussions of quality, that is the distinction between quality assurance and market-oriented quality. Quality assurance fundamentally implies evaluation by experts, such as in a peer review system. Essentially that suggests subjective judgements, since one may wonder what qualifies the experts to make their judgements. Should one ask 'experts' from other universities? Should 'experts' from 'semi-autonomous' independent commissions be recruited? The issue of how the comparison is conducted arises too. For example, in the Netherlands and Flanders, the quality of internationalization is compared to the national 'average'; hence quality is that which stands out. Quality assurance thus raises questions of integrity and trust, not to mention quis custodis custodes. It is moreover suspect in a time of higher education competition. In contrast, market-oriented quality is based on the use of performance indicators (Ball & Wilkinson 1994). However, the challenge here is to determine what should be a performance indicator. As Elton (1987) commented, "what is easily measurable is a performance indicator". As Dochy et al. (1990: 136-137) note, effective performance indicators are related to institutionally defined functions, and they serve as indicators of the extent to which institutional goals are achieved. For effectiveness, they depend on the valid operationalization of what they intend to indicate, and that they can indeed be measured and interpreted in a reliable and correct way. At their simplest, performance indicators do provide a rough and ready guide to the health of an educational system.

2.2 Quality: conceptual definition

It is not easy to define the concept of quality. It is an elusive, slippery, value-laden term (Green 1994: 12). Essentially, it is a multi-faceted, philosophical concept (compare the discussion in Schindler et al. 2015: 4). Broadly we can
construe four conventional understandings of quality. The first, the traditional understanding of quality, connotes the provision of a service or product that is distinctive and special, and that confers status on the owner or user. It implies extremely high standards of production, delivery and presentation, and using scarce resources, usually at great expense. Ultimately, it implies exclusivity. Products such as Rolex watches, high-end perfumes, and distinctive champagnes would fall under this concept of quality.

In higher education, this traditional concept of quality is visible in the attention to the exceptional and excellence (Newton 2006). The evidence lies in practices like benchmarking, league tables, rankings, and the use of a 'gold standard'. Quality may also focus on consistent maintenance of perfection where concern shifts to measuring process standards rather than outcome standards. In this conception quality is a mechanism to monitor the processes of or through assessment, accreditation, audit, or external examination and suchlike (see Harvey 2006; Harvey & Green 1993).

A second conventional understanding implies conformance to standards, whereby the product or service meets required characteristics. Standards are laid down, either by a government authority or a professional or international body (e.g. IEEE\(^2\)), and the product or service must meet these to 'qualify' for the label. It is a static model of quality, where quality is defined in terms of what can be measured. In higher education, we can see quality conforming to standards as a combination of three different types of standards (see Newton 2006): academic standards that measure ability to meet a specified attainment; service standards that are devised to assess the level of service provided; and quality standards which reflect norms in terms of formal statements about expected practice (see ENQA\(^3\) quality standards, ESG 2015).

The third understanding is where a product or service is deemed fit for purpose. In this case, quality is judged in relation to the extent to which a service or product meets its stated purpose. This is a developmental or dynamic model of quality, in that the purposes can change over time. In higher education, one can relate this concept of quality to employability and it may show itself in institutional mission statements. However, a prior question for higher education is precisely what the purpose of it is. Different stakeholders, such as government, students, employers, academic management, and academic staff, are likely to give conflicting answers. Quality as fit for purpose is basically a stakeholder-related concept. The quality of the service or product is judged against the costs of the investment by the stakeholder. Quality measurements will include performance data such as student retention and graduate employment.

\(^2\) Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Standards Association.

\(^3\) European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
The fourth understanding is concerned with meeting customers' needs. In this conception, the challenge is to translate the future needs of customers and users into measurable characteristics. However, the problem in higher education is exactly who the customer is. Here, an overlap with the previous understanding is evident in that higher education has to meet the needs of different stakeholders, some of whom can clearly be conceived as customers, whereas others would not be.

However, quality can also be conceived as one of transformation (Newton 2006; Harvey & Williams 2010: 5), in which the learning process empowers students, enabling them to develop. The transformative concept can also be seen when changes in the institution enable better learning.

In summary, quality is concerned with judgements of attainment, service, and expected practice. It can be construed as relative to sets of stakeholders (i.e. variable); the efficient and effective running of a mechanism (a process); or as a theoretical concept. Schindler et al. (2015) reviewed the literature on the definition of 'quality' in higher education, noting that there had been little change since the 1990s. There seems to be some kind of agreement that quality is a multifaceted concept and which aspects you wish to choose depends on who you are, what your stake is, and what you want to do or achieve with the concept. They classified quality definitions under four categories: purposeful (products and services conform to the mission or vision, standards, etc.); exceptional (products and services achieve distinction, exclusivity, through high standards); transformative (products and services effect positive change in student learning and professional potential); and accountable (institutions are accountable to stakeholders for use of resources and delivery of products and services). Schindler et al. (2015) noted that quality is measured through sets of indicators (see above), referring in particular to administrative indicators, such as developing a mission or vision, achieving internal or external standards and goals, or procuring resources for optimal functioning; student support indicators regarding the availability and responsiveness of services, for example in addressing student complaints; instructional indicators, measuring the relevancy of educational content and the competence of instructors; and student performance indicators, such as student engagement with curriculum, faculty, staff, and increases in knowledge, skills, abilities that lead to gainful employment. Schindler et al. (2015) constructed a conceptual model of quality in higher education on the basis of their review (Fig. 1).
Schindler et al.'s (2015: 7) model starts in the centre from the perspective of the stakeholder. The way quality can be defined depends first and foremost on the stakeholder. The next circle stipulates four broad conceptualizations of quality, while the outer circle specifies examples of quality indicators that could be used to assess the conceptualizations. Schindler et al. (2015: 7) emphasize that the model depicts "a multifaceted approach to defining quality, which requires eliciting stakeholder perspectives to develop a broad conceptualization of quality and to accurately select specific indicators to measure that conceptualization of quality".

Essentially, quality monitoring is relative to and depends on the higher educational institution involved. This principle underlies the recommendations and guidelines in the revised European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)\(^4\) adopted by Ministers responsible for higher education in the European Higher Education Area in 2015 (ESG 2015). Quality remains essentially "intangible", "the result of interaction between teachers, students and the institutional leaning environment" (ESG 2015: 7).

---

\(^4\) Authors: European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA); European Students' Union (ESU); European University Association (EUA); European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE); in cooperation with: Education International (EI); BUSINESSEUROPE; European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).
3. Principles, standards, criteria underlying quality management in the Netherlands

Instead of describing the ESG generally in detail, I turn to the Netherlands and show how the ESG are interpreted in this country. The Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organization (NVAO) follows ENQA guidelines, focusing on 'quality enhancement' rather than 'quality assurance'. In this sense, the NVAO guidelines (see also NVAO 2016) can be construed as transformative.

Accreditation takes place at two levels, institutional level and programme level. In addition, the NVAO operates accreditation in terms of distinctive quality features, e.g. internationalization, on which I focus further in this paper. It is a relative judgement: one institution is compared with other Dutch higher education institutions. Accreditation is based on principles similar to ESG, such that institutions have primary responsibility; there is respect for the diversity of systems, etc.; attention is paid to the development of a quality culture; and account is taken of needs and expectations of students and all stakeholders. This is also in line with the principles set by the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA 2015). From the principles, the NVAO sets out standards, and then criteria against which the standards can be measured.

Quality is measured through a lengthy procedure involving self-evaluation, internal audit, and a critical reflection (note that for the NVAO distinctive feature internationalization, the critical reflection must be written in English). The NVAO then establishes an assessment panel (again note that for the NVAO distinctive feature internationalization, the panel must include two experts with an 'unquestionably international profile', which is not narrowly defined). The panel conduct a site visit, and then submit their recommendations. Finally, the NVAO makes its decision. It is likely that the processes in the Netherlands resemble those of other EHEA countries.

The Netherlands does not have a separate system for measuring the quality of programmes where instruction is in an additional language, such as EMI programmes. They will be assessed on the same basis as programmes in Dutch, although naturally comment would be made about the use of the language of instruction. All fourteen Dutch universities implement the University Teaching Qualification (better known by its Dutch acronym BKO, or Basis kwalificatie onderwijs) as a requirement for all academic teaching staff. The intention is to guarantee the quality of teaching (see for example Leiden University's Faculty of Humanities, Universiteit Leiden 2017a). The BKO does not specifically measure the quality of a teacher's English, but since it includes

---

5 European Higher Education Area.

6 The term "additional language" itself can be considered contested, generating different connotations according to context, see for example De Angelis (2007), Leung (2001), and Leung & Creese (2010).
a portfolio of the teacher’s work, this may well be in English if the academic is teaching through English. Dutch universities may offer additional quality qualifications for teaching through English (see also the example of Universiteit Leiden 2017b). The assessment may not be as detailed as the TOEPSAS (Test of Oral English Proficiency of Academic Staff) developed in Denmark (Kling & Stæhr n.d., see also Dimova & Kling 2015), although the combination with the BKO portfolio which includes a self-reflective report and the qualification in English may be seen as equivalent (see Driessen et al. 2006, on the validity of self-reflection in a portfolio).

4. Quality of internationalization – the Dutch practice

As mentioned above, the NVAO system of accreditation in the Netherlands also offers a quality assessment of distinctive features, such as the degree to which an institution is international. The assessment of internationalization follows the framework set out by the European Consortium for Accreditation7 (ECA 2015). It is conducted according to five standards and may be conducted at the level of the institution as a whole or at the level of a programme. The procedure is similar to that for accreditation. It is valuable to comment on the standards against which the institution is rated.

At institutional level, standard 1 specifies that there is a clear and shared vision on internationalization, supported by internal and external stakeholders, and linked to the quality of education. Standard 2 mandates an institutional policy that enables the realization of the vision. This policy includes, among other matters, specification of international and intercultural learning outcomes, with respect to teaching and learning and the staff and students. Language, however, is not necessarily a specification. As Maastricht University (2012: 5) indicated in its submission for the distinctive feature internationalization: "Language proficiency is not regarded as a goal in itself, but as an enabling competence and a tool that facilitates communication in the university's international setting."

In terms of Schindler et al.’s (2015) model, the NVAO’s internationalization would fit into the purposeful conception of quality. However, internationalization is measured "against" the other institutions in the country (Netherlands), that is, a kind of national average. A university or programme with special distinction for internationalization stands out from the others. The implication is that not every university/programme can acquire the distinction. Thus, it would fit into the "exceptional" or "exclusive" category overall, but, when we look at the standards, we do not see features of the exceptional category.

Standard 3 specifies a demonstration of the extent to which the policy is realized, for example the degree to which students are prepared for the global

---

7 The European Consortium for Accreditation comprises 18 members, quality assurance agencies, from eleven countries. Switzerland is not a member (ecahe.eu, accessed 2 May 2018).
labour market. Evidence for this would be the international elements and learning outcomes, as well as extracurricular activities with an intercultural and international focus. Further demonstration would lie in the language courses for students, the activities of career services, the existence of a relevant diploma supplement, as well as evidence from alumni, for example where they are working. In this case, the accountable and purposeful conceptions of quality seem to apply. Moreover, an institution would have to demonstrate an international profile in their education and research, which would include how it recruits and welcomes international students as well as the scope of international education projects, international research, and the extent of internationalization among the staff. Even this evidence may not be sufficient. The institution also has to demonstrate its social and global engagement (see Watson & Temple 2009). This will include research initiatives and institutes with societal relevance, as well as student initiatives and activities with societal relevance. In this case, we can see the transformative conception of quality coming into play.

The fourth and fifth standards concern improvement and integration strategies. An institution can demonstrate the inclusion of internationalization in its internal quality assurance system, and internationalization is effectively integrated into the organization and the decision-making structure. In both cases, this evidences a purposeful conception of quality.

It should be clear that the assessment of quality of internationalization is subjective based on the recommendation of visiting experts. One quality assessor (reported by Jan Vijge, Maastricht University internal audit, personal communication, 12 May 2016) was quoted as saying, "You spend two to three days visiting a university and usually find the opinion you formed in the first 20 minutes doesn't change."

5. English-medium instruction

When we switch the language of instruction in higher education, we encounter some definitional dilemmas. There is a plethora of terms that have been used to describe the context. Although the over-arching term CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is widely used in primary and secondary education (Wolff 2009; see also Mehisto et al. 2008), two other terms predominate in higher education: ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education, e.g. Wilkinson 2004), partly because the higher education learning context differs significantly from primary and secondary education, and the dual focus on content and language goals characteristic of primary and secondary CLIL may be unequal, with content goals dominating. The second term is EMI (English-Medium Instruction), which has arisen because English is
by far the commonest additional language of instruction. EMI\(^8\) may or may not specify language learning goals; indeed, many programmes, especially at Master's level, may denote learning of disciplinary content through English without any specified language learning goals (e.g. Coleman 2006; Doiz et al. 2013: 216-217). The goal of an EMI programme is the teaching and learning of disciplines through English as the language of instruction. Content is paramount, and language learning may or may not be a goal. This contrasts with ICLHE, where language learning goals are also prescribed, and where there is likely to be collaboration between content teachers and language teachers, sometimes involving team teaching. The aim in ICLHE is precisely to integrate the content and the language, which may for example generate a collaborative approach to how the disciplinary language works in the community of practice (Wenger 1998) of the relevant discipline. However, in her analysis of the English-medium paradigm, Schmidt-Unterberger (forthcoming 2018) argues that most integrated university programmes are best encapsulated under the term EMI which may be supported by embedded or adjunct courses in English for specific or academic purposes.

Teaching through the medium of an additional language began at Maastricht University in 1987 as described in Wilkinson (2013). It began as one small multilingual programme in the Faculty of Economics but gradually spread across the university to other faculties. It was not a planned process in that there was an end-goal to establish EMI as the dominant instructional medium in the university\(^9\); it was rather a series of reactions to opportunities and threats. Wilkinson has categorized five phases of EMI at Maastricht: cross-border, Europeanization, consolidation, globalization and monetization. Unterberger\(^10\) (2014) found a similar pattern at the Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien/Vienna University of Economics and Business, but also detected a sixth phase which she termed profiling. At Maastricht, there was a period when language goals were deemed critical components of programmes, especially during the Europeanization and consolidation phases (see Fig. 2). Since then, however, the programmes through English fall more under the term EMI, in that language learning is seen as an enabling goal, not an end-goal. It is not "dual-focused" (Marsh 2002: 10).

As indicated earlier, the process of globalization, characterized as the meshing of myriad factors and influences such as mobility, trade, migration,

\(^8\) There are several other acronyms denoting more or less the same concept, although with slightly varying connotations: ETP (English-Taught Programmes, e.g. Wächter & Maiworm 2008), EMP (English-Medium Programmes, Unterberger 2012), EMT (English-Medium Teaching, Coleman 2006), Dafouz-Milne & Smit (2014) coined the term EMEMUS (English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings) to cover the wide heterogeneity of applications of English as the instructional language in universities.

\(^9\) More than half the programmes at Maastricht University are taught through English.

\(^10\) Now known as Schmidt-Unterberger.
harmonization of rules, and rankings, is arguably a principal reason for the rise of EMI programmes. As Marginson & van der Wende (2007: 4) note, universities are not objects of globalization, but in practice agents of globalization. Altbach (2004: 5-6) emphasizes the transformative process of globalization in that it meshes influences from many sources and transforms national systems and institutions. Internationalization, on the contrary, denotes the ways in which institutions respond to, cope with and manage globalizing factors and influences, thus encompassing processes of policies, practices, and beliefs.

EMI: Phases of evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>recruitment (internat. &amp; excl. students)</td>
<td>international, at-home</td>
<td>recruitment (student expertise)</td>
<td>recruitment (money)</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>multilingualism</td>
<td>new programmes</td>
<td>home market (small/saturated)</td>
<td>new programmes</td>
<td>profile (bilingual)</td>
<td>profile (ranking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>new programmes</td>
<td>profile (bilingual)</td>
<td>cost of biling. options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration/complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Phases and motivations for EMI as identified at Maastricht University, Netherlands (Wilkinson 2013: 9); extended by Unterberger (2014: 153) in her study of Vienna University of Economics and Business. The dates refer to the start of the phase at Maastricht University.

According to Maiworm & Wächter (2014: 38), EMI in Europe remains small, with less than six percent of students in the European Higher Education Area enrolled in full-time EMI programmes. They report an S-shaped growth pattern, with the rate of growth highest in south-west Europe with eight times more programmes than in 2007, but with growth plateauing in some previous growth areas. While the Academic Cooperation Association’s (ACA) study, coordinated by Wächter and Maiworm (2014), only surveyed programmes fully taught through English, other variants of EMI programmes also exist including programmes where the language is both the means and the target, as well as programmes that may be bilingual or multilingual (see also Wilkinson 2017).

Maastricht University presents a practical example for probing the quality monitoring of its international profile. While initially content and language development were seen as structured goals, with language both a medium and
a target, by the early 2000s critical mass could be said to have been reached, in that the quality of local students and international students 'seemed' "good enough" in English. No definition was ever given of "good enough". We may presume that this was 'measured' for example by a low number of complaints about the quality of English and by the relative degree of success in passing exams. We can place the change at the time that English became the medium of instruction in many programmes where the only explicit linguistic target was the development of academic writing skills. Moreover, little or no attention was paid to students' first language (L1). In terms of the European Union's policy for all citizens to develop their competences in their mother tongue plus two foreign languages, MT + 2 (European Commission, 2008), Maastricht University has moved in its international programmes from MT + 2 to MT + ENG + 1 to ENG + MT (± 1), always assuming that students' competences in their mother tongue do not erode (but see Wilkinson & Gabriëls 2018: 352, whose interviewees do report first language erosion).

In the current conception of EMI programmes at Maastricht, it is appropriate to look at how quality is conceived and measured. The most important aspect is the identification and measurement of learning outcomes. These will of course be largely programme-dependent. A second critical aspect is student graduation times (or throughput time), measuring what percentage of students graduate within the time frame expected for the programme. A third key aspect is student graduate employment and the length of an unemployment or job-seeking period. Fourthly, attention is paid to regular student satisfaction surveys, both internal faculty surveys and those conducted periodically by contracted outside agencies. Note is also taken of the complaints received about a course, as well as how those complaints are dealt with. A fifth key point is the academic staff's perception of the quality of the students. Finally, the staff's competences in English are monitored, as well as recruitment, especially from among international PhD students. These measures are largely quantitative and can be categorized under Schindler et al.'s (2015) purposeful category of quality management. The above list pays little attention to qualitative aspects of the quality measurement of learning programmes. Here, we would be drawn to the throughput of programmes, that is teaching and learning processes. This would cover the optimal design of programmes and courses, whether the teaching and learning approaches do reach the learning goals, whether alternative approaches might yield superior outcomes, as well as looking into the less tangible aspects such as the student-teacher relationship in that a more empathetic learning environment is suggested to be conducive to better outcomes (see for example Mykkonen et al. 2015).

At the programme level, there are principally four groups of factors that affect programme quality (summarized in Fig. 3): student factors, such as entry and exit competences, motivation, and cultural background; teacher factors, such as content expertise, teaching competences, and multicultural teaching
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competences; programme design factors, such as the conceptual design of the programme and its implementation, the use of student-centred approaches, and the methods employed; and institutional contextual factors, such as location and history, services provided, and the scope and depth of the employment market the institution serves. The list is not exhaustive.

Quality and EMI: Factors involved

![Figure 3: Groups of factors mediating quality at programme level](image)

Assessing and monitoring quality of an international profile is thus a complex and dynamic process, even if it is limited to EMI programmes. The project, "Developing Quality Management Parameters for International Profiles at Universities of Applied Sciences", for which this paper was written, is an example of an approach to master this complex process. The project aimed to develop and test quality management parameters that would aid institutions in grounding their participation in an international programme of excellence (see Studer, this issue). However, if we wish to assay quality in international profiles in EMI programmes alone, we cannot merely take account of the international dimensions of the programme. We have to measure all aspects, on the grounds that the whole makes up more than the parts, and ostensibly non-international components may have catalytic effects on the international dimensions. Biggs (2001: 222) noticeably cites a quote from Seymour (1993): "because quality resides not in any one performance indicator, but in the way the system as a whole works, individual indicators do not give the picture of the whole, which is what matters". The same may apply by extension to limited groups of indicators.

In the following, I take a knowledge-skills-attitude (KSA) approach to the competences among students and teachers that would form part of a measurement instrument for quality in an internationally profiled EMI programme. Fig. 4 lists the competences that could be assessed for students
and teachers, whereas Fig. 5 notes a selection of factors related to the programme design and the institutional context.

Many other skills could be added to this list of competences (Fig. 4). For instance, for students it may well be important to monitor employment skills, career skills, and lifelong learning skills. The items in bold relate to those that are assumed to impact most likely on the quality of the international profile of an EMI programme, especially those under teacher competences.

Categorizing the factors where internationalization plays a key role leads to quite an intricate patchwork of aspects to measure or judge. We can deduce quality (of the programme, institution, teacher or student) as deriving from the interaction of these factors and likely with other factors too. It should be borne in mind that many of the factors that would relate to any teaching and learning in higher education (e.g. in an L1 context) also apply, but they are not necessarily included here.

A challenge facing those constructing a set of quality management parameters for international profiles is that the criteria will inevitably overlap. The process of criteria development will aim to minimize this overlap so that two criteria do not tap the same factors (see Studer, this issue). The objective for quality management parameter development in this case is to broaden the number of criteria to as many as are needed to cover the international elements of quality management in international profiles, but to then pare them down to as few as are practical to implement. If the criteria employed are at too high a level of detail, they will become unworkable. Arguably, too detailed criteria are unnecessary for the quality measurement of an international profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic disciplinary knowledge/domain(s)</td>
<td>• Information literacy and documentation skills</td>
<td>• Approaches to learning (deep, surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language of instruction/learning</td>
<td>• Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>• Conceptions of learning (low [knowledge transmission], high [knowledge transforming])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic tasks/requirements</td>
<td>• Analytical skills (interpreting, synthesizing)</td>
<td>• Motivation (intrinsic, instrumental, utility, etc. (Pintrich 2003))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic/professional vocabulary/terminology</td>
<td>• Evaluation skills</td>
<td>• Perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discourse &amp; academic cultural conventions in disciplines</td>
<td>• Mathematical literacy</td>
<td>• Willingness, curiosity, interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenges/problems/issues as seen in other cultures/languages</td>
<td>• ICT skills</td>
<td>• Cultural, social, language, academic differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Etc.</td>
<td>• Self-assessment skills</td>
<td>• Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication skills (reporting, presenting, disseminating)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers
Knowledge Skills Attitudes
▪ Academic discipline(s)/domain(s)
▪ Teaching discipline(s) (e.g. how to order information)
▪ Language of discipline
▪ Language knowledge (e.g. pronunciation)
▪ Academic/professional vocabulary/terminology
▪ Discourse & academic cultural conventions in disciplines
▪ Assessment competences
▪ Cultural, social differences (including impact on learning)
▪ Etc.
▪ Teaching skills
▪ Assessment skills
▪ Management skills (e.g. class, information, time, pressure)
▪ Skills in managing different teaching and learning approaches
▪ Communication skills (lecturing, tutoring, monitoring, giving feedback, etc.)
▪ Interpersonal skills (networking, teamwork)
▪ Intercultural skills (understanding different cultures, different academic cultures, different approaches to learning, working with others in different languages, cultures, competences)
▪ Etc.
▪ Empathy and interest in individuals
▪ Motivation (intrinsic, instrumental, utility, etc.)
▪ Patience (under time pressure)
▪ Understanding student learning challenges
▪ Cultural, social, language, academic differences
▪ Etc.

Figure 4: Competences in students and teachers that could be monitored in a quality management system for an internationally profiled EMI programme (not exhaustive). Items in bold are assumed particularly to impact on the quality of the international profile of an EMI programme.

Programme design factors Institutional contextual factors
Management
▪ Teacher recruitment and staff development
▪ Multilingual / multicultural group composition (nationality, languages, gender, competences)
▪ Group interaction (attention to awareness of individual differences, inclusion/exclusion potential)
▪ Identity building (belonging to academic & cultural community)
▪ Strategies for cooperation
▪ Documentation of outcomes (e.g. transcripts)
▪ Monitoring, auditing
▪ Etc.
Facilities
▪ Physical buildings, equipment
▪ Library, ICT
▪ Support systems
▪ Etc.

Figure 5: Factors in programme design and institutional context that could be monitored in a quality management system for an internationally profiled EMI programme (not exhaustive)

6. Conclusion

In this article, I have sketched the background to quality in the contemporary higher education context. Higher education has become a neo-liberal market (e.g. Wilkins 2012), subject to competitive forces, whereby efficiency has a
critical role. Quality is a comparative concept where ranking, benchmarking and outputs are decisive. Quality, however, remains a rather elusive concept, the definition of which depends on who is making it. Because higher education has such a diversity of stakeholders, the manner in which quality can be conceptualized depends primarily which stakeholder or stakeholders are concerned. Quality in the eyes of students will differ from how it is construed by employers. Moreover, a distinction can be made concerning the object of quality management, whether we are concerned with teaching or research, whether it is a question of the institution as a whole or of an individual programme. I have adopted the conceptual model of quality elaborated by Schindler et al. (2015), which depends primarily on the stakeholders concerned and then on four broad conceptualizations of quality that may be sought, before identifying the potential indicators for the chosen conceptualization.

After briefly looking at how quality of higher education is assessed in the Netherlands, I have reviewed the Dutch approach to the quality of internationalization, before delving into the nature and quality of EMI and internationally profiled programmes. The final part looks at aspects and factors that could be measured theoretically to monitor the quality of an internationally profiled EMI programme. I refer here to the work in the project "Developing Quality Management Parameters for International Profiles in Universities of Applied Sciences" (see Studer, this issue). The more numerous and the more finely calibrated the factor (or descriptor), the more unworkable the quality management of programmes become.

Apart from the detail of descriptors used to measure quality, there is a second risk in quality management, the scope of international comparison. The more complex and the more transnational the system, the less it reflects the national culture and national politics (see Stensaker & Gornitzka 2009: 125, who comment on the difficulty of establishing trust across nation states). Transnational quality management risks distancing itself from what national stakeholders (e.g. taxpayers) may view as quality. What is quality in internationally profiled programme through an additional language may often be an intangible interaction between student, teacher, programme and context. Quality is the balanced outcome of practices, processes, procedures, expectations, beliefs, attitudes, and values, some of which can be managed.
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1. Introduction

This paper deals with the English-medium classroom in higher education, and specifically with the English-taught programme (ETP), which is a widespread means of internationalizing higher education curricula in Switzerland (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 38-39). While internationalized curricula can take different forms and may serve different purposes (e.g. van der Wende 1996a+b), in reality the main driver behind the change of the medium of instruction has been the idea to design curricula so as to attract a foreign student population. This narrow perception of the internationalized classroom is encouraged by quality indicators used to measure and rank university internationalization profiles (e.g. Times Higher Education), which focus strongly on the number of foreign students enrolled in universities.

Such a narrow view of internationalization, however, stands in sharp contrast to insights from research (e.g. Hudzik 2011, 2015; Wächter 2003; Leask 2015; Green & Whitsed 2015) and current EU policy efforts emphasizing a more
inclusive and comprehensive approach to internationalization that focuses on the integration of a "global dimension in the design and content of all curricula and teaching/learning processes" (European Commission 2013: 6). This expanded perception of internationalization is often referred to as internationalization at home. Beelen & Leask (2011: 5) suggest that internationalization at home comprises "a set of instruments and activities 'at home' that focus on developing international and intercultural competences in all students" (my emphasis). While internationalization at home can include foreign students, its key objective is to include, and to offer to, all domestic students an international learning environment (for a full argumentation, cf. de Wit et al. 2015: 49, also Sursock 2015: 71). The establishment of ETPs, therefore, can be viewed as part of a university's efforts at internationalizing its regular study portfolio by incorporating "an international and intercultural dimension into the preparation, delivery and outcomes of a programme of study" (Leask 2009: 209).

If ETPs are introduced in an effort to internationalize a curriculum in a comprehensive way, three questions emerge prominently: Firstly, to what degree does comprehensive internationalization of a study programme require broader curricular adjustments (modifications in study content, additional modules, etc.)? Secondly, how can the use of English as a medium of instruction contribute to internationalization in a comprehensive sense? Thirdly, how can we translate the extended role of English in the classroom into teaching competences?

This paper provides first tentative answers to the second and third questions, reporting on how language-related teaching competence parameters were developed through and for class evaluation. Ultimately, such teaching competence parameters can be used to assess a teacher's suitability to participate in ETPs. The parameters were developed in the framework of a project entitled 'Internationalization of Universities of Applied Sciences', funded by SERI (State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation) and tested in a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration study programme in a University of Applied Sciences in Switzerland.¹

2. Conceptual considerations

There are different labels that are used to refer to the integration of language into content teaching, which reflect different approaches and terminologies. The most common labels found in the literature are CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) and EMI (English-medium Instruction). Despite various attempts at

¹ I would like to acknowledge the valuable advice and thoughts of all colleagues and experts who collaborated on the development of the competence parameters presented in this paper. I particularly wish to thank Bob Wilkinson for critical reflections on a draft version of this paper.
clarification, there is considerable overlap between these approaches in terms of the bandwidth of language integration they allow into their definition and the educational contexts they may refer to (e.g. Greere & Räsänen 2008; Dafouz & Smit 2014; Macaro et al. 2018).

English-medium instruction (EMI) is not a clearly defined self-contained linguistic phenomenon. It broadly refers to a communicative event that is characterized by the switch of classroom language into English in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the population is not English (for an operational definition cf. Dearden 2014: 2). EMI is often defined as a vehicle of internationalization aiming to make a geographical area more attractive to foreign students and to the broader international academic community, while improving domestic students' English language abilities (e.g. for the Taiwanese context: Chen & Tsai 2012: 186-187). At the simplest level, EMI refers to content being delivered in a classroom through English.

Whereas, in EMI, language is often conceptualized as having no function other than being the medium through which content is delivered, both ICL and CLIL tend to be located at the other end of a continuum where language is simultaneously a medium and the object of instruction (e.g. Wilkinson & Zegers 2007 on ICL; Dalton-Puffer 2011 on CLIL; see also Wilkinson this volume). We could, with reference to Smit & Dafouz (2012) and Dafouz & Smit (2014), tentatively distinguish between CLIL and ICL in that the former approach represents the integration of formal language objectives into the curriculum; ICL, on the other hand, refers to the communicative focus of content teaching, which requires some attention to the language used in class. In higher education, and especially in contexts where no additional support from language teachers is possible, the function of English in reality often falls on the EMI end of the continuum. Content teachers often neither possess the language skills nor the linguistic awareness (or interest) needed to pay attention to questions of language development in their lesson planning and delivery.

The answer to the question as to where to place content teachers on the continuum from EMI to ICL and CLIL is not an easy one to find. It crucially depends on role we attribute to the L2-medium teacher in the internationalized curriculum and the perceptions of quality we associate with programmes taught through English. There exist, to date, only a few studies that attempt to define the role of language in higher education from the perspective of teaching quality. In Freiburg, Germany, for example, the university’s language learning centre has developed an internal Quality Management Scheme for organizational units wishing to have their international profile options certified (cf. Gundermann and Dubow, this volume). The Freiburg model is, in part, based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR 2001) and a previous Quality Management scheme developed at Copenhagen (TOEPAS cf. Kling & Stæhr 2012; Kling 2015). While I commend these efforts in that they raise questions
about quality in internationalized curricula that centre on language and communication, we have to view these previous approaches as culturally and institutionally bound in that they were developed to address specific local teaching and learning contexts. Moreover, both approaches focus on the EMI end of the continuum.

Both quality management schemes, Freiburg and Copenhagen, focus on the language behaviour of content teachers in ETPs, which is assessed through observation. This focus on content teachers is in line with the literature on internationalization which emphasizes the teachers' 'pivotal', 'indispensable', 'primary' role in implementing policy on the ground (Green & Whitsed 2015: 8; Hudzik 2011, Leask & Bridge 2013). While both quality schemes, Freiburg and Copenhagen, focus on teacher observation, only Freiburg observes teachers at work; in the case of Copenhagen, mock-performances are examined. When speaking of teacher observation, in the context of the present paper, I refer to the Freiburg approach as it allows us to collect more holistic and comprehensive data (teacher self-assessment, student evaluation and observation notes), which is line with Rowley's (1997: 9) call for the inclusion of all stakeholders involved in the "service experience."

If we try to define an extended role of English in higher education in the sense of ICL or CLIL, we need to think about what English language use can do in the regular content class. Broadly speaking, the switch of language helps students build up English language and communicative proficiency in their fields of study, thus facilitating the development of the "extensive mix of skills" students need in order to "function in complex environments" (Sursock 2015: 15). Thus, they learn to use English in (potentially work-relevant) contexts of study. At the same time, it may also mean that they learn about the language they use so they understand the potential and limitation of communicating through an L2-medium.

Which components of the L2 can be actively developed in the content classroom? If we picture the content classroom as a place in which teachers and students are co-present physically or virtually for the purpose of teaching and learning, then oral communication clearly constitutes the main characteristic of this particular communicative situation. Indeed, speaking has been identified as one skill area in L2-medium instruction where students tend to make the biggest progress, especially at undergraduate level (e.g. Rogier 2012; cf. also Ruiz de Zarobe 2008; Lasagabaster 2008).

In terms of general language skills, there are two areas that lend themselves to active development, especially at undergraduate level: vocabulary and speech control. Vocabulary (together with morphology), alongside elements of speech performance such as fluency and quantity, has long been identified as direct language learning benefits of CLIL at primary and secondary school levels (Dalton-Puffer 2008). Vocabulary training not only actively facilitates the
students' language development but also supports general academic performance. Previous studies have pointed out that students perceived their lack in disciplinary and general academic vocabulary as a key obstacle to subject comprehension while listening to English-medium teachers (e.g. Hong-Kong: Evans & Morrison 2011; generally: Berman and Cheng 2001; on vocabulary thresholds Laufer & Ravenhorst-Kalovski 2010). The fact that international students often struggle with understanding their English-medium teachers, even when these teachers are native speakers (Berman & Cheng 2001: 26), underlines the importance of students' passive and active speech control in classes delivered through English. The suitability of speech control training is further supported by recent insight into students' foreign accent development in EMI, also when the students' instructors were non-native speakers of English (Richter 2015).

Dalton-Puffer (2008), and other colleagues (Hüttner & Rieder-Bünemann 2010; Studer & Konstantinidou 2015), have further documented the benefit of ICL/CLIL and EMI in building confidence of speaking and general confidence in one's language ability, developing flexibility in spontaneous speech, engaging in dialogue, or listening actively to others. These competence areas, in part, make up what, with reference to the CEFR, could be understood as discourse, strategic and interactional competences. These competence areas can be connected to broader communicative activities, such as:

- monologic activities, such as presenting to an audience (cf. productive activities and strategies, particularly oral production, CEFR 2001: 4.4.1);
- dialogic activities, such as conducting an interview or moderating (cf. interactive activities and strategies, particularly spoken interaction, CEFR 2001: 4.4.3);
- self-directed correction activities activating resources to overcome communication problems (CEFR 2001: 4.4.1.3).

Communicative activities such as these constitute, as Rogier (2012: 133) points out, elements of L2-medium instruction that may benefit student language and communication learning. A language-sensitive content teacher, therefore, can be pictured as someone who is able to facilitate learning experiences with activities that allow students to use the language, alone and in teams, in professionally and study-relevant communicative situations. This idea of a joint class experience where learning takes place through oral exchange and negotiation can be referred to, broadly, as a teacher's "ability to create an interactive environment," which constitutes one of the two most important attributes found by Dearden (2014: 24) to describe an English-medium teacher. The most important attribute of an English-medium teacher, according to Dearden (2014: 24), can be related to the delivery of content, i.e. the "ability to explain difficult concepts."
Interactivity, as well as the successful delivery of content, are aspects of a learning experience that seem to reflect lecturing quality in general. Revell & Wainwright (2009: 214), for example, suggest that the quality of a lecture depends strongly on participation, interaction of students, structural clarity, and rapport. All elements, with the exception of structural clarity, follow from a teacher's effort to enhance and facilitate interactivity in the classroom. The change of language, or generally the use of a language which may be neither the teachers' nor the students' first language, offers an opportunity to participants to engage through attention to the medium of communication they share. But it is precisely this that presents EMI teachers with problems. Teachers may not feel adequately confident, prepared or willing to take advantage of the communicative opportunities they have. Instead, teachers who struggle with the language change may over-focus on content delivery (Rogier 2012: 125).

From what has been said so far, it seems only logical to assume that if teaching quality is connected to interactivity and the active use of speech in ways outlined above, then an ETP teacher, to some limited extent, also assumes the role of the students' communication instructor or, at least, their communication facilitator. From this also follows that language and communication teaching methodology forms an integral part of considerations of ETP quality and, consequently, of ETP teacher assessment. While the language-methodological considerations for ETP quality await further clarification, such considerations will likely draw inspiration from student-centred approaches surrounding content-based instruction, as described, for example, by Krahnke (1987), and from ideas following task-based learning, as originally developed by Willis (1996).

3. Developing language-related quality parameters for teachers

3.1 Competence dimensions

In the following sections, I will summarize how the above conceptual considerations guided us in the definition, and revision, of ETP teacher competence parameters in developing an observation protocol to be used for the purpose of evaluating language-related teaching performance in the classroom.

In a first step, broad competence dimensions, or areas, were proposed by a small team of researchers which would align with the vision of the internationalized classroom presented above. These dimensions were then refined further into analytic categories relevant to the context studied. While no in-depth description of these dimensions and categories can be provided here, I will briefly outline their main characteristics and purpose in the study.
Six potentially relevant competence dimensions were identified by the research team that relate to L2-medium content teachers:

1. Basic language competence
2. Strategic competence
3. Monologic competence
4. Dialogic competence
5. Communicative-didactic competence (ICL)
6. Language-didactic competence (CLIL)

Basic language competence (1) was understood as the language-competence threshold, a necessary pre-condition of successful classroom performance that would be noticed mainly if absent. Strategic competence (2) was conceptualized as the ability to cope with challenges in producing speech (repair, achievement, avoidance, etc.). In addition to language and strategic competence dimensions, four other dimensions were identified that were to reflect language-related teaching competences as we move from EMI to ICL and CLIL.

Monologic competence (3) referred to hearer-oriented discourse competence (discourse structuring, cohesion, logic). Dialogic competence (4) was used as an umbrella category to describe instances of the explicit inclusion of the 'other' in the joint construction of meaning (asking questions, joint consolidation of content). While monologic competence was perceived as important mainly from a content learning perspective in episodes of a class where information had to be delivered or concepts consolidated and explained, interactivity and opportunities for active student participation were believed to show greater potential for language learning.

The two dimensions (5 & 6) were to draw attention to a teacher's deliberate attention to language, i.e. on episodes during a content class which were dialogic with an ICL purpose or with a CLIL focus. Dimension (6), language-didactic competence, would even potentially extend to lesson-planning efforts that address language and communication objectives as well as language teaching methodology.

The six dimensions were not understood as forming a scale but they were viewed as making different contributions to the English-medium classroom, ranging from language production and delivery, to the inclusion of students and systematic attention to language. While not necessarily representing progressive steps of complexity, the competence dimensions closer to the language-didactic end of the continuum were assumed to present a greater challenge to teachers than those at the language-production end. It was assumed that there would be little evidence of ICL or CLIL in the classroom where the field experiment was planned.
3.2 Analytic categories

Following the establishment of broad analytic dimensions, analytic sub-categories were defined that could be assigned to the six dimensions. The following points guided the definition of sub-categories:

1. Existing sub-categories from the CEFR (2001) were included where possible.
2. Where the CEFR (2001) did not suggest any meaningful sub-category, new sub-categories were defined.
3. Each sub-category was to consist of one positively-worded can-do descriptor.
4. The sub-categories were to reflect a high degree of detail allowing for the re-construction and diagnosis of communicative teaching behaviour and were expected to be reduced gradually to a number of qualitatively distinctive parameters after revision and application (CEFR 2001: 37-38; Alderson 1991).
5. No limit was set as to the number of sub-categories included at this point.

Initially, we defined 25 analytic categories for observation of speaking and interaction in the international classroom under the six analytic dimensions, which is seen in table 1 (version 'zero').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General language competence</th>
<th>1. Vocabulary range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Vocabulary control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Phonological control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fluency and Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Grammatical control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic competence</td>
<td>6. Planning action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Compensating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Monitoring and repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Listening comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Understanding conversation between speakers from different cultural backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologic competence</td>
<td>11. Overall oral production (monologic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Sustained monologue (descriptive or putting a case):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Addressing audiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Version 'zero'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogic competence</th>
<th>14. Conversation (social use of language)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Formal discussions and meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Goal-oriented cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Non-/paraverbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Identifying cues and inferring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative-didactic competence (ICL)</td>
<td>19. Facilitating a positive learning experience of students in L2 situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Using multilingualism in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Managing teaching units facilitating student orientation in a L2 situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-didactic competence (CLIL)</td>
<td>22. Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Facilitating comprehension and development of L2 register (domain-specific lexical range and control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Facilitating comprehension and development of students' ability to pronounce L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Facilitating development of communication skills in L2 (domain- and situation-specific)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 First revision of descriptors through expert feedback

Once the analytic categories had been defined, a first version of descriptors was drafted (at least one descriptor per analytic category). In this initial phase, descriptors were based, in wording, as closely as possible on the CEFR (2001) illustrative bank of validated descriptors (level C1), in line with the Freiburg approach (Gundermann & Dubow, this volume), where an analogous procedure was chosen. Especially categories relating to ICL/CLIL competences, however, did not have CEFR (2001) equivalents so that descriptors had to be formulated by the research team. Most descriptors for categories that did have CEFR equivalents had to be adapted to the particular context under investigation.

The aim of the subsequent revisions was two-fold: First, the extensive list of categories was to be consolidated so as to identify distinctive categories relevant to teacher observation in the context of ETPs; second, the descriptions belonging to the categories were to be revised so as to make them "clear, transparent and useful" (North 1995: 449). The revision process loosely followed the Delphi method of reflective research whereby group communication (in our case: ETP experts) is structured in a way as to be able to deal with complex problems. The communication typically involves: "some feedback of individual contributions of information and knowledge; some assessment of the group judgment or view; some opportunity for individuals to revise views; and some degree of anonymity for the individual responses" (Linstone & Turoff 1975/2002).
In a first revision, the descriptors were fed into a database and sent to 25 EMI experts from the project network contacts. The experts were to score each descriptor according to its perceived importance in ETP teacher observation (no importance, little importance, moderate importance, high importance) and were invited to suggest alternative formulations, modifications, additions, or to provide any other qualitative feedback. The results from this consultation were analysed, presented in a project meeting and further consolidated in a workshop with the same experts. Based on these results, a consolidated list of descriptors was produced.

Of the 25 experts participating in the consultation, seventeen completed the questionnaire fully. Based on the results from the consultation, the descriptors were divided into three categories: highly important, moderately important and little important. Highly important descriptors were defined as those by a minimum of ten experts (c. 60%) and would, together with those ticking moderate importance, be found important by at least more than 70% of the participants. There were seven descriptors that could be classified as highly important.

Three of the seven highly important descriptors referred to teachers' language competence in terms of their vocabulary control, vocabulary range, and their phonological control. One highly important descriptor referred to strategic competence (compensation abilities: circumlocution and paraphrasing, descriptor 7). The remaining three highly important descriptors emphasized dialogic and language-methodological competences. Dialogic competence descriptor 16 (goal-oriented cooperation) received a high rating similar to compensation strategies. The expert participants further found descriptor 19 (positive attitude to the L2 classroom) and, to a lesser degree, the language-didactic descriptor 22 (lesson planning) to be of high importance. However, the experts found this last descriptor (22) in need of rewording. It is worth mentioning that none of the monologic abilities listed above were found to be highly important.

Fifteen descriptors fell into the bracket 'moderately important'. In the bracket 'moderately important', raters seemed less unanimous, which was seen in the variance of the scores awarded to individual descriptors as well as in the experts, qualitative feedback. There were four descriptors that fell into the bracket 'little importance'. These included two descriptors from the category dialogic competence (descriptor 14 on the teacher's ability to use language for social purposes and descriptor 18 on the teacher's ability to infer from, and react to, student input). The results of this first consultation and expert workshop led to a consolidated list of descriptors, which was to be used in a field study.
3.3.1 Consolidated list of descriptors for field study

The consolidated list comprised sixteen descriptors. In total, nine descriptors were dropped or amalgamated with other descriptors. Eight descriptors were left unchanged; eight descriptors were modified. I will focus, in particular, on the changes made to the original descriptions. Note that the revised descriptors are referred to by lower case letters; the original descriptors are numbered as in table 1.

There were four language competence descriptors following revision as displayed in table 2 (a through d). Descriptors a) and b) dealt with vocabulary while descriptors c) and d) focused on phonological control and fluency. As there had been some overlap between the original descriptors 1 and 2, it was decided to shorten descriptor 2, removing redundant parts dealing with vocabulary range. In line with the outcome of the consultation and the follow-up consolidation workshop with experts, descriptor 5 on grammatical control was dropped altogether.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Can select appropriate formulations from a broad range of domain and discourse-specific language to express him/herself clearly, without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.</td>
<td>Vocabulary range</td>
<td>No revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Uses vocabulary sufficiently accurately so as to support, and not distract from, the content of the lesson.</td>
<td>Vocabulary control</td>
<td>Re-phrasing, deletion of focus on range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Pronunciation is comfortably intelligible to speakers with different L1, sentence stress and intonation supports his/her message, speech rate is at an appropriate level.</td>
<td>Phonological control</td>
<td>No revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Speaks fluently, allowing gaps to be readily overcome with circumlocutions; little obvious searching for expressions or avoidance strategies. No major language-related disruptions, pauses or gap-fillers. Speaker uses discourse connectives and cohesion markers appropriately.</td>
<td>Cohesion and fluency</td>
<td>No revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Consolidated list of descriptors of language competence

Out of the five descriptors belonging to the dimension of strategic competence, two remained on the consolidated list in table 3. A new descriptor e) was suggested as an amalgamation of the original descriptors 7 and 8 (compensating, monitoring and repair). Descriptor f) was also formed as a result of joining two descriptors (9 and 10) and was adapted to focus on a teacher's interviewing abilities with students, such as comprehension and clarification checks. The original descriptor 6 (planning) was dropped.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Can recognize the cause of communication breakdowns and implement repair strategies, such as circumlocution and paraphrase to cover gaps in vocabulary and structure. Can backtrack when he/she encounters a difficulty and reformulate what he/she wants to say without fully interrupting the flow of speech.</td>
<td>Monitoring and repair (compensation included as repair strategy)</td>
<td>Amalgamation of descriptors 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Shows ability to follow extended and complex spontaneous speech of L2 users from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds through clarification and comprehension checks even when the speech is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly.</td>
<td>Active listening comprehension</td>
<td>Focus on interviewing techniques, amalgamation of descriptors 9 and 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Consolidated list of descriptors of strategic competence

Monologic competence in table 4 was reduced to one descriptor only, reflecting the moderate importance given to this category by the experts in the consultation and the consolidation workshop. The new descriptor g) presented an amalgamation of several descriptors (11, 12 and 13). In line with the expert's call for a more holistic approach to rating, Descriptor 11 (overall oral production) was used as the basis for the new descriptor g) and was expanded by other elements, such as descriptive and argumentative points from descriptor 12 and handling of interjections from descriptor 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Can give clear, detailed descriptions and presentations on complex subjects, integrating sub-themes, developing particular descriptive or argumentative points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion. Can handle interjections from the audience well, responding spontaneously and almost effortlessly</td>
<td>Communicative competence, overall oral production (monologic)</td>
<td>Amalgamation descriptors 11, 12 and 13, more holistic description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Consolidated list of descriptors of monologic competence

In the consolidated list detailing dialogic competence (table 5), four out of five descriptors were retained, as the experts acknowledged the emphasis given to interactive activities in the literature. Descriptor 18 (inferring from student input) was dropped as it had been accorded low importance by the experts and seemed difficult to measure through observation. Descriptor 16 (goal-oriented cooperation) was kept with a slight modification. Descriptor 14 (ability to use language for social purposes, conversation) was retained because of disagreement among the experts. The text was, however, modified slightly to include the function of social language to build rapport with the audience. Descriptor 17 (non- and para-verbal behavior) was retained for the same reasons but was left unchanged. Descriptor 15 (formal discussion and meetings) was kept with a new focus on moderation and session chairing abilities.
h) Can use language flexibly and effectively to build rapport with the audience, including emotional, allusive and joking usage.

Sub-category: Conversation
Revision: Re-phrasing, focus on audience rapport

i) Allows student counter arguments and can easily keep up with a discussion/debate. Can chair a discussion/debate convincingly, responding to questions and comments and answering complex lines of counter argument fluently, spontaneously and appropriately.

Sub-category: Formal discussion and meetings
Revision: Re-phrasing, focus on moderation

j) Effectively helps along the learning progress of students by allowing time for and inviting students to join in, say what they think and by continuously checking their understanding.

Sub-category: Goal-oriented co-operation
Revision: Re-phrasing, clarification

k) Conveys confidence in his/her delivery, e.g. through body language, intonation, positioning himself/herself to achieve maximum visibility while maintaining (eye-)contact with the students.

Sub-category: Non-/para-verbal communication
Revision: No revision

Table 5: Consolidated list of descriptors of dialogic competence

With regard to the category of communicative-didactic competence (ICL) in table 6, two out of three descriptors were retained (descriptor 19, positive attitude, and descriptor 21, managing teaching units). Descriptor 19 was considered highly important by the group but was felt difficult to measure. The group of experts suggested adding examples of observable display of attitude. Descriptor 19 was subsequently amalgamated with descriptor 20 (use of multiple languages as one example of showing a positive attitude to multilingualism). Descriptor 21 was kept without further revisions.

l) Conveys a positive attitude towards the L2 situation, drawing attention to multilingualism and multiculturalism as a resource and opportunity for learning and classroom interaction by some of the following measures:
   - By meta-communication addressing the audience as a multilingual and multicultural learning group
   - By meta-communication referring to the professional world as an international space
   - By addressing the cultural or linguistic significance of study content (e.g. in examples used for illustration of content)
   - (In monolingual groups) by using L1 on a principled, didactic basis;
   - (In multilingual groups) by using other languages or references to etymology to clarify terms/concepts.

Sub-category: Facilitating a positive learning experience of students in L2 situation
Revision: Re-phrasing, clarification and list of examples, amalgamation with descriptor 20

m) Manages a teaching unit appropriately in an L2 situation by clearly introducing context, goals and the stages of the session at the start, indicating the different stages during the session, and summarizing the session by revisiting the main points.

Sub-category: Managing teaching units facilitating student orientation in an L2 situation
Revision: No revision

Table 6: Consolidated list of descriptors of language-methodological competence (ICL)
In the area of language-didactic competence (CLIL) in table 7, descriptor 24 (development of phonological control) was dropped from the list for conceptual reasons. Descriptor 22, which was the only highly important descriptor from the original list, was left as it was despite the experts' initial suggestion for rewording. The consolidation workshop did not reveal any concrete points for modification. Descriptors 23 (development of L2 register) and 25 (opportunities for students to use L2 in authentic situations) were retained without modifications at this point as there had been disagreement about their suitability in teacher observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Can plan teaching units that address learning needs of students in specific study contexts (seminar, tutorial, lecture, laboratory), taking into consideration the language level of audience, including visual aids (e.g. slides) or other support (e.g. handouts), the selection of appropriate texts / tasks for preparation and post-mortem analysis.</td>
<td>Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2</td>
<td>No revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| o) | Displays appropriate awareness of the students' challenges in using L2 register by some of the following measures:  
• By consolidating (whole-class) of terminology, concepts  
• By ensuring that new material is intelligible by inferencing from verbal context, visual support, etc.  
• By student elicitation or dictionary, etc. look-up as needed for specific tasks and activities  
• By presenting words accompanied by visuals (pictures, gestures and miming, demonstrative actions, realia, etc.)  
• By the provision of word-lists, etc. with translation equivalents  
• By exploring semantic fields and constructing 'mind-maps', etc. | Facilitating comprehension and development of L2 register (domain-specific lexical range and control) | No revision  |
| p) | Displays appropriate awareness of communicative needs of students by creating opportunities for students to participate directly in authentic communicative interaction in L2, including group activities and tasks, role-play, simulations, mini-presentations, etc. | Facilitating development of communication skills in L2 (domain-and situation-specific) | No revision  |

Table 7: Consolidated list of descriptors of language-methodological competence (CLIL)

3.4 Application of descriptors in field study

The resulting sixteen descriptors were subsequently tested in a field study in one University of Applied Sciences in Switzerland. The English-taught programme observed was an international study option of the BSc in Business Administration, a full-time degree programme entirely taught through English (see Ali-Lawson & Bürgi, this volume). The first full-time class in this programme commenced in 2012 and, at the time of the present study, included 95 students who constituted approximately half the student population of the programme, and 31 teachers. In the course of this field study, one full week's worth of studies (10 courses in 8 modules at 90 minutes, involving 8 teachers) was observed by
6 expert raters. If possible two raters were co-present to share impressions after the class. All raters were invited to take free notes on their observations using the consolidated list of descriptors and provide a short report at the end of their observations.

All raters received two documents with the descriptors, one for grading the teachers on a scale from 3 to 6 (6 being excellent and 4 being a pass) and one for the rating of the descriptors themselves. In the assessment of the descriptors, the raters could indicate whether a descriptor was useful in evaluating a teacher's performance, helpful in consolidating the rater's overall impression of the class, important in terms of construct relevance, easy to use, observable in the classroom or possibly redundant.

In the following, I look at the raters' experiences in the field in greater detail, starting with their feedback on the construct relevance of the consolidated list of descriptors when applying them in the field. For this purpose, raters were asked to indicate on the sheet their score for each descriptor in terms of whether or not they found it relevant to the construct of teacher competence for teaching in English-medium programmes (1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree; 3: agree; 4: strongly agree). Three raters returned their completed forms after class observation. Three raters did not use these forms but commented freely on the descriptors. The results from the completed forms are summarized in table 8.

If unanimous agreement about a descriptor's relevance to the construct being measured were a pre-condition for inclusion, then the forms indicated that four descriptors should be considered highly construct relevant. The raters focused their attention on language competence (vocabulary range and phonological control), on dialogic behavior (goal-oriented cooperation), and on communicative-didactic competence (ICL) (structural explicitness). Still relevant, yet slightly less so than the previous ones, the raters identified six descriptors in the dimensions of language competence (cohesion and fluency), strategic competence (monitoring and repair), monologic competence (overall oral production), dialogic competence (formal discussions and meetings) and language-didactic competence (CLIL) (planning teaching units, development of L2 register). The two descriptors on language-didactic competence received the highest points in the bracket 'relevant'. Feedback on the remaining six descriptors (b, f, h, k, l, p) was mixed so that they could not be considered as relevant to the construct under investigation.
The analysis of construct relevance was compared to the free comments by the raters in their teacher evaluation forms and their final reports. In total, fifteen completed teacher evaluation sheets were received from four raters. Due to unforeseen circumstances, however, one rater dropped out so that one rater had to fill in nine evaluation sheets alone. One rater did not fill in evaluation sheets but commented freely on the observations.

One aspect that stood out when comparing notes and evaluation sheets was the overall positive impression of the teachers' performances. No teacher gave the impression that he or she might have failed the evaluation; on the contrary, performance was generally rated between good and very good. It seemed that four competence dimensions were selected more rigorously than others: Language competence, dialogic competence, communicative-didactic competence (ICL) and language-didactic competence (CLIL).

The raters tended to be particularly strict in awarding full points on phonological control; most teachers were only given the second highest points or even lower scores. The reasons for giving lower scores listed in the comments section ranged from speech production criteria such as "intelligible but accented", "mispronunciations", to speech performance criteria such as speech rate ("high speech rate") or speech monotony ("monotonous, doesn't project voice"). While speech performance criteria emphasized the raters' focus on students and the idea that students may easily feel overburdened, the comments on the teachers' speech production abilities seemed to indicate an underlying native-speaker orientation as accent and mispronunciations were taken as sufficient reason to reduce points even when it did not affect intelligibility. Overall, speech performance criteria had a greater impact on the points than speech production ability.

With regard to dialogic competence, there were few lower points in the evaluations of teachers, which did not seem to impact the overall assessment of their performance considerably. The lowest points were awarded on descriptor (j) (goal-oriented cooperation); some lower scores were also found in
descriptor (i) (formal discussions and meetings). The comments raters provided on their evaluation sheets raised the point that it could not always be observed and that raters did not know how to treat it if it was not visible in a class. Goal-oriented cooperation, on the other hand, was always found to be present in some measurable way. The descriptors on goal-oriented cooperation and formal discussions and meetings were seen to be serving the same goal, offering an interpretation of dialogic competence as a quality ensuring comprehension through repeated information rather than through convincing students of specific points. This interpretation of the teachers revealed a picture of dialogue which was information-heavy. It is not surprising, in this context, that other dialogic descriptors such as self-confident appearance and 'positive face-work' (reduction of teacher-student distance through e.g. humour) as in descriptors (h) and (k) were seen as irrelevant to the construct being measured. While new teacher models stress the role of the teacher as a coach rather than someone passing information onto students, the use and feedback on dialogic competence descriptors in the field suggested an underlying picture of the teacher who primarily imparts knowledge onto students.

There was considerably more variance in points awarded in the areas of ICL and CLIL. Within communicative-didactic competence (ICL), descriptor (l), emphasizing a positive attitude to the L2, received the least attention by the observers. If it was felt to be present, which was mostly the case, it received full points; if absent, none. In other words, there was very little nuance in grading a teacher's attitude and enthusiasm in an L2 situation. Feedback on descriptor (l) emphasized that it was too broad for assessment. Descriptor (m) (structural explicitness), on the other hand, was felt to be more relevant to teacher performance and was perceived to be straightforward for assessment. Approximately half of the evaluation sheets contained slightly lower scores under this category. The interpretation of descriptor m in the field supported previous notions of students tending to feel overburdened by the L2 situation and needing clear signposting.

Of the three language-didactic descriptors, descriptor (n) (lesson planning) received little critical rater attention. Teachers generally received medium to high points on this descriptor, with some indication in the feedback sheets that the descriptor was difficult to assess. Descriptors (o) and (p) (L2-lexical development and the creation of authentic opportunities to use the L2) were applied most rigorously by the rater team of all descriptors in the areas of ICL and CLIL. With regard to descriptor (o), most teachers did not receive high points and, in some cases, the observers noted that they found no evidence of active register development in the class. There was one teacher with a mere pass and three teachers that failed on this particular descriptor. With regard to descriptor (p), the points teachers received were even lower. One teacher only received a pass on descriptor (p) and seven teachers even failed. Feedback on these two descriptors was critical to the extent that the raters questioned
whether content teachers could be asked to provide active language-learning opportunities. Especially descriptor (p) was controversially discussed by the raters.

4. Discussion and conclusion

This paper set out to describe experiences made in a research project that focused on the development of quality parameters for observation of English-medium teachers in English-taught programmes in Swiss higher education. The project first situated broader internationalization trends, drawing attention to the fact that comprehensive internationalization needs to lead to a more systematic inclusion of language into content teaching.

The paper then presented conceptual considerations underlying teacher observations and the rationale for the development of analytic dimensions, categories and descriptors. In a third step, the paper discussed the qualitative revision processes the descriptors underwent and first experiences made with a consolidated list of descriptors in the field.

The paper suggests that if we are to reduce the number of descriptors to ones that are distinctive to the context studied, then our focus shifts to five analytic sub-categories for further development. This revised list of descriptors underlines the impression that language-related quality in ETP teaching, in the eyes of experts, is connected to

1. phonological control in L2, i.e. little accent, hearer-oriented speech rate and lively intonation (general language competence)
2. student comprehension (dialogic competence)
3. explicit content structure (communicative-didactic competence ICL)
4. L2-consolidation activities (language-didactic competence CLIL)
5. opportunities for L2 use in classroom (language-didactic competence CLIL)

This reduced and revised list of descriptors marks a clear departure from previous approaches as it emphasizes interactive and didactic competences in an L2-medium context, conceptualizing the L2 as an object of learning in the observation of ETP teacher performance. Descriptors such as the ones presented in this study can be developed further into scales and may ultimately have practical use in quality assurance of ETPs, suggesting paths for teacher training and evaluation. At a broader level, this study has attempted to make an initial contribution to the discussion of quality in ETPs by highlighting the teacher's role as a language and communication facilitator in a comprehensively internationalized classroom.
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Les mesures de qualité dans l’enseignement supérieur ont tendance à accorder une plus grande importance aux connaissances du contenu de la discipline de la part du professeur et à sa recherche qu’à ses compétences pédagogiques, qui sont plutôt négligées ou considérées comme allant de soi. Cependant, les mesures de qualité pour les enseignants dans les contextes EMI, où les apprenants et les enseignants n'ont pas l'anglais comme langue maternelle, doivent inclure des aspects linguistiques et didactiques. La fiche d'observation créée dans le cadre du projet de recherche «Internationalisation of Universities of Applied Sciences» (voir Studere ce numéro) est l'un des outils qui abordent la qualité de la performance des enseignants EMI en classe. Le présent article vise à mettre en évidence la pratique pédagogique EMI et ses implications sur la qualité en rendant compte des perceptions de huit enseignants EMI. Dix séances EMI différentes mises en place par huit enseignants ont été observées et évaluées en termes de qualité à l'aide de cette fiche d'observation. Les perceptions des enseignants sur les séances ont ensuite été recueillies au moyen d'un entretien et d'un questionnaire en ligne. Les résultats révèlent que, bien que les enseignants observés n'aient pas affiché certains des paramètres sur la fiche d'observation, la fiche reste un outil précieux pour évaluer la qualité de l'enseignement EMI parce qu'elle tient compte de la complexité de ce contexte.
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1. Introduction

Higher Education Institutions (HEI) have been adopting English Mediated Instruction (EMI) at an ever-increasing rate in the last decade. With this increase, the challenges that EMI implementation brings about have become evident (Shohamy 2013; Wilkinson 2013). For example, in terms of overall organisation, HEIs have had to overcome the fact that no specific language policies were established before the spread of EMI, or that empirical research and budgets were not attuned to the EMI context (Hernandez-Nanclares & Jimenez-Munoz 2015). Some other points of concern include intercultural communication issues (Klaassen & De Graaff 2001), an increasing workload for both lecturers (Vinke et al. 1998) and students (Tatzl 2011) or a reduction in the amount of content that can be taught in EMI compared to teaching in the native language (Costa & Coleman 2010).

Since EMI courses are taught in countries where English is not the native language, the linguistic aspect is one of the main concerns that seems to affect both EMI students and lecturers (Cots 2013; Lasagabaster & Sierra 2011, 2013). Students show "lack of sophistication" because their "school English" differs substantially from academic demands (Erling & Hilgendorf 2006: 284),
which may affect their class participation (Knapp 2011), induce anxiety and reduce motivation (Inbar-Lourie & Donitsa-Schmidt 2013), and ultimately have an influence on their grades (Dafouz & Camacho-Miñano 2016). Students' perception on the language-skills of their lecturers is not very promising either (Evans & Morrison 2011). Airey (2013), for instance, mentions that lecturers have the unavoidable demand of solving "language-related issues" (Airey 2013: 64) as well as the requirement to make adjustments in order to make content linguistically comprehensible (Costa & Coleman 2010). Hence, determined efforts should be put in place to ensure that limited language proficiency, on behalf of both the lecturer and the student, does not hinder fluid communication and, therefore, learning in the class.

The linguistic issue is not the only concern. Successful EMI implementation requires lecturers to have some elemental knowledge of second language acquisition processes and develop "effective classroom behaviour", such as "effective lecturing behaviour skills" (Klaassen et al. 2001: 282), that go beyond translating the content of a given subject into English (Cots 2013; Dafouz et al. 2007). Lecturers should also be able to adopt teaching techniques suitable to the EMI classroom, such as paraphrasing knowledge or calling attention to subject-specific vocabulary and technical terms (Dearden 2014). The use of these teaching techniques are in line with a methodological move towards more learner-centred forms of instruction (Cots 2013), where the focus shifts from a mere transfer of information to greater student participation. EMI teaching, in the same way as teaching for mixed ability classes, requires lecturers to promote active engagement so that learning is warranted regardless of learners' background. As Biggs (2011: 5) points out "Teaching that engages students' learning activities appropriately minimizes differences of ethnicity between students as far as learning itself is concerned."

In this context it is not fortuitous that quality in EMI has become a focus of attention within quality assurance (QA), which adds to the QA measures that HEIs already implement for accreditation purposes to legitimise the institution and their programmes, as well as to adapt to transnational processes like the European Higher Education area (EHEA). An example of QA targeted at EMI teaching quality has been developed in Switzerland, where the trend of implementing English taught programmes (ETP) has been on the increase in the last 10 years. In Wächter and Maiworm's (2014) analysis of ETPs in Europe, 39 HE institutions offering 239 ETPs were identified in Switzerland (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 34). The project "Internationalisation of Universities of Applied Sciences" aimed at generating and testing a set of quality management parameters that would evaluate the quality of international study programmes in English. As part of this project, an observation form was developed (See Studer: this volume) in order to gauge quality standards in English-taught lectures in Swiss higher education. In particular, the present study looks at the lecturer's viewpoint on the parameters developed in this observation form.
2. Data collection and analysis

Data for the present investigation, which aimed at discovering what EMI teachers think of the parameters established on the observation form, was collected mid-semester during a week at a university of applied sciences in the area of German-speaking Switzerland within an International Programme in Business Administration. Data was retrieved by means of class observation followed by an informal structured interview and a subsequent online questionnaire.

2.1 Class observation

Class observations were carried out in eight different modules (Introduction to Business Administration, Financial Accounting, Management Accounting, Tax Law, Microeconomics, Security Analysis, Derivatives and International Business Management) by six observers, two in each observation. Although there were eight modules observed, the final number of observed sessions was ten, as two lecturers were observed teaching the same course to two different groups, which makes an amount of 15 hours of recorded observations in total.

All the observations followed the same procedure: Before classes started, students were informed that an observation was going to take place and, even though video-recording was not necessary for this study, they were asked to give their permission to be video recorded as the data retrieved would be used in other studies (see Khan, this volume, for an example of how the data was used). The video camera was placed in one of the corners of the class ensuring that the shot took the students as well as the lecturer and that the sound recorded was clear. During the class, observers were as unobtrusive as possible while they took notes on the observation form created for this purpose. Once the class was over, one of the observers maintained an informal interview with the teacher and informed them that they were going to receive an online questionnaire, which had to be returned to the observers at their earliest convenience.

The observation form designed for this study was divided into five sections: Linguistic Competence, Monological Communicative Competence, Dialogical Communicative Competence, Strategic Competence and Didactic Competence. Each section was further subdivided into additional subsections, assembling a total of sixteen parameters. Each parameter was clearly identified with a label and a short definition of its meaning, which allowed the observer to identify specific features of the class. It also included a four point rating scale for each parameter, where 3 was fail, 4 was pass, 5 was good and 6 was very good\(^1\).

\(^1\) In Switzerland a 6 point grading scale is used, where 1 represents the lowest possible grade and 6 the highest one. In the present study it was assumed that none of the teachers would score lower than 3.
Next to the rating scale there was an available space for observer's comments or notes on the lecturer's performance (see Studer, this volume, for a detailed description of the form).

After the observations an inter-rater reliability analysis using the Kappa statistic was performed to determine consistency between the two raters for each observed class. Even though raters had not been trained beforehand for this particular study, inter-rater reliability ranged from Kappa= 0.47 (moderate agreement) to 0.83 (almost perfect agreement), which indicates an acceptable agreement for class observation research (Rui & Feldman 2012).

2.2 Interview

Once the class observation was over, one of the observers interviewed the lecturer who had done the class. Although the interview was informal, it was structured around three points: 1) class procedure (whether the class had gone according to their plan), 2) student behaviour (whether students had acted as they usually did, or whether they had been affected by the observation), 3) the lecturer's perception of the quality parameter observation form. That is, during the interview lecturers got to see the form and expressed their opinion about whether the parameters were relevant to EMI in general and/or to their classes, as well as how they perceived their own performance in relation to each parameter. During the interview, the observer took notes of the lecturer's responses and wrote down comments that she deemed relevant for the investigation.

The observers' notes and comments were subjected to content analysis, from which categories related to the their motivation for teaching EMI courses, their language background and their teaching experience, as well as categories on their opinion of the form were drawn.

2.3 Questionnaire

Just after the interview, lecturers were informed that they were going to receive an electronic questionnaire, which was made available to the lecturers for two weeks after the class observation. The return rate was 100%.

The questionnaire consisted of 13 questions, six of which were open for them to give extended answers and seven were closed. Questions were divided into five sections: Language background, teaching experience, motivation for teaching and EMI course, EMI training received and, finally, the observed parameters.

In the same way as the interview notes, qualitative content analysis was performed to the open questions in order to extract common categories, while descriptive statistics were calculated for the closed questions.
3. The observed parameters

Observers filled in the observation form with comments of observed behaviour in the classroom. Figure 1 shows the parameters in each section and an example of the type of comments the observers noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Example of observers' notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Vocabulary range</td>
<td>Proficient use of domain-specific vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vocabulary control</td>
<td>Native speaker control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Phonological control</td>
<td>Fast. Too fast for some students? Stress: - re-bal-AN-cing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cohesion</td>
<td>Fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monological Communicative Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Communicative competence, overall oral production</td>
<td>Can communicate clearly and effectively. Long explanations. Shows links between different terms and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogical Communicative Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Conversation</td>
<td>Elicits information from students. Asks direct questions to check terms already covered in previous lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Formal discussion and meetings</td>
<td>Not appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Goal-oriented co-operation</td>
<td>Use of whiteboard to draw illustrative figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Non-/ para-verbal communication</td>
<td>Confident. She doesn't move from the front of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Monitoring and repair</td>
<td>No need to reformulate in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Active listening comprehension</td>
<td>Able to understand students perfectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Didactic Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Facilitating a positive learning experience of students in L2 situation</td>
<td>Task descriptions show examples from foreign companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2</td>
<td>Couldn't be fully observed. Judging by the slides, lecturer prepared her class beforehand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Managing teaching units facilitating student orientation in an L2 situation</td>
<td>Writes answers to task on board. (Handwriting not clear). Links her session to what students will be doing next semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Facilitating comprehension and development of L2 register</td>
<td>New terms were displayed on slides. Shows video to illustrate concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Facilitating development of communication skills in L2</td>
<td>Students can participate if they wish. No pressure on the part of the lecturer to participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Parameters and examples of comments from observers on the observation form.
Moreover, observers also assessed the teachers' behaviour against the descriptors given with each parameter. Figure 2 shows the mean score for each parameter (3 is the lowest score, 6 is the highest) and the total mean score per lecturer. The mean score for each parameter was calculated from the scores given by the observers. When observers could not produce a score, because a particular parameter was not observable, a hyphen appears in the table.

As Figure 2 indicates, with the exception of parameter 15 (Facilitating comprehension and development of L2 register) for Lecturer 4 (T4), and parameter 16 (Facilitating development of communication skills in L2) for Lecturers 3 and 6 (T3, T6), the scores given by observers are all 4 or above 4, which is the pass mark. The highest scores (5.9) are for parameters 1 (Vocabulary range), 5 (Monological Communicative Competence) and 13 (Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2). The lowest score is for parameter 16 (Facilitating development of communication skills in L2). This seems to suggest that lecturers displayed greater control of their language but less control on their didactics and promotion of L2 skills.

The number of hyphens in the table reflects that some parameters in the observation form like 'Formal discussion and meetings' proved challenging for the observers because in the classes under observation such elements did not appear. Furthermore, these hyphens show that some parameters, such as 'Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2' or 'Facilitating a positive learning experience of students in L2 situation' proved problematic for the observers since they could not be judged from just one single observation. The observers explicitly commented that repeated observations would be required to evaluate these aspects as well as a thorough review of the class materials and specific interviews.
4. The lecturers and their perspective

4.1 The lecturer's profile

With the online questionnaire (n=8), the lecturers' motivation for teaching EMI courses, their language background and teaching experience was determined. Concerning lecturers' motivation to teach an EMI course, an open question revealed six categories: Management decision, Benefit for student's employability, Teacher's L2 improvement, Teacher's professional development, Personal interest and Lack of sufficient language skills in German.

Three of the teachers mentioned that they are teaching in English due to a management decision. These lecturers considered that they are teaching in English because their high level of English renders them more appropriate to teach than other colleagues whose English language skills are weaker. Two of them also mentioned that proficiency in English is an important business capability not only for their students, as their future job is probably going to be in the international field, but also for their own improvement as teachers, since working in English allows them to hone their own English skills, which in turn...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Total mean/parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean / lecturer</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
help them advance professionally. Moreover, two of the teachers also emphasised their own intrinsic motivation either because they have always wanted to work in an international field or because they are personally interested in other cultures. Finally, one of the comments retrieved referred to the lecturer's lack of skills to teach in German, which forced him/her to teach in the International Programme in English.

A second open question inquired about the lecturers' English language acquisition background. In terms of their level of English competence, all the lecturers self-reported at least a C1 (CEFR) level. In particular, three lecturers self-reported an "advanced language level" (between B2 and C1), whereas the other five considered themselves as "proficient" users of English (above C1). As for the reasons for their language proficiency, having lived in an English-speaking country like New Zealand, the US or England for a long period of time (between one and six years) for work or study purposes was the most prevailing argument. Other reasons that accounted for their English proficiency were having done an international academic stay during their studies, having learned their English at school from native lecturers, or having taken extra language courses in English speaking countries. At the time of filling in the questionnaire, half of lecturers reported that they were doing their research exclusively in English and six of them mentioned that their work environment outside the university required them to use English. Finally, three lecturers reported that thanks to travelling they could put their English skills to good use.

As far as their teaching background is concerned, all of them reported an extensive experience in their first languages. Two of them had an experience that spanned up to more than twenty years, another two more than ten years and the remaining four lecturers more than five years. However, their EMI practice was more limited, ranging from five years or less (5 lecturers) to a maximum of ten years (2 lecturers).

4.2 Lecturers' perspective on the parameters observed

The lecturers' opinion about their classroom performance was retrieved by means of both the interview done after the observation and the questionnaire. Although lecturers were not given any explanation about the meaning of the parameters, they were prompted to mention their concerns by asking open questions about each of the parameters. Their answers, as mentioned above, were subjected to qualitative content analysis.

4.2.1 Linguistic competence

In line with their self-reported proficiency, all lecturers displayed a high degree of vocabulary range and control, allowing them to express themselves in coherent and understandable speech. They were also confident of their language skills and their ability to convey accurate and appropriate messages
in their subject specific domain in English, which is in line with their reported proficiency level (advanced or proficient) in the questionnaire. Proof of their confidence is that, when asked about this aspect, one of the lecturers responded:

(1) "English has not ever been a problem or source of complaint in my courses."

It is true, however, that some of the lecturers were aware of their own gaps in their proficiency. Thus, two lecturers pointed out that the greatest problem they were confronted with in their EMI classes were their own language mistakes. One lecturer also mentioned that he found it troubling to

(2) "express myself in a differentiated 'academic' way",
as he considered himself fully competent when he had to use English in everyday situations, whereas finding the right tone and style in the classroom proved more demanding. Finally, two more lecturers reported that

(3) "it's sometimes difficult, to find the right words quickly",
therefore showing that fluency is somehow problematic for some of them.

4.2.2 Communicative competence

Communicative competence in the observation form was divided into monological and dialogical competence. The former refers to the competence the lecturer shows in giving a monologue - or in lecturing in front of the classroom - and the latter refers to both the ability to communicate with the students in various forms of interaction, like in a conversation or a formal discussion, as well as the ability to display specific features when engaged in interaction, such as giving support to the interlocutor to convey the message or using classroom-appropriate body language. During the classroom observation monological competence was straightforward to observe as most of the lecturer talk fell in this category. Even so, lecturers' reaction to this parameter shows that they recognise that

(4) "explaining a complex issue is easier in the native language. It is demanding and definitely more work"

or

(5) "I still have difficulties to explain a topic in another way as I prepared it".

While monological competence was a common trait in the classes observed, dialogical competence was less frequent or even non-existent. That is to say, in the classes observed there were no instances of tasks in which formal discussion or meetings among students, or lecturer and students, were called for. However, the fact that these kinds of interaction did not occur in the particular class being observed does not preclude that discussions and
meetings could be present in other classes. Moreover, as one of the lecturers commented, the use of interactive activities can be subject-specific. She said:

(6) "I am teaching finance. Because the subject is difficult and many ideas/instruments are completely new to the students the interaction with the class is very limited. I cannot ask many questions in class. Other topics are more prone for interaction"

One of the lecturers, whose module is taught both in German and English, indicates that because the contents of her module is based on the German curriculum, it is difficult to find published textbooks in English that cover all the topics. Therefore, she feels the need to provide all the content herself and cannot spend class time on interactive activities. She remarks:

(7) "As courses at this university have to be the same in German and English and as the German courses have been there before, many courses are based on German textbooks. It can be very difficult if not impossible to find a suitable English textbook for my classes. If I don't find one, classes become quite tough as I have to give most of the inputs in class more as a lecture and less interactive."

Finally, another lecturer also mentions that the observation procedure may have influenced that particular class being observed, making the students more passive than in the other classes given by the same lecturer:

(8) "In the class on Monday students were less responsive than usually. That was not the case with the class on Wednesday, which had already gone through other observations before."

4.2.3 Strategic Competence

As far as Strategic Competence is concerned, some observers mentioned that it was not noticeable in some classes, or that it was difficult to observe in a single session. One of the reasons for the lack of observations in this parameter might be simply that this type of strategic behaviour did not take place in that particular session, but we may infer that it can occur in other sessions. Another reason might be that class observation, as a research instrument, does not allow the researcher to grasp the differences in strategy use that other, more precise instruments, may reveal (see Khan's study in this volume). The lecturer's perception of their own strategic competence seems to be limited as they do not seem to be aware that any type of interaction, especially when it takes place in a foreign language, entails a vast array of strategies. For example, one of the lecturers recognised that:

(9) "I don't change anything, the students are English literate. There is no need to adapt",

whereas in the actual observation comments, the observer states:

(10) "The lecturer is able to rephrase what students meant in different words. When she doesn't understand/hear what a student says she repeats the last words the student said."
Thus, although she does not recognise or is not familiar with the term "strategic competence" her actual strategic behaviour is effective. Similarly, although "monitoring and repair" instances were not documented in the observation form, as observers indicated that there was

(11) "no need to reformulate in this class",

the mean score given to this parameter is above average (5.6), which probably reflects the observers' assumption that this type of strategic behaviour is already part of an advanced user of a foreign language as these EMI lecturers are.

4.2.4 Didactic Competence

The last part of the observation form considers Didactic Competence, which encompasses parameters related to class management (planning and managing teaching units), assistance with L2 progress (facilitating comprehension, developing L2 vocabulary, developing communication skills), and positive L2 experience. The presence of "no observed comments" shows the observers' difficulty in detecting instances to illustrate some parameters on the form. These parameters are not readily observable either because they did not appear in the session observed or because a deeper knowledge of the module is required for the researcher to perceive them. This is the case of the parameter "Formal discussion and meetings", which even though it is one of the milestones that needs to be addressed in EMI, it was not possible to be noticed in one single observation.

A different situation is the case of the parameters related to class management. "Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2" had a considerable percentage of "no observed comments" as well as "Managing teaching units facilitating student orientation in an L2 situation". Both parameters comprise two ideas: firstly, the fact that lecturers show the ability to plan or manage their lessons, which are behaviours that consider the general teaching ability no matter if the lecturer is in an EMI context, and secondly, the underlying idea that the lecturer should display their intention to aid L2 comprehension or orientation. With both parameters, observers seemed to struggle with documenting the lecturer's plans and intentions, since these aspects are subjective and hard to grasp in observation. Thus, observers were only able to draw their observations from few moments that reflected the actual lecturer's performance when facilitating comprehension and orientation, even if such moments were not frequent.

When the observed lecturers were confronted with the parameters related to didactics in the post-observation questionnaire, five of the lecturers replied that they did not do any kind of adjustment to their EMI classes with the specific goal of facilitating L2 learning. Comments such as
The lecturers' perspective on EMI quality

(12) "I do as if they were proficient"

and

(13) "The students are English literate so no adaptation is needed"

are proof of their point of view. Moreover, two lecturers indicated that, as they were using materials already published in English there was no need for them to alter or modify their instruction. Examples of this opinion are the following comments:

(14) "I do not adapt because the literature and the materials are in English and do not require any adaptation"

or

(15) "All the literature is in English, including the slides. So there is no need to make adjustments on these fronts."

Last but not least, only one lecturer expressed that he did adapt his teaching precisely because of the use of English textbooks. He acknowledged that

(16) "I have taught a similar subject in German. But through English, I use other books. Thus I have different approach to the subject".

The last element that Didactic Competence takes into account is "providing a positive experience", which was operationalised in the following terms: "drawing attention to multilingualism and multiculturalism as a resource and opportunity for learning and classroom interaction". As with other parameters, this parameter was too broad to be observed in a single class observation. Even so, when lecturers were asked about this parameter in the interview and post-observation questionnaire, three of them considered that their teaching should be not only

(17) "attractive for international students"

but should also prepare students for their prospective international jobs. Three remarks that illustrate this point are the following:

(18) "English is the language of Economics today. I believe that, by teaching the subject in English, we are enhancing the students' ability to use their knowledge"

or

(19) "Finance around the world is mostly done in English. Today the language of business is English, but in finance it is even more important and relevant."

Therefore, they consider it is a must to

(20) "provide (students) with international standards".

Finally, the online questionnaire revealed the notion that EMI lecturers are required to negotiate their identity in non-English speaking countries. One of the lecturers explicitly indicated that he felt more at ease with the international students in the EMI classroom than when he taught in German. He regretted that, when teaching in Switzerland, he could not get rid of the stereotypes about German people in this country. However, in his EMI classes, he felt that all the
preconceived ideas about his background dissipated because he was in an international environment. He mentions:

(21) "In my special situation as a lecturer of German origin in Switzerland I am sometimes faced with certain preconceptions when teaching in German. In my English classes I am considered a "normal" foreigner as some of the students as well."

5. Discussion

The lecturer profile in this study is an expert lecturer who has been teaching for at least 5 years in their own language, with good level of English thanks to having previously studied or worked in an English environment, and who, at present, has ample opportunities to use this language in their research or job outside the university. This is the same type of profile found in other studies that have looked into the lecturers' perceptions in EMI settings (Vinke et al. 1998; Tatzl 2011).

Considering the score given by the observers on the observation form, the lecturers in this study excel at all the parameters that could be observed. First of all, they do not show considerable problems with their English language competence. Although imperfect linguistic skills, especially flaws in pronunciation, is one of the most relevant problems when considering the quality of an EMI course/programme (Wilkinson 2013; Airey 2004), it would seem that the lecturers in the present study do not find shifting their language of instruction to English a major challenge. It is true that some of them have concerns related to their ability to use the language in an academic way, or to being fluent enough, but overall, they match the profile of the "successful switcher", that is to say, a lecturer who "explicitly stated not to have any problems with their language-related skills" (Vinke et al 1998: 388), as they consider themselves advanced or proficient in English in addition to being active English users in their research and/or their work environment.

Secondly, all the parameters associated with communicative competence, both monologic and dialogic, scored above 5. Even parameter seven (Formal discussion and meetings), which was only observed in four classes, was given a mean above 5. Nonetheless, lecturers relied on monologues to deliver their content either because of the lack of published English textbooks that covered the curriculum of a module, which in turn forced the lecturer to be the only source of input, or because the nature of the module prevented the lecturer from delivering it in a learner-centred fashion. Hence, although student-centred learning has been argued to be an effective course design (Wilkinson 2013: 15; Cots 2013), only few instances of this approach could be observed. Here is where stronger EMI teacher training that attends not only to linguistic aspects but also "attends in detail to the methodology of teaching through a foreign language" (O'Dowd 2015: 12) would surely help lecturers to change their teacher-centred approach towards a type of instruction largely focused on the
learner. This shift should promote active learner engagement which would enhance their learning.

Thirdly, in terms of strategic competence the lecturers received high scores for the two parameters included in the observation form. However, they did not seem to be aware of the number of strategies they displayed when teaching. As all of them possessed considerable teaching experience in L1, they seemed to be transferring the teaching strategies used in L1 to their L2 teaching. Thus, they did not consciously use any specific teaching strategy adapted to the EMI context. Instead, they simply relied on their teaching experience and trusted their intuition as proficient L2 users.

Finally, no problems were documented in the observed lecturers' didactic competence either. In general, the lecturers did not perceive the need for didactic adaptations in their way of teaching or the materials or resources they used in their classes, especially when lecturer and students are both English proficient. In this case, they believed that students should be treated as if they were native speakers, like the students they have in their L1-taught classes. However, when materials, such as the textbook used in the EMI class is already in English, the English textbook seemed to help EMI lecturers to adjust their teaching to the EMI environment. Comparable perceptions were found by Tatzl (2011) in his study of English-taught masters in Austria.

6. Conclusion

The results described allow us to gain a deeper insight into lecturers' perception of EMI teaching quality. Even though these results are drawn from a group of lecturers teaching in an international programme in Switzerland, their perspective may be of interest when considering quality elements related to EMI lecturers in other settings.

The international lecturer quality profile can be succinctly described as an expert lecturer, both in L1 and to a minor degree in L2, with high English proficiency, who uses the language in his/her everyday life for a variety of purposes, like travelling or research, outside the university.

All the lecturers in this study received high scores, which reflect their EMI quality when assessed using the observation form. Their overall scores ranged from a minimum of 3.5 to a maximum of 5.7. Similarly, all the sixteen parameters in isolation received a score above the pass mark (minimum score=4.7; maximum score=6), which, in turn, entailed that they demonstrated the five competences described in the observation form.

Even so, the scarce amount of observed instances of dialogic competence and the nearly exclusive use of lecturing in the classes would call for a more intensive EMI training in student-centred methodologies, which would enable lecturers to incorporate a variety of didactic elements. This would lead to an
increase of dialogic competence, moving away from using practically only lecturing towards a more interactive environment, which would entail increased learner engagement, thus rendering learning more effective.

Future research into quality parameters for international profiles should contemplate a diversity of settings, namely international programmes held in other areas of the world with different teacher and student's features, in order to achieve a broader, more complete picture of quality management in EMI teaching.
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Dans l'anglais en tant que langue d' instruction (EMI), les stratégies employées par les enseignants peuvent être plus cruciales pour déterminer la qualité des cours que leur maîtrise de l'anglais (Björkman 2010). Cette étude exploratoire visait à identifier les stratégies de cours efficaces de quatre enseignants non-natifs qui enseignaient dans un programme d'Administration des affaires dans une université suisse de sciences appliquées. Les cours ont été enregistrés par vidéo et les stratégies ont été codées, quantifiées et comparées entre les différents enseignants. Les résultats sont décrits par rapport aux mesures de qualité totales des cours, ainsi qu'évaluées par les étudiants et les chercheurs dans une étude connexe (Studer, ce volume; Gautschi, ce volume). Nous avons identifié vingt-cinq types différents de stratégies dont la fonction pourrait améliorer la compréhension des cours (17 étaient utilisées pendant les longues périodes de discours monologique, 7 pendant des épisodes interactifs plus courts et une seule stratégie (demande de clarification) a été repérée concernant les cas, très peu nombreux, de malentendus qui ont été observés. Neuf des stratégies les plus fréquemment employées feront l'objet de cet article: inciter, susciter, baliser, souligner, paraphraser, évaluer, définir, vérifier la compréhension et indiquer les apprentissages antérieurs. Tous les enseignants ont obtenu de très bons résultats en termes de qualité et les deux avec les meilleurs résultats ont employé plus d'incitation et d'élicitation, ce qui correspond à d'autres recherches (par exemple, Morell 2004) qui préconisent des cours interactifs. Les implications pour la formation à la stratégie sont discutées.
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Normes de qualité, enseignement en anglais (EMI), stratégies, cours magistral, administration des affaires, discours académique.
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1. Introduction

Lecturing is the most widely recognised form of teaching at university so effective lecturing is fundamental to learning and has long been the focus of much language research (see Fortanet-Gómez 2005, for a review). Studies have recognised the value of lectures as a teaching methodology (effectively conveying facts, summarising and simplifying complex information, linking research findings to every-day practice), as well as their drawbacks (students unable to remember, understand, critically reflect on or apply the knowledge conveyed). These drawbacks become even more accentuated when the language of instruction is not the student's first language (L1), as in EMI (English-medium instruction) contexts, and even more so when English is not the lecturer's L1. The sharp rise of EMI at universities across Europe (Wächter & Maiworm 2014) has therefore brought with it corresponding concerns about the quality of lectures given by non-native English lecturers.
In their review of EMI research in higher education, Pinyana and Khan (2014) found that much research so far has focused on institutional policy (Marsh 2006; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe 2010; Fortanet-Gómez 2013) or teacher and student perceptions (Wilkinson 2005; Pinyana & Khan 2007; Tatzl 2011; Aguilar & Rodriguez 2012). Fewer EMI studies have observed university lecturers (Miller 2002; Dafouz-Milne & Sánchez García 2013; Airey 2011) and fewer still have addressed the question of the quality in EMI (Dafouz et al. 2014; Kling & Dimova 2015; Gundermann this volume).

Although the linguistic competence of non-native lecturers is a key element in EMI lecture quality, many researchers point to strategic competence as being equally, if not more, important (Dafouz & Nuñez 2010; Björkman 2011). A native speaker may be linguistically competent but lack the necessary strategies to be able to lecture effectively. In terms of effective lecturing strategies, novice native and non-native lecturers in higher education begin on a level playing field, as usually neither have had training, rather they learn "on the job".

The term 'strategy' has been defined and used in many different and overlapping ways. In education, the terms teaching strategy or instructional strategy are used to refer to techniques, tasks or activities teachers use to help students achieve learning goals and become more autonomous learners, guided by underlying theories of learning (e.g. Tobin et al. 1994). Strategies are viewed as positive pedagogical techniques which function to facilitate learning.

In second language research, communication strategies, accommodation strategies, discourse strategies and pragmatic strategies are all terms which describe strategies in oral communication. These strategies are mainly viewed as problem-solving devices (Poulisse 1990; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997), triggered by a breakdown in communication or overt disturbance (Björkman 2011). Such breakdowns have been documented in conversations or dialogic speech, between non-native speakers (NNS) and native speakers (NS) or NNS, but they also occur among native speakers (NS), albeit to a lesser extent. Examples of strategies that overcome communicative breakdown include clarification, repetition or paraphrasing. However, in communication strategy research, strategies are also viewed as having a negative effect on communication (mumbling, topic avoidance, message abandonment). Therefore, in these areas of research effective communication is indicated by successfully overcoming instances of communicative breakdown.

Strategies do not only occur as a response to a communicative breakdown but are used to enhance communication. For example, in university lectures, strategies which structure the lecture, such as the use of discourse markers e.g. now, so, however (Dafouz & Nuñez 2010), are not produced in response to indications of non-comprehension, but in response to the lecturer foreseeing potential comprehension problems. In fact, as lecturing involves mainly monologic speech, few instances of interaction, and, therefore, overt
communicative breakdown, occur, so lecturers ability to foresee such potential problems and use strategies becomes particularly important.

The strategies identified in this study draw from previous inventories of communication strategies (Dörnyei & Scott 1997), pragmatic strategies (Björkman 2011) and discourse analysis studies (Fortanet-Gómez 2005). The term lecturing strategies will be used here to refer to strategies which are used 1) in the context of the university lecture 2) in spoken academic discourse and 3) with or without any overt instances of communicative breakdown occurring. In identifying these strategies the assumption is that lecturers employed them consciously or automatically in foreseeing potential learning or communication problems. Although, non-verbal communication, such as gestures and eye contact are also considered strategies (Dörnyei & Scott 1997), they were not included in this analysis.

Other researchers have examined strategies in EMI but from slightly different perspectives to this study, focusing on native-speaker lecturers (Flowerdew & Miller 1996), lecture comprehension strategies (Flowerdew & Miller 1996) or small sets of strategies such as discourse markers or questions (Dafouz & Nuñez 2010; Dafouz-Milne & Sánchez García 2013). Flowerdew and Miller carried out a series of ethnographic studies and investigated how English-speaking lecturers delivered lectures in English to Cantonese-speaking students (Flowerdew & Miller 1996) and Flowerdew et al. (2000) described the perceptions of Chinese lecturers lecturing in English to Chinese students. Miller (2002) sums up the results as "Their lecturers' main strategies to help students comprehend the lectures were to modify their language and use plenty of examples". A natural follow-up to these results therefore seems to be to determine more precisely which strategies non-native lecturers use to get their meaning across to students, which was the aim of this study.

A substantial amount of research has investigated EMI lectures from the standpoint of lecturer discourse (Thøgersen & Airey 2011; Braga Riera & Maíz Arévalo 2013; Dafouz-Milne & Sánchez García 2013) and to a lesser extent pragmatic strategies in ELF (English as a lingua franca) settings (Björkman 2011; Smit 2010) and codeswitching (Airey 2009; Ljosland 2011). Summarising the findings relevant to this study, research has shown that 1) In Denmark, L2 lecturers' speech rate is slower in English than L1, but not necessarily due to a lack of fluency, as strategies are used to provide more comprehensible input through repetition, synonyms or defining (Thøgersen & Airey 2011), 2) fewer pragmatic strategies are used by lecturers compared to students working in groups in Sweden (Björkman 2011), 3) translation strategies employed during lecture preparation, structuring and exemplification strategies improve students' comprehension in Spain (Braga Riera & Maíz Arévalo 2013) and 4) checking comprehension, the lecturers answering their own questions, and display questions, which are questions teachers already know the answer to (Mehan
1979), were the most common types of strategies non-native lecturers employed in Spain, similar to L1 lecturers, and similar across disciplines (Dafouz-Milne & Sánchez García 2013).

Although taxonomies have been published for small sets of pragmatic strategies (Björkman 2011) or accommodation strategies (Tsai & Tsou 2015), to the authors' knowledge, there does not seem to be any full exploratory study of lecturing strategies. Hence, the following research questions were posed:

1. What types of lecturing strategies do non-native EMI lecturers use?
2. Which lecturing strategies are used more frequently?
3. Are there any differences in strategy use between EMI lecturers?

In this paper, an exploratory study is described which aims to further our understanding of the lecturing strategies of non-EMI lecturers. It was part of a larger project, Internationalisation in Universities of Applied Sciences, (Studer, this volume) carried out in Switzerland on an international business programme. The main focus of this paper is lecturing strategies, but references will be made to qualitative and quantitative data from the larger project to gain a better understanding of the context in which strategies were employed. A brief description of the four lectures is provided, summarised from classroom observation, researcher field notes and post-class interviews. This is followed by quantitative data on lecturing strategies identified in the lecture transcripts. The most frequently occurring strategies are then compared across lecturers and the paper ends with some recommendations for teacher training.

2. Method

One aim of the project Internationalisation of Universities of Applied Sciences (Studer, this volume) was to assess non-native lecturers in EMI classes on the International Programme in Business Administration (BSc) at BFH Bern University of Applied Sciences in Switzerland. A quality parameters observation protocol was designed taking into consideration existing descriptors, such as those in the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS) by Kling & Dimova (2015) and those used at the University of Freiburg (Gunderman & Dubow, this volume). It contained 16 positively worded, assessor-oriented and analytical parameters on a 4-point rating scale, which were divided into five competence areas: linguistic, monological, dialogical, strategic and didactic, matching those of the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference).

In November 2016, ten classes (90-100 min) were observed and video-recorded by two researchers sitting at the back of the class with a camera pointing at the lecturer. During the class researchers took field notes and rated the lecturers using the quality parameters observation protocol. After the class the lecturers were interviewed as described in Pinyana (this volume).
An overall quality rating for each lecturer was obtained by taking mean scores for the 16 different parameters from the two researchers who observed each lecturer, and from students who assessed the lectures by answering a questionnaire based on the same parameters (Gautschi, this volume). Figure 1 shows the overall quality ratings for the four lectures in the present study. Although this is a very limited sample size, it generated sufficient data to identify lecturing strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Student mean rating</th>
<th>Researcher mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student mean rating was on a Lickert scale converted numerically (1=low score, 4=high score)

Figure 1: Overall quality rating of the EMI lectures

As seen in Figure 1 the overall quality rating of all four lectures was high, not only according to researchers (.76-.93) but also students (3.05-3.67), so the four lecturers were considered effective lecturers with expert profiles (Pinyana, this volume). Lecturer 1 was evaluated highest, Lecturers 2 and 3, slightly lower and Lecturer 4 slightly lower than the other three lecturers.

While reference will be made to these quality ratings, the main aim of the present paper is to describe lecturing strategies. To do so, video recordings were carefully watched to identify four comparable classes which included mainly monologic speech in order to obtain a dataset which would yield the most lecturing strategies, as opposed to classroom interaction strategies more common in group work or student-led activities. From each lecture the first 60 minutes were transcribed using ATLAS.ti 7 and analysed for strategies. This resulted in an EMI corpus of 240 minutes and approximately 25,000 words. Transcriptions were then coded for lecturing strategies and the different types of strategies were quantified. To ensure a measure of reliability for the strategy coding, another researcher recoded one of the four lectures. Inter-rater reliability for the strategy coding was 90%.

Figure 2 summarises the main characteristics of the four lectures. Three of the lecturers were male and one female. Two of the lecturers were German, one was Swiss and one was Mexican. Two courses were first-year subjects: Introduction to Business Administration and Management Accounting 1 whereas the other two were third year subjects: Global Supply Chains and Derivatives. The number of students attending the classes varied between 6 and 24, most students (62-75%) being local Swiss students with German as an
L1 and the remainder (25-38%) international students from different language backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Global Supply Chains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Introduction to Business Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corporate Strategies and Culture</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Swiss/German</td>
<td>Management Accounting 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job Costing</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Derivatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Characteristics of the EMI lectures

3. Results and Discussion

Firstly, a brief descriptive summary of each lecture is provided to contextualise the quality indicators and strategy use. Secondly, lecturing strategies are presented and then the most frequently employed strategies are compared across the four lecturers.

3.1 Description of Lectures

Drawing from lecturers' comments in post-class interviews, some common points in all the lectures were 1) students' behaviour (e.g. level of participation, affective state) had not been affected by the classroom observation, 2) classes had gone as planned and 3) lecturers had provided students with their presentation slides prior to the class.

Lecturer 1 was the most highly evaluated by both researchers and students (See Figure 1) and rated his level of English as proficient. He was a fluent and fast speaker with no foreign accent or discernible lexical or grammatical errors. He gave a third-year lecture on Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility to a group of six students. The lecturer began with a very brief introduction to the topic and then lectured using presentation slides. All through the lecture, Lecturer 1 interacted with the students by addressing the whole class with different questions. He gave students ample time to respond and make comments, prompting them to provide more answers or more well-developed ones. Student interventions were the longest and most complex in this lecture, nevertheless, these interventions were mainly from the same student, while the other students were observed off-task (on computers or mobile phones). One observer's comment was that explanations were long and it was easy to get lost.
Lecturer 2 was the second most highly evaluated (0.84). She was a fluent and fast speaker with only a hint of a German accent and very few lexical or grammatical errors. She rated her level of English as proficient. Her lecture was a first-year lecture on Corporate Strategies and Culture to a class of 17 students. This lecturer began by eliciting student’s knowledge of concepts learnt the previous week, writing them up on the whiteboard and linking them to the lesson. Lecturer 2 lectured and then addressed the whole class with different questions and elicited answers. Students were given an exercise to do followed by whole class feedback. After a 5-minute break the students watched a video, followed by a brief whole-class discussion. Aspects of the lecture that may have caused some students difficulty were that Lecturer 2 spoke very fast and did not allow students much time to think before responding to her questions.

Lecturer 3 was rated only 0.02 points lower (0.82) than Lecturer 2 and he rated his level of English as proficient. His lecture was a first-year lecture on Job Costing to a class of 13 students. He was a fluent speaker who spoke slowly and clearly with a noticeable German accent and very few grammatical errors. Lecturer 3 began by addressing questions on the previous topic and then listed the course content to show students where they had reached in the syllabus. He began his lecture, asked the whole class questions at one point and then continued lecturing. After a 5-minute break students were given an exercise to do followed by whole-class feedback. The lecturer then continued lecturing, which was briefly interspersed by a couple of student-initiated interactive episodes triggered by students' requests for clarification.

Lecturer 4 was rated lowest (0.76) and he rated his level of English as advanced. He gave a third year lecture on Investing to a class of 24 students. Lecturer 1 was quite fluent with a Mexican Spanish accent and some noticeable grammatical errors. He began by making small talk, joking and discussing class administration. The lecturer thought aloud as he went through a problem with the whole class prompted by a student's request for clarification and then started lecturing. During the lecture he highlighted the importance of particular concepts, used analogies and, on several occasions, referred to the class exam. Lecturer 4 used humour, made frequent asides and used social strategies: addressing students by name and using personal examples and his knowledge of individual students to illustrate points. Lecturer 4 communicated clearly but did not give students enough time to think about and answer questions. His class seemed less structured and objectives were not referred to explicitly.

All in all, the lectures were representative of the lecturers' normal practice, they were mainly monologic with shorter interactive episodes. As expected from expert lecturers, they were able to communicate the content effectively with little overt communicative breakdown. Overall lecture style could be summed up as follows: Lecturer 1 was interactive, Lecturer 2 was structured and interactive, Lecturer 3 was structured and Lecturer 4 was interactive and social.
3.2 Lecture strategies

In order to validate these descriptions summarised from classroom observation, field notes and interviews, EMI lecturers' strategies were examined in more depth in answer to Research Question 1) *What types of lecturing strategies do non-native EMI lecturers use?* and Research Question 2) *Which lecturing strategies are used more frequently?* Lectures were transcribed and coded for strategies. A total of 819 strategies were coded from the 240-minute corpus of four lectures stored in Atlas.ti software. Figure 3 shows that in 60 minutes of lecturing between 114 and 264 strategies were used, showing that all the lecturers, whether they were conscious of doing so or not, employed strategies. The highest-rated lecturers (1 and 2) employed the greatest number of strategies, followed by Lecturer 4, while Lecturer 3 was the least strategic lecturer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Very high quality</th>
<th>High quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of strategies</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Total numbers of strategies used by non-native EMI lecturers

The 25 most frequently-used strategies are presented in Figure 4 as a percentage of the total number of strategies employed. Lecturers used 17 types of strategies to help communicate their message during monologic speech: *signposting, emphasising, paraphrasing, evaluating content, defining, indicating prior learning, giving an example, analogy, commenting on course structure, rhetorical question, cultural reference, repetition, referring to students by name, asides, commenting on affective state, commenting on evaluation, commenting on own affective state.* During the briefer interactive episodes, 7 strategies were identified: *prompting, eliciting, checking comprehension, recasts, referential questions, evaluating students and clarification.* As expected, very few instances of overt communicative breakdown occurred and these were marked by the use of one strategy, *requesting clarification,* by either students (data not included) or lecturers (strategy 19 in Figure 4; 1.2%). These instances of breakdown, in each case, were promptly resolved, suggesting the strategy to be effective.
### Table: Percentage of Strategies Used by Non-Native EMI Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>% Total Strategy Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 prompting</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 eliciting</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 signposting</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 emphasising</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 paraphrasing</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 evaluating content</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 defining</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 checking comprehension</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 indicating prior learning</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 giving an example</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 analogy</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 recast</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 referential question</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 evaluating students</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 commenting on course structure</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 rhetorical question</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 cultural reference</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 repetition</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 requesting clarification</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 referring to students by name</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 small talk</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 commenting on students’ affective state</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 clarification</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 commenting on evaluation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 commenting on own affective state</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Percentage of strategies used by non-native EMI lecturers

Comparing these results with other EMI research on non-native lecturers, three strategies in this study (defining, signposting and emphasising) were equivalent to pragmatic strategies identified by Björkman (2011) at a Swedish university: commenting on terms and concepts, commenting on discourse structure and signalling importance, respectively. Five strategies: eliciting, emphasising, giving examples, signposting and defining were also identified as non-native...
Lecturer accommodation strategies by Tsai and Tsou (2015) in their study on an international MBA in Taiwan. In addition, six strategies were equivalent to those included in Gerakopoulou's (2011) scaffolding taxonomy for secondary school CLIL teachers in the Netherlands: giving examples (referred to as modelling in Gerakopoulou 2011), indicating prior learning (bridging), analogy (contextualising), evaluating (developing metacognition), prompting and eliciting (elicitation) and paraphrasing (elaborating and redefining).

3.3 Strategy differences between higher and lower-rated EMI lecturers

So far we can see that at least 25 different effective lecturing strategies were used by the expert non-native lecturers. In answer to Research Question 3, Are there any differences in strategy use between EMI lecturers?, this section will compare nine of the most frequently used strategies. The remaining 16 strategies were less instrumental in determining effective lecturing as strategy use was low, below 5%, as seen in Figure 4, and so results could be considered anecdotal and may not be generalisable to other non-native lecturers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Lecturer 1</th>
<th>Lecturer 2</th>
<th>Lecturer 3</th>
<th>Lecturer 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 prompting</td>
<td>14.4*</td>
<td>15.2*</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 eliciting</td>
<td>14.0*</td>
<td>10.0*</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 signposting</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>17.7*</td>
<td>11.4*</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 emphasising</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.3*</td>
<td>10.1*</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 paraphrasing</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.2*</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 evaluating</td>
<td>11.7*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.1*</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 defining</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 checking comprehension</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>15.7*</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 indicating prior learning</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13.6*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* over 10% of total strategy use

Figure 5 compares the nine most frequently-used strategies across lecturers.

1. **Prompting** or the use of follow-up questions was the most frequently used strategy and it was always used in combination with eliciting, the next most frequent strategy. When lecturers elicited information from students they often followed up with further questions, comments or clues to the answers they were expecting. The function of this strategy was to guide students towards a solution to the question elicited, to extract further information or reflections from them, or to guide them along a particular line of thought. Examples of this strategy were (1)-(2):
Rather than the lecturer answering their own questions, lecturers who prompted provided students with extra support, so that students could observe lecturers’ sequential thinking in reaching a solution, as seen in excerpt 1 above. This would make the process of thinking more transparent and also give students more time to process and understand the information. Figure 5 shows that the two highest-rated lecturers, Lecturers 1 and 2, prompted more than the others (14.4% and 15.2%, respectively).

2. Eliciting was used nearly as frequently, and in combination with prompting. This is a common instructional strategy (Mercer 1994; Gerakopoulou 2011; Björkman 2011; Tsai & Tsou 2015), whose function is to help students to reflect on the information communicated and think of solutions. It is also used to find out the extent of students’ knowledge of a topic. Eliciting involves different types of display questions (Mehan 1979), which are questions whose answer is known by the lecturer. Examples of this strategy were (3)-(6):

(3) L1_ Does anyone have ideas of a broad definition of CSR?
(4) L2_ When you look at those elements that we discussed last week, where do you find them in this company goal hierarchy that we discussed in part 2 earlier in this semester?
(5) L3_ And let’s assume that this maintenance work has cost 100,000 Swiss francs because it’s for a whole year. Now it’s included here (lecturer points to a calculation). And what’s the problem if it’s in here?
(6) L4_ … I have hedged very fast. I bought stock relatively cheap. The premium paid is more than enough to compensate my costs. What would have happened?

Figure 5 shows that the two highest-rated lecturers, Lecturers 1 and 2, also used this strategy most, followed by Lecturer 4. Eliciting alone, as an instructional strategy is an effective tool to make students think. However, as mentioned above, if the teacher or a particular student immediately provides the answer, not all students will be able to grasp the steps involved in reaching the answer.
It is the combined use of eliciting and prompting, or what is commonly known in classroom discourse studies as IRF (Initiation-Response-Follow-up) patterns (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), that provides a more powerful instructional tool or supportive scaffolding (Saxena 2010). The difference between eliciting and combining eliciting and prompting is illustrated by comparing the two extracts, (7) and (8), below.

(7) **ELICITING**

L3. So the cost allocation base here will most probably be the cost per hour and the cost per hour is 60 dollars, 150,000 dollars divided by 2,500 hours and now we have the cost allocation base. *What does it mean? Or what is the advantage of having this base?* (pause) *eliciting/paraphrasing*

L3. If number 5 is this robot then we can measure how many hours it has worked for job A...(the lecturer answers the question himself)

(8) **ELICITING AND PROMPTING**

L2. You actually mention strategic goals (referring to a student's previous answer), which was not that wrong because it connects some of the goals we have in the company in the hierarchy with the strategy. *Where do you put them?* (pause) *eliciting*

L2. or anyone else? (pause) *prompting*

L2. Because strategy isn't here. (pause)

L2. Which level is strategy? (pause) *prompting*

S1. Corporate goals.

L2. Corporate goals right

L2. That is the strategy *lecturer writes on whiteboard*

L2. Do we find other things? (pause) *prompting*

L2. Do we find other structure or culture? (pause) *prompting*

L2. in this hierarchy

L2. What is this vision mission about? *prompting*

S2. what the company would like to… what the company sees as its reason to exist.

L2. Yes, what is the reason for the company to exist, who we are, what do we do - that is the vision and mission.

In excerpt (7), Lecturer 3 makes a calculation and asks students what it means. He waits for an answer, indicated by a pause, but he then answers the question himself. In general, this lecturer used little eliciting (3.5%) and prompting (4.4%). In comparison, in excerpt (8), Lecturer 2 elicits and then uses several prompts, which involve the participation of two students. Lecturer 2 presents the information more concisely and simply, including repetition, rephrasing and more student participation.

Both Lecturers 1 and 2, the highest rated lecturers, elicited and prompted a lot more, confirming perceptions from observations that these lecturers were more interactive. These kinds of episodes are known to provide key supportive scaffolding (Saxena 2010) that facilitate learning, and may be particularly important in EMI contexts to lighten the extra cognitive load for the student who is learning in a foreign language, and to indicate to the lecturer the extent of students' understanding.

3. **Signposting** was another frequently used strategy. The function of this strategy is to structure the content by signalling to the listener what the speaker will talk about next or what they have just talked about, by organising the content.
using sequencing words (firstly, next…) and by linking content either forwards or backwards in the discourse. Examples of this strategy were (9)-(12):

(9)  L1_ As I was saying Nestle employ…
(10) L2_ Next step how do we get there,…
(11) L3_ We want to look now at how…
(12) L4_ So let's see how it works…

Lecturer 2 used signposting much more frequently (17.7%), followed by Lecturer 3 (11.4%), again confirming classroom observations that their lectures were highly structured or organised. Signposting has been found to be a strategy EMI students appreciate in lecturers (Björkman 2011; Tsai and Tsou 2015; Dafouz & Nuñez 2010, among others). Lecturers 1 and 4 employed this strategy far less, but could have benefitted from it, as "easy to get lost" was a comment on their quality parameter observation forms.

4. **Emphasising** functions to draw students' attention to key or problematic features of the content. Examples of this strategy (13)-(16) were:

(13)  L1_ So this highlights the problem…
(14)  L2_ The most important point of this strategy development is…
(15)  L3_ Anyway, before we start with that I would like to just to draw your attention to some terms.
(16)  L4_ Please remember what it means…

This strategy was used frequently by all lecturers, but especially by Lecturers 3 (12.3%) and 4 (10.1%). Emphasising was a frequently used strategy in other EMI studies (Tsai & Tsou 2015) and to a lesser extent in Björkman (2011).

5. **Paraphrasing** presents information using different language, by rephrasing. It is often preceded by "I mean…", "what I mean…" (Tsai & Tsou 2015; Mauranen 2009). Again, this strategy makes the information more understandable through repetition and approximation with the use of alternative language, which gives students more time to pay attention to and process information. Examples of this strategy (17)-(20) were:

(17)  L1_ the thing is that most continuous production is already harming the system. I mean you do have some sort of waste or you're using up energy…
(18)  L2_ there is long term competitive advantage about them and again it's on long term and it's an advantage
(19)  L3_ we have to be able to trace and to allocate the cost and to trace the revenue which this job creates, that is what I mean with this last sentence here
(20)  L4_ Well please remember what it means this number what it means this thing

*Paraphrasing* was another frequently used strategy, particularly by Lecturer 3 (13.2%). Lecturer 3 chose *paraphrasing* and *emphasising* to make his lecture more comprehensible rather than the more interactive prompting and eliciting strategies.
6. Evaluating content was a strategy which lecturers used to qualitatively assess what they were discussing, often involving adjectives: difficult, easy, good, sophisticated, simple, old fashioned, or expressions: it doesn't make sense, it's a no-go. It shows students that the lecturer is thinking critically about the concept under discussion and comparing it to an ideal. Examples of this strategy (21)-(24) were:

(21) L1_ …which I support greatly
(22) L2_ …so it's a very sophisticated analysis
(23) L3_ it's a good explanation of a topic which is not so easy to grasp
(24) L4_ so it's very straightforward

Lecturers 1 (11.7%) and 4 (10.1%) used this strategy more frequently, as seen in Figure 5. Both these lecturers were teaching third-year courses, therefore, one explanation for the use of this strategy could be that as course complexity increases over time more critical thinking is required. Another explanation could be that the lecture topics (Investing and Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility) naturally lend themselves to a more critical approach.

7. Defining (5.1%) was a strategy that the highest-rated lecturers, Lecturers 1 (5.3%) and 2 (9.1%) used more, although in both cases less than 10% of all strategies used. This strategy involves explaining the meaning of terminology or concepts. Again, it is a strategy which involves breaking down the content, making it more comprehensible. This strategy would be more frequently used for a new topic where terms are unfamiliar, which could have been the case for the first-year class on Corporate Strategies and culture (Lecturer 2), and the third-year class on Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility. However, another explanation could be that these lecturers were experienced in giving such explanations and definitions to help students process the new information presented, and that this difference contributed to the higher ratings of their lectures.

Examples of this strategy (25)-(28) were:

(25) L1_ So CSR is the way of going about sustainability in a very broad sense...
(26) L2_ structure, the second of the structuring forces, and it's basically about how to coordinate all the activities in the company.
(27) L3_ A cost pool is also an important term when we talk about job costing. A cost pool is a department or any other grouping of individual or indirect cost items
(28) L4_ swaps are symmetrical instruments which are mostly traded stochastic...

8. Checking comprehension is a strategy used to see if students are following the lecturers' explanations. Examples of this strategy (29)-(32) were:

(29) L1_ Sounds ok?
(30) L2_ Somebody can see the numbers or is it too small?
(31) L3_ Does this help?
(32) L4_ Any questions?
This strategy was used distinctly more by Lecturer 4 (15.7%). This lecturer had slightly lower linguistic competence (advanced) and he was an L1 Spanish speaker addressing a mainly (75%) German-speaking audience. Awareness of these facts may have prompted Lecturer 4 to use this strategy more frequently to ensure he was understood.

9. **Indicating prior learning** was a strategy that Lecturer 2 used much more (13.6%) than the other lecturers. During her lectures she was continually and explicitly linking to concepts taught previously. This strategy has long been considered important in learning theories (Information Processing, Schema Theory, Constructivism) and language learning. It helps learners to connect what they know with the new information presented. Lecturer 2’s lecture, as previously mentioned, was also highly structured, therefore it is quite plausible that the combination of signposting and linking to prior learning gives students’ the essential scaffolding they need to comprehend the content, link it to their present knowledge and appropriately develop this knowledge in the L2.

Examples of this strategy (33)-(36) were:

(33) L1_ Remember this model? What's it called?

(34) L2_ and this is what we discussed when we discussed the decision making…

(35) L3_ which we learnt in the second unit and which are becoming important again

(36) L4_ we talk about it last week but I'm going to do it again

4. **Conclusion**

The aim of this paper was to identify non-native lecturer strategies in an EMI setting, compare differences in strategy use across four lecturers and relate them to quality ratings. Results revealed that non-native lecturers use a repertoire of effective strategies (25) that could have contributed to the quality rating of the lectures. It seems likely that experienced lecturers transfer these strategies from their L1 to L2 lecturing. This finding clearly dispels concerns that non-native lecturers cannot provide quality EMI.

The most frequently used strategies (**prompting, eliciting, signposting, emphasising, paraphrasing, defining, indicating prior learning**) functioned as scaffolding for learners by either breaking down the complexity of information provided, structuring the content, linking new concepts to what learners were familiar with or focusing learners’ attention on important points. The strategy **evaluating content** introduced learners to critical thinking, and the use of **comprehension checks** by Lecturer 4 compensated for his slightly lower linguistic competence. Furthermore, the two highest-rated lecturers employed more prompting and eliciting, a finding in line with other research (Morell 2004, among others), which advocates interactive lecturing.

These findings have implications for lecturer training, as in making lecturers more aware of strategies they may benefit by incorporating the ones they use
less frequently or changing their strategies. For example, interactive Lecturer 1, although the most highly-rated lecturer, could include more *signposting and indicating prior learning*, strategies which he used less frequently. Structured and interactive Lecturer 2 could incorporate more *evaluating* into her lectures and encourage longer and more complex student responses and more critical thinking. Lecturer 3 could employ more *eliciting and prompting* to encourage student participation, and Lecturer 4 could include *signposting and indicating prior learning*, which could help students follow and organise his lecture content.

The results of this study may be of particular interest to those working in similar academic settings (EMI in business-related degrees with expert non-native lecturers). However, it must be acknowledged that the small sample size in this study makes it difficult to generalise about strategy use in other contexts. The analysis of more student-centred classes involving group work might reveal a different set of strategies at work, as would the investigation of lecturers or students with lower English proficiency.

It may be that lecture quality is determined mainly by linguistic competence and that the strategies described in this study play a minor role. As mentioned, Lecturers 1, 2 and 3 were more proficient compared to Lecturer 4. Therefore, it follows through that Lecturer 4 could improve his quality rating by improving his linguistic competence. Nevertheless, improving *vocabulary range, phonological control, cohesion and fluency*, components of linguistic competence, is no simple feat. Hence, in the short term it may be more effective for lecturers to undergo strategy training to improve their lecturing skills. Other EMI researchers (Klaassen & de Graaf 2001; Björkman, 2011) suggest that student-centred teaching or the use of pragmatic strategies in EMI are more important than linguistic competence once lecturers have reached advanced linguistic competence.

Further understanding of non-native lecturing strategies could be gained by building up a larger corpus of EMI lectures. Lecturers and students' level of L2 proficiency or the nature of the academic discipline (engineering, law, mathematics, literature) may be important factors determining the kinds of strategies employed. Finally, a longitudinal study of a series of lectures by the same lecturer would reveal if lecturers use the same repertoire of strategies or if they change over time. Smit (2010), for example, in her longitudinal study on classroom discourse found that lecturers moved from display to referential questions over time. This kind of data could be complemented with students' recall of the lecture, which may point to hidden comprehension problems or confirm the effectiveness of the strategies used. This would provide a broader picture of lecturing strategies and their contribution to the quality of lectures in EMI settings.
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1. Introduction

European Higher Education (HE) is witnessing a rapid growth in the number of degree programmes and course units taught through English, and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have sometimes launched into EMI as a need to remain abreast with the general trend of internationalisation in HE, and as a way to attract international students, funding and to improve rankings. As with all new movements, a picture of how it will develop over time is sometimes elusive, as is a clear idea of how the notion of quality can be instilled and maintained in teaching practice.
As Valcke and Wilkinson recall, English has become a "dominant 'partner' within all higher education learning approaches where an additional language medium is involved" (2017: 15). The reasons for this dominance lie within the economic and political arenas. As a number of scholars have observed (Shohamy 2013; Wilkinson 2013; Philippson 2006; Costa & Coleman 2013; van der Walt 2013), English-medium instruction in countries where English is not the main language of communication is often conceived as a synonym for internationalisation, where HEIs hope to "attract more national and international students and lecturers and gain visibility at the international level, thus emulating and even competing with the world's top universities located in Anglophone countries such as the USA and the UK" (Guarda & Helm 2016: 1). Although EMI may offer opportunities for both students and teachers, in terms of international mobility for study and employability, and in terms of furthering language and intercultural learning, several scholars in the field have warned against the risks of this trend. Some have highlighted a tendency towards commoditisation of education, linguistic dispossession and domain loss for local languages, as well as an imposition of a Western mindset as a new form of imperialism (Philippson 2006). Others have stressed how the shift towards EMI may become a discriminating factor, in that it marginalises students and teaching staff whose language competence is not felt to be adequate, or who are unwilling to study or teach through English (Coleman 2006).

In the debate regarding the empowering and marginalising nature of EMI, a key issue is the quality of educational provision. In programmes where English is the medium of instruction, constant monitoring should be assured (Valcke & Wilkinson 2017) so as to maintain the quality of teaching and learning so that EMI students do not risk falling behind those enrolled on programmes taught in their native languages.

In this paper, quality should be interpreted as the result of language mastery on the part of both lecturers and students alike, and competence in the use of effective methodological approaches that can enable students overcome the challenges which are naturally posed by the shift in the language of instruction and learning. As Klaassen and de Graaff suggest (2001: 282), EMI requires an additional effort on the part of teaching staff, who need to be made aware that students may need additional support in accessing content and negotiating meanings in a language that is not their own. Therefore, as Cots puts it (2013: 117), a shift in methodology is required, in other words a "process of decentring of the focus of pedagogic action from the instructor to the students". By giving students a more active role during classes, for instance through group work and discussion, role plays and other learner-centred tasks, lecturers can empower students to construct knowledge by themselves, thus moving away from the top-down approach of knowledge transmission that often characterises academia. According to Hahl, Jarvinen and Juuti (2014), students who feel empowered in the EMI classroom are not only able to enhance their own learning, but are also
able to generate a more positive atmosphere for both themselves and their lecturers.

In Italy, EMI in higher education is a relatively recent phenomenon (Costa & Coleman 2013) when compared with northern European countries. First introduced in the early 2000s, the implementation of study programmes taught in a foreign language was formally reinforced by a 2010 law regarding universities which advocated the promotion of education through a foreign vehicular language. Since then, Italian HEIs have been moving very quickly towards the implementation of EMI at the graduate and, more recently, undergraduate levels. Guarda and Helm observe (2016) in the academic year 2015/2016 a total of 245 English-taught programmes were offered by 55 universities across the country, 226 of which were at the Master's level and 19 at Bachelor's level, with a remarkable 72% rise compared with the previous year¹.

While EMI has gained momentum in Italian HE, it is important to note that the issue of language proficiency, on the part of lecturers and/or students, has not appeared to be a major source of concern until very recently, nor has the issue of methodology been discussed in depth. In a survey on EMI in Italy conducted in 2010, Costa and Coleman found that most lecturers – the vast majority of whom were Italian – were often "forced to teach through English regardless of their target language competence" (2013: 11). What is more, 77% of the 38 institutions that responded to the survey admitted that they did not provide their lecturers with any kind of training or support, be it linguistic or methodological. It may be this lack of training that led the two authors to conclude that the shift to EMI did not appear to lead changes in the way contents are delivered, as formal monologic lectures still constituted the most common teaching style in Italian HE.

In recent years, however, some changes have become evident: several institutions across Italy have started offering their lecturers courses, seminars and other forms of support and training related to EMI. In the sections that follow, we will first outline the LEAP (Learning English for Academic Purposes) support programme that was devised and run by the Language Centre of a large university in north-east Italy. We will then discuss the main findings of two research studies that aimed to collect EMI lecturers' evaluations of their own concerns about teaching in English and of the impact of this shift on their teaching practice, as well as students' evaluations of EMI and lecture quality.

2. EMI at the University of Padova and the LEAP project

The University of Padova, one of the oldest in the world, has a long tradition of welcoming international scholars and students since 1220. This has become a

¹ For an overview of EMI in Italy, see Helm and Guarda (2015) and Guarda and Helm (2016)
driving force recently as the university shares with other HEIs the need to catch up, and keep up with the swiftly moving concept of internationalisation, in particular, as concerns EMI.

In May 2013, all the University's lecturers were sent information about the support options offered by the LEAP\(^2\) project, namely a 2-week summer school in Venice, an intensive course in Dublin, a blended course at the University Language Centre in Padova and an individualised language advising service\(^3\). They were also sent an application form which included a link to a survey aimed at collecting responses on what the lecturers perceived as their needs and concerns about teaching through English. The survey contained both closed-ended and open-ended questions, and sought to cover some of most relevant areas related to English use for communicative and professional purposes, including: background experience with the English language; previous experience with EMI, if any; perceived concerns about using English for communicative and didactic purposes; perceived strengths and weaknesses in English; expectations about the support programme and areas of language and didactics that the respondents wished to cover\(^4\). Of the 115 lecturers – all Italian - who completed the application survey, 86 were teaching at the graduate level, 19 in undergraduate degree programmes and 11 at PhD level. Nearly half the respondents (50) had no experience with EMI at all, while the remaining 65 lecturers had at least one year's experience of teaching in a foreign language. The responses were useful to the LEAP team to tune the support options to the lecturers' real needs and expectations, and to gain insights into their experiences and motivation. To meet these aims, a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) was adopted to analyse the open-ended answers qualitatively. By adopting a constant process of comparison across chunks of text, it was possible to identify a series of recurring themes and patterns through the data.

One of the survey questions asked applicants to describe their previous experience (if any) with EMI. Interestingly, responses were varied: for 18% of the responding lecturers, teaching in English had been a very positive experience. For an equal number of respondents, previous experience had been mixed, with positive aspects including the greater degree of internationalisation promoted through EMI, while the drawbacks included a greater workload and different levels of students' linguistic competence. A totally negative picture, on the other hand, was provided by 5% of the responding lecturers, as exemplified

\(^2\) The LEAP (Learning English for Academic Purposes) Project was funded by the International Relations Office of the University of Padova, and was based at the University Language Centre.

\(^3\) All support options had a dual focus on EMI methodology and on language. For more information, see Dalziel 2017.

\(^4\) For a more exhaustive overview of the methodology for data collection and analysis, as well as for a more extended discussion of lecturers' needs and concerns about teaching through English, please refer to Helm and Guarda (2015).
in the following comment: "The experience was not satisfying, both for the low approval from the student and for the self-evaluation of my English" (R27).

Besides asking the lecturers to describe their previous experience with EMI, the questionnaire also sought to explore what they perceived as their needs and concerns related to the use of English, both while lecturing and when interacting with students on a more informal level. Although 10% of respondents stated that they had no concerns at all, the other lecturers identified a variety of concerns and areas which they felt weak in. The most frequently mentioned concern relates to teaching methodology, where 28% of the respondents expressed their need to modify their teaching approach and to adapt it to the EMI context in which they were teaching. Some of this subgroup expressed a lack of spontaneity and inability to improvise in class in the same way they would do in their native language, for example "I have to prepare carefully my lessons. Improvisation is not allowed in a second language" (LA12). For others, the need to adapt their teaching style was linked to their willingness to give students a more central role in the classroom, something which resonates with the EMI research illustrated above. In this light, while applying for the support options offered by the Language Centre, they were expecting to "receive guidance on how to organise my lectures (…), on the way I can involve more the students in the course (I am trying to implement a more active and participating modality of teaching)" (D04). The awareness of the need to adopt a more learner-centred methodology seems to suggest that lecturers were, at least in part, aware of the difficulties that students face in the EMI classroom, and were willing to experiment new strategies to facilitate the learning process. In addition, responses to the questionnaire appear to contrast with Costa's (2012) observations, namely that Italian university professors are not interested in receiving any methodological training. It cannot be denied, however, that there was some resistance on the part of a few participants in the initial stages of the support courses offered by the Language Centre. This resistance seems to be due to the fact that while some lecturers had recognised the need to implement new teaching strategies, others may not have expected a focus on methodological issues as part of EMI training. It was interesting to note, however, that as the courses progressed, in most cases any initial resistance transformed into active involvement and even unexpected enthusiasm about pedagogical issues in some cases.

Besides methodology, questionnaire responses suggested that the use of English in informal communicative episodes, together with fluency, pronunciation and a perceived lack of vocabulary, were the major sources of concern for all lecturers - those with previous experience with EMI and those without. These concerns were the areas that the lecturers stated they needed more support in, and were expecting to tackle in the options provided by the Language Centre. The following comments exemplify the main concerns in relation to the respondents' language ability: "I have limited experience with
'social' English" (B14); "My English is still not fluid enough to allow me express a concept in different manners (D04)"; "My pronunciation is orrible" (SS15); "I have a poor pronunciation and a limited vocabulary outside technical context" (SS01). Some of these findings appear to confirm previous research on EMI. Lehtonen et al. (2003) and Tange (2010), for instance, also found that informal conversational episodes with students were a source of concern for lecturers. Finally, the responses to the questionnaire also showed further areas of language use, such as limited knowledge of grammar rules as well as a certain lack of self-confidence, that were felt as problematic by some of the respondents.

Of the 115 lecturers who completed the application survey, 70 were selected to participate in the support options provided as part of the LEAP project. Given the limited availability of places, priority was given to lecturers who were already teaching through English, with the aim of supporting them to maintain or improve the quality of their academic activity (for further details, see Guarda & Helm 2016).

3. Impact of English and of LEAP on teaching practice

At the end of the three courses offered by the LEAP project (the Summer School in Venice, the intensive course in Dublin and the blended course), the 53 lecturers who had taken part in these support options were asked to complete a second, final survey. The survey, which contained both open-ended and closed questions about the support option attended, was completed by 28 participants from across the three courses. In addition to the survey, the 27 lecturers from the blended course were also invited to write open feedback on the last day of their experience. A few months after the end of the courses, 17 participants from across the three support options also agreed to be interviewed by one of the researchers. All the interviews took place towards the end of the academic year after the EMI lecturers had been teaching again. The aim of data collection was to gather the participants' comments on whether the support they had received through LEAP and the use of English had had an impact on the way they conceived and implemented their teaching. Besides giving us access to the participants' perceptions and experiences, the data was also important for evaluating the quality of the LEAP support options and to plan further events and courses. The open-ended questions of the survey, the open written feedback and transcriptions of the interviews underwent a qualitative thematic analysis to reveal recurrent patterns and themes. The following section sums up some of the most relevant findings. However, for a more complete picture of the

5 The feedback from the 17 participants in the language advising service was not included in this analysis. As it is an individualised service, it was felt that this support option could not be compared with the three courses which, on the contrary, involved groups of lecturers and included group work and discussions.
themes that emerged during the analysis, we invite the reader to refer to Guarda and Helm (2016).

The findings of this research phase appear to be in line with the analysis of applicants' needs and concerns. The research showed that many lecturers, when teaching in a language that is different from their own and their students', feel that their teaching approach needs to become more student-centred. This emerged in particular in the responses of lecturers working in the humanities, while it was felt as less urgent by some professors in the hard sciences. Despite this difference across disciplinary areas, many participants reported discovering the potential of such a methodological shift, which can empower students to access contents and meanings despite the potential barriers posed by the vehicular language. This is exemplified, for instance, by the following extract: "I had to structure it [the course] in a more erm in a less less monologic way, and make sure that there were moments in which the students could think and do things themselves, some breaks, some moments in which they could rest because [attending such a course] is tiring" (Interview, D02). This sense of renewed awareness also emerged in the words of lecturers who initially seemed to be reluctant, or did not expect to engage in discussion about methodology: "Before starting the course, I thought it would have been a course of English: grammar, vocabulary, way of saying...but it was more, in particular because I have understood something new for me about teaching methodologies" (Survey, B02). It should not come as a surprise that lecturers used expressions such as 'unusual', 'discovered', 'surprise', 'motivated', 'impressed' to comment on the discussions of pedagogy that took place in class. As some respondents made clear, these discussions were an 'opportunity to reflect, for the first time, on training pedagogy' (Open feedback, SSU-08), something which, in a context like Italian HE, appears to be 'quite unusual in our professional activity' (Open feedback, B15): "I have been teaching in higher education for almost 30 years and I have never had the chance to reflect upon the pedagogical dimension of my activity, also because as you know the recruitment process that we have here does not include this aspect at all" (Interview, SS13).

During the analysis, a further interesting element emerged which seems to reveal the impact of the LEAP support courses and the shift to English as the vehicular language. For some lecturers, adapting their teaching to EMI also implied giving their courses a more "international flavour" (Open feedback, B04). As Guarda and Helm remark (2016: 11), "the use of another language called for a wider view on the issues dealt with in class, and thus broadened the spectrum of experiences and knowledge to which the students could have access". The respondents who pinpointed this shift commented that the use of English had stimulated them to introduce examples from different countries and to refer to a variety of cultural backgrounds, as well as to invite their international students to share knowledge and experiences as seen from their own perspectives. The following extract is an example of this: "this is something I learnt at S. Servolo,
that it's not just a matter of translating my Italian course (...) I had to change all my examples (...), using another language automatically puts you into a different wider context, you no longer speak only about Italy, you automatically think "but [what happens] in Germany, but in Sweden, but in Finland (...)" (Interview, SS07).

A further theme that emerged in the analysis was that a great number of lecturers who participated in the LEAP programme openly recognised the need for support. Given the challenges that EMI poses to the teaching staff, the participants reported that they had greatly appreciated the sense of community that arose during the courses. In their words, it was thanks to the "positive interactions among colleagues of the class and the exchange of experiences, opinions, problems and ideas during the numerous discussions stimulated by the teacher" (Survey, BU-05) that they could feel that 'my worries are those of other colleagues" (Survey, B11) and discover that "we could improve our teaching activity simply sharing our experiences'" (ibid). The emergence of a Community of Practice (Wenger, McDermott & Snyder 2002) also had the potential to inspire its members' teaching practice: "After each our meeting (in which we discussed, presented and listened to talks, attended seminars, received advice,...), I remember that I continued for several days after, to reflect about the topics, to reformulate my considerations,.....I fixed in my mind terms, phrases and strategies that I will try to apply in my courses" (Open feedback, B04). In addition, it also reinforced the participants' feeling that they need support and guidance in order to move into the new territory of EMI with increased confidence and awareness: "I agree that a good proposal would be to think about a permanent support organized by CLA [the University Language Centre] and structured in several activities scheduled and covering all the academic year, with teachers booking the ones they are interested to" (Open feedback, B04).

The research we conducted on the lecturers' needs and concerns prior to participating in the LEAP support options, and their perceptions of the impact of such courses and of English on their teaching practice, showed that introducing a foreign language for teaching and learning may open up opportunities to reflect on teaching, and the implementation of more student-centred approaches. This may have an important impact on the quality of education provided in contexts, such as EMI, in which students need more support and empowerment to learn through a language which is not their own, despite the potential limitations.

4. Students' needs and concerns about quality EMI

Clearly quality in EMI involves an adequate and appropriate preparation of students as well as their lecturers. We have found that lecturer support and methodological training leads to changes in the classroom environment and an
improvement in learning, and it is therefore opportune to evaluate the students' involvement in the process as part of the more complex picture of the multiple players communicating through the EMI interface, where both students and lecturers reach a beneficial and reciprocal level of interaction and negotiation in the learning process. Thus the students' needs and concerns must also be considered in order to satisfy quality parameters.

A different study that was undertaken as part of the LEAP project regarded students' views with the aim of understanding their perceptions of EMI, and their learning. The issue of quality in this context refers to the factors which affect the entire outcome of the learning process in the EMI classroom, rather than the provision of support where necessary. The success of internationalisation is regularly measured in terms of the capacity to attract international students (Grin 2010), with numerous comparative quantitative studies now available, however there is, as yet, little research to show how students cope with EMI.

While lecturers have had the opportunity to participate in the LEAP training, students enrolled in EMI courses at the University of Padova do not receive specific preparation for the English-taught programmes. In the past, students who had an EMI course in their study plan were offered the possibility of attending voluntarily a 50-hour general English course. However this project has now concluded with mixed and not very satisfying results. Although students must self-declare that they have at least a B1 level, there is no provision for refusing enrolment due to unsuitable language ability, and there is no obligatory language test after enrolment. The typical EMI scenario is a predominantly L1 Italian classroom with a varying, but limited proportion of international students, and an L1 Italian lecturer. The typical classroom also comprises a mixed capacity in English ranging from B1 to native-speaker.

Students enrolled in a Postgraduate ETP in the Social Sciences were invited to participate in the project by responding to a 38-item questionnaire which asked about their perceptions of EMI, their views on how their learning may, or may not have been affected by EMI, and whether the language competence of their lecturers and/or classmates is decisive in the learning process. The questionnaire asked students to rate on a 5-point Likert scale their answers to direct questions about their own language competence, how they perceived language as affecting lecture quality, their lecturers and perceived changes in language and teaching on the course, followed by 3 open questions (see Clark 2017). The aim was to see whether students' and their lecturers shared the same concerns, and also to discern which, if any, language issues are perceived as affecting the quality of EMI.

Responses from 74 students\(^6\) enrolled in the 1st and 2nd years of the course were studied and it was found that international students (IS) were more critical

\(^6\) Of these, 60 were domestic students with L1 Italian, while 14 were international students (including L1 English, Russian, Rumanian, Spanish, Portuguese and Vietnamese).
in their self-evaluations of language competence. Their rating of their own language skills was lower than the domestic students' (DS) ratings in all skills. Further, 1st year DS considered their language skills to be higher than 2nd year DS.7 Saarinen and Nikula point out (2013) that a B2 level is generally required for successful participation in EMI, yet many of our sample were a B1 level and had difficulty reaching B2. On the other hand, most respondents said that they had met absolutely no language difficulties in the course so far, but those who did express difficulty in following the course all rated their own levels as high or very high which implies that they may consider their own competences to be adequate and that the source of difficulty may lie elsewhere.

The relationship between language capacity affecting the success of lectures and the students' perception of what may be considered a 'good' lesson (see for example, Gundermann 2014; Clark 2017) was a concern of many lecturers. In this regard, all respondents claimed that there was definitely a difference in level across the class - as one student noted: "an important part of the students have problems with the language as well" (IN2-02). It is possible that the calibration of the levels (as outlined by the CEFR8) may not be sensitive enough, or that intercultural competence may play a part, or, as Dafouz and Smit point out, the "language code which functions as a tool for [...] teaching and learning" may not "encapsulate discursive and other social practices" (2016: 4). Language level (B1, B2, C1 etc.) was not a useful predictor of student satisfaction with courses or perceived quality of EMI.

Although all students were aware of a difference in language level, they also indicated that the discrepancy in level did not affect the success of lectures, a result which does not coincide with the literature. It is interesting to note that lecturers generally expected language competence to be closely correlated to lecture success. DS in their 2nd year were most aware of the negative effects of the different language levels, while IS and 1st year DS did not find that differences in level affected the success of lectures. Nonetheless, students (including those who had not yet reached a B2 level) generally agreed that entry requirements to the course should include a minimum language level of B2 to avoid the mixed levels and possible negative impact on the class. It was also suggested by several participants, that lecturers should be asked to pass the same tests.

It has been argued in the literature that the quality of education diminishes in the EMI classroom (Troudi & Jendlhi 2011; Al-Bakri 2013), with the suggestions that learning must in some way be hindered if the subject is taught in a language different from the students' own L1. In this study, it was found that only 13% of students (all 1st year DS who rated their own competence as high) agreed that

---

7 See Clark (2017) for further details
8 Common European Framework of Reference
their learning was probably slower. This disadvantage could manifest itself in taking longer to learn, slowing down knowledge acquisition, not receiving an optimum level of knowledge acquisition in their lectures, or over-taxing the working memory having to work in two languages. On the other hand, 32% of respondents (all 2nd year DS) indicated that they had not felt any hindrance to their learning by following EMI courses.

As mentioned above, most EMI lecturers interviewed were concerned with their language (in particular, pronunciation and accent) and/or methodological skills (Helm & Guarda 2017).

Students’ perceptions of quality clearly involve their lecturers' language competence, and students were keenly aware, and at times critical, of their lecturers' language skills: "Unfortunately, not all the lecturers have a very good level of English" (IT2-03), "Some lecturers have very good English, most are average and their lessons are clear and understandable. However, some are a disaster" (IT2-11). Similar results were found in a Swiss study (Studer 2015: 226) which also noted that language competence was mentioned by students when discussing poor teacher preparation and methodology. While lecturers were more concerned, or sensitive about, pronunciation and/or accent (see Helm and Guarda, 2014), Gundermann (2014: 124) suggests that pronunciation and accent are key to comprehension and thus it was expected that students might share this concern, as comments made in class suggested. It was interesting to note that half the respondents indicated that lecturers' pronunciation posed no problems to understanding, with IS being the most critical. Lecturers' clarity and fluency (intended as speaking smoothly with complete information units, few false starts, etc) was not generally a problem, although about 13% of students (all 2nd year) - said that lecturer clarity and fluency was not good at all.

Lecturers participating in the LEAP project had commented on the level of students' English and whether classroom problems might arise from mixed and lower levels, which, in turn, would affect the perceived quality of the teaching. Over half the participants in the survey thought that their own level of English was better than their lecturers'. Regarding this point, some scholars (for example Maiworm & Wächter 2002) have suggested that only lecturers with a valid certificate, including language skills, should hold EMI courses, a proposal that student participants agreed with. However, careful evaluation must be made of what types of certification should be required, since the CEFR levels and structure may not be appropriate for the EMI context, as mentioned above (Pilkinton-Pihko 2013).

Regarding teaching methodologies, students were aware that methodology was an element discriminating between successful and less successful lessons. They recognized the benefits of participation, the merit of practices which included presentations, seminars and discussion, and expressed their
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disappointment in some lecturers who they perceived as being unable to interact effectively with the class. An International student pointed out: "Professors should be encouraging discussion more. This could be done in the form of seminars [...] which could also be aided by an interactive activity" (IN2-16). Students were also appreciative of lecturers’ ability to stimulate participation and discussion and an exchange of ideas in a positive classroom atmosphere with nearly 20% of respondents saying that lecturers were always able to manage the classroom in such a way as to encourage participation and discussion.

Lecturers participating in the LEAP project have been keen to discuss whether EMI students should be offered a choice of language for assessment purposes (Helm 2017). Students, on the other hand, feel very strongly that no choice of language be offered, and over 70% of respondents were totally satisfied with written and oral exams being held in English. Similarly for their thesis (an obligatory part of the coursework in degree programs at Italian universities) more than half the respondents stated that they felt ready to write, present and defend their thesis in English and no students reported being definitely not ready. This finding is surprising since although students rated their writing as better than their speaking skills with 74% indicating that their writing skills were high or very high, this is not supported by the results of the rigorous B2 tests offered by the University Language Centre where students struggle to reach a B2 level in writing. Further research will be carried out on this area since it is crucial to the discussion of quality in EMI.

5. Conclusions

As the process of Internationalization in HE gains momentum, it inevitably brings with it a move towards EMI, which has become a fixed factor in HE prospectuses in a short time. In this changing scenario, the role of the various stakeholders – not least lecturers and students – needs to be defined, especially in terms of assuring quality.

The LEAP project and the various sub-areas of study described above have the single aim of arriving at an understanding of the concerns of both students and their lecturers which have a bearing on the success of the EMI classroom. Within this picture, the University of Padova has been at the forefront in offering lecturers a wide range of support options with the aim of refining methodological skills, raising intercultural awareness and, to a lesser extent, improving the strictly linguistic levels of lecturers involved in EMI, in keeping with Valcke and Wilkinson’s observation that "quality can be assured through practices of continuous professional development" (2017: 17).

However, support for lecturers is only one aspect of quality assurance, as the further findings with students have shown. Students have an important role in quality assurance in EMI, and as some of their responses has shown, their concerns do not always coincide with their lecturers’ (a further study is currently
underway at the University of Padova investigating EMI from the students' point of view). Further, students were very perceptive of the role of language, although their responses regarding their own levels in terms of the CEFR and their language competence were not always reflected in language testing carried out at the University Language Centre.

Nonetheless, a further important aspect of EMI has not been discussed in this paper, that is, the quality of EMI programmes also derives from the quality of HE administration and support services, which includes the English language skills and intercultural awareness, as well as the sensitivity of support services for international students. This area of EMI requires further attention.

REFERENCES


EMI lecture quality parameters: the student perspective

Curtis GAUTSCHI
ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften
Gertrudstrasse 15, 8400 Winterthur, Switzerland
curtis.gautschi@zhaw.ch

La capacità dei docenti di gestire lezioni nei quali la lingua di insegnamento è l'inglese (English-medium Instruction: EMI) è una componente chiave per la garanzia della qualità dei programmi internazionali universitari. Un metodo per valutare la preparazione dei docenti in questo senso è l'osservazione e la valutazione degli stessi da parte di esperti specificamente formati in materia. Tuttavia, in quanto soggetti centrali in tema di istruzione, le prospettive degli studenti sono anch'esse una componente essenziale nella valutazione delle competenze dei docenti. Questo studio esamina le valutazioni degli studenti con due obiettivi. Il primo è quello di convalidare i criteri utilizzati nella valutazione della qualità delle lezioni EMI da parte di esperti. I parametri di qualità in questione sono stati sviluppati nell'ambito del progetto "Internationalisation of Universities of Applied Sciences" (ved. anche Studer questo numero). Il secondo obiettivo è quello di sviluppare un pool di elementi per questionari di feedback ad uso degli studenti, da utilizzare in contesti EMI. I dati studente-specifici supportano l'inclusione di criteri di valutazione in senso linguistico, comunicativo e didattico sia per la valutazione da parte da esperti che per gli strumenti di feedback degli studenti.
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1. Introduction

Fluent English proficiency is clearly a requirement when lecturing through the medium of English. Several specific facets of language competence have been noted as indicators of EMI lecturing competence. For instance, Schaller-Schwaner (2005) postulate that a minimal vocabulary range in technical language should be a prerequisite for foreign language subject teaching. Londo (2011: 97) also reports that lecturers cite limited vocabulary and language problems as challenges in EMI. It is, therefore, not surprising that some quality assurance approaches to EMI focus primarily on linguistic competence, as measured by recognised foreign language general proficiency assessment (e.g., TOEFL) or tests of English for Academic Purposes (e.g., TOEPAS - Kling & Staehr 2012). Language competence is under constant scrutiny by higher education authorities in the interest of quality assurance (Ball & Lindsay 2013). However, acknowledging the complexity and uniqueness of EMI settings (Smit 2013: 13) has led to the understanding that language proficiency criteria alone are an insufficient basis for the assessment of lecturers' EMI suitability (Wilkinson 2008; Klaassen & Räsänen 2006). This is supported by several
studies. For example, Klaassen (2001) found that while effective language behaviour did impact students' perceptions of understanding, it did not impact student learning, neither was language competence found to be a significant predictor of lecture clarity, nor did it correlate with effective lecturing behaviour or with student learning. Björkman (2011) reports that a high level of language competence is not a prerequisite to effective language use in EMI. Pilkinton-Pihko (2013) found that comprehensibility goals override native-like language proficiency in intercultural EMI settings. Finally, in an analysis of students' interpretive repertoires collected in group discussions elicited by video recordings of EMI lectures, Studer (2015) found that positive EMI experience "crucially depends on the lecturers' ability to negotiate communicative-didactic rather than linguistic competence".

In this light, more comprehensive quality approaches have been developed (e.g., the University of Freiburg EMIQM project - Gundermann & Dubow 2017; Aalto University Language Guidelines - Plym-Rissanen & Suurmunne 2010) that integrate EMI-specific linguistic and communicative/didactic competences. Continuing in this direction, the 2015-2017 "Internationalisation of Universities of Applied Sciences" project, funded by Swissuniversities and co-led by the Bern and Zürich Universities of Applied Sciences, developed an assessment tool to measure this range of competences in live EMI lecturing performances. This tool is intended to be used by EMI-trained raters during single classroom observations.

2. Theoretical Framework

A central question in the assessment of lecturer competence is how the student perspective can be used. One method is to implement student feedback questionnaires alongside trained-rater assessments. Another under-researched use for the student perspective is the validation of trained-rater instruments themselves.

According to Bachman (2004: 264-279), assessment instrument validation begins at the start of the design process with reference to the instrument's purpose, use, and interpretations and decisions to be made based on resulting evaluations. This implies that scores from trained-raters should also be a reflection of the perceptions of stakeholders, thus ensuring that scores are properly interpreted. While it is obvious that the student perspective would be the basis for the development of a student feedback questionnaire, it is argued that student perceptions also play an important role in the design and validation of trained-rater assessment tools. Their perspective should be taken alongside other validation considerations related to stakeholders in the education enterprise, such as the institution, policymaking bodies, or those representative of the post-education workplace. Since the purpose of the rater assessment tool in question is to measure the quality of EMI lecturing, students necessarily
represent a key target stakeholder group, whose perceptions of lecture quality should be reflected to some degree in trained-rater assessment scores. The importance of students' perspectives, given their position as the users of EMI lectures, is also demonstrated by the body of studies that focus on the student view (e.g., Chang 2010; Suvinity 2012; Jensen et al. 2013). If true that the starting point in any model of teacher competence is linked to facets that impact students (Roelofs 2007: 127), and that any "meaningful testing should reflect the target situation" (Pilkinton-Pihko 2013: 3), it follows that the student perspective have a central role in the development of lecturer competence assessment tools.

The use of student feedback to assess the quality of teaching generally and in higher education in particular is not new. Such feedback plays an important role in quality assurance and accountability in education (Leckey & Neill 2001), and is often used to provide diagnostic feedback on, and determine the degree of, teaching effectiveness, to facilitate administrative decision-making, or for research purposes (Marsh & Dunkin 1992). Specifically with regard to EMI, research has examined student attitudes towards and experiences with English-taught programmes (e.g., Airey & Linder 2006; Karakaş 2017). Rarely, however, has empirical data from student reactions to live performances of EMI lecturers been used to facilitate the selection and verification of criteria for EMI quality assessment. In addition, student survey practices tend to be idiosyncratic and may often lack validation, reliability evidence as well as evidence of dimensionality through quantitative analysis (see Alderman, Towers & Bannah 2012: 261-263).

In view of these considerations, the present study examines the student perspective through the analysis of student reactions to EMI-lectures for two specific purposes. The first is to validate the trained-rater assessment tool specifically with respect to the linguistic, communicative and didactic competences. This is achieved by comparing student and trained-rater assessments and identifying items that are related to students' perception of EMI-lecture quality. The second objective is to construct a pool of empirically-tested items for use in EMI student feedback instruments and test items using newly developed reliability indices to assist in item decision making.

3. Method

3.1 Instruments

Student data was collected via two paper-based questionnaires. The first contained items that were strictly based on the original trained-rater assessment tool, and contained 15 items, plus a response variable to measure students' satisfaction with overall lecture quality, representing the construct under study, namely, EMI lecture quality. Items were simplified to compensate for students'
lack of specific training, while capturing the central meaning of the original trained-rater items (see Appendix for full wording of student items).

Student items were measured on a 4-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree). Each item was assigned to one of three analytic categories under study: language competence (LC), communicative competence (CC) or didactic competence (DC). These categories correspond to configurations of sub-competences in Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurell's model of Communicative Competence (1995) and Celce-Murcia's subsequent revision (Celce-Murcia 2008). In these models, linguistic competence is identified as a bottom-up microlevel consisting of lexico-grammatical and phonological components. Interactional, discourse and strategic (an inventory of strategies that speakers draw on to facilitate communication) competences work together to facilitate communicative purpose, and are thus grouped together under CC (e.g., conversation, interacting with students via questions, verifying student comprehension). DC items are related to EMI-context-bound didactic goals or facilitating learning (e.g., drawing attention to the value of multicultural settings, the use of learning aids).

Data collected was used to validate the trained-rater questionnaire using two approaches. First, comparisons of student and trained-rater assessments were made to evaluate the correspondence between the two groups and the effectiveness in capturing the student perspective. This was done by means of a) direct comparisons of student and trained-rater assessments with statistical tests and b) Cohen's kappa coefficient, a chance-corrected measure of rater agreement (Everitt 1998: 202). The second approach was via regression modelling, which provides the basis for studying and characterizing the construct of interest. This is achieved through the formulation of a realistic mathematical model of the relationship between the outcome variable and the quality parameter variables (Everitt 1998: 319).

The second student questionnaire was subsequently developed based on the findings of the first questionnaire and by adding other items from other sources. This second questionnaire was then used to test a) the new items (see Appendix) and b) newly designed indices to facilitate decision making regarding item selection, both of which contribute to the development of an empirically-based pool of student feedback items for EMI.

3.2 Questionnaire 1 results

All statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software (R Core Team 2017 - Version 3.4). Complete datasets, additional plots, analyses and R-scripts, together with the original questionnaires, are available as online supplementary material.
The first student questionnaire was implemented together with the original EMI-trained-rater assessment tool in the fall of 2016, in 10 teaching units of the bachelor-level Business Administration International Programme, at the Bern University of Applied Sciences. The dataset contained 151 student evaluations and evaluations from six trained-raters (who observed in pairs or as individuals) of eight lecturers. Most students were German/Swiss German native speakers (75%), followed by Vietnamese (8%), English (8%), Russian (5%), French (5%), with the remainder Chinese, Albanian, Kurdish, Spanish, Portuguese, Indonesian and Arabic. Trained-raters were from Spain, Germany and Switzerland.

3.2.1 Comparison of students' and raters' evaluations

Trained-rater evaluations used the common Swiss grading-scale with grades of 3, 4, 5 and 6, 4 representing a minimum pass. This scale has a different acceptable/unacceptable threshold compared to the students' Likert scale. The two scales were harmonized by collapsing factor levels into three ordinal categories, namely, fail, sufficient and exemplary (the highest possible grade), thus facilitating the comparison of trained raters' with students' assessments. The collapsing of ordinal categories is a common procedure (Healey 2012: 307) and acceptable on the condition that data structure remains intact (Kateri 2014: 208-211). This was verified by comparing correlations before and after combining categories (Castiglioni & Dalla Zuanna 1992: 554). While some information is lost with any such merging, this was found to be minimal considering the nearly identical correlations revealed after the harmonization (see supplementary material for full details).

Student and rater assessments were analysed by comparing mean assessments of each questionnaire item at the class level as well as total scores in each analytic category (LC, CC, DC), plus an overall score based on the total sum of all items (see Tables 1 and 2 for summary statistics). Missing data was deleted listwise resulting in 142 complete student and nine rater cases for analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rater</th>
<th>student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_TOT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_TOT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_TOT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary statistics for total scores in linguistic, communicative and didactic categories, with overall sums of all items.
Table 2: Summary statistics for all items in questionnaire 1. No comparison for CC_3 (discussions) as trained raters did not evaluate this item.

Figure 1: Trained-rater (R) vs. student (S) assessment distributions for total scores in A) LC category, B) CC category, C) DC category and D) sum of all items for all participants. Wilcoxon tests indicate statistically significant differences between students and trained raters.
The overall relationship between student and rater assessments was found to be uneven. While mean scores of all variables in all teaching units are statistically similar, the relationship is weak (Spearman’s $r = 0.17$, $n = 138$, $p = 0.05$). Differences in total score distributions were not significant for LC or DC, but were for CC (Fig. 1). In addition, at the level of analytic categories (linguistic competence, communicative competence and didactic competence), the relationship appears strong for LC but weaker for CC and DC, as seen in the spread away from the blue lines in Fig. 2. Together this suggests that linguistic
features are perceived and conceptualized in a similar fashion, while
communitive and didactic items are to a lesser degree.

An uneven level of agreement is also indicated by Cohen's kappa coefficients
(weighted). Based on Landis & Koch's (1977: 165) rule of thumb, agreement is
slight at the level of mean assessments for all items in all teaching units ($\kappa = 0.17, n = 138, p = 0.02$), and moderate for category totals for all teaching units
($\kappa = 0.40, n = 24, p = 0.03$) and overall score sums ($\kappa = 0.50, n = 8, p = 0.04$).
This unevenness is also seen at the class level (Fig. 3) where significantly
different score distributions were found in three of the ten classes.

3.2.2 Model of student perception of lecture quality

Three main regression models were developed to examine the construct of EMI
lecture quality:

- Model.step: step-wise based on the Akaike information criterion
  (AIC),
- Model.fa: factor analysis,
- Model.corrstruct: variable-network structure based on the
  Fruchterman-Reingold algorithm.

Given that the outcome variable (perception of lecture quality) is ordinal, the
ordinal regression model method was used implementing Cumulative Link
Models (CLM) for ordinal data as described in Mangiafico (2015: 374-380). The
models were then compared on the criterion of explained deviance, with
significant differences indicated via ANOVA. The best fitting parsimonious
model (i.e., maximizing explained deviance with a minimum of variables) was
found to be model.step (see Table 3). However, this model is strict, with only six
items. While this approach to regression modelling is ideal for outcome
prediction alone, the main interest here is to understand functional relationships
among variables related to lecture quality (see McDonald 2014: 231; Everitt
1998: 319). Consequently, a more cautious approach is preferred.

Factor analysis and principal component analysis, which deconstruct
correlations and covariances to impute underlying factors that variables are
related to (Everitt 1998: 140), were used to identify two distinct clusters of
variables (see supplementary material). The secondary cluster, consisting of
interaction, planning for student level, discussion and promotion of multilingual
settings, was flagged for removal in the model.fa formula.

Model.corrstruct relies on the Fruchterman-Reingold algorithm, wherein forces
within the data (here, the degree of relationship as expressed by correlation
coefficients) are visualized. Low covariance is a repulsing force in the
visualization, high covariance, an attracting force. In this way, the graph in Fig.
4 identifies groups of variables that are related to each other by considering all
forces within the dataset rather than individual pairwise comparisons of correlations (see Fruchterman & Reingold 1991: 1129-1132; Epskamp et al. 2012: 36). Variables that are most distant from the dependent variable (DV) in Fig. 4 are deselected in the model formula (development of L2, discussion, and promotion of multilingual-settings – the latter two are in common with model.fa).

An analysis of variance was used to compare how well the models fit the data. None of the models showed significant differences in fit. However, the DC_3 variable (promotion multilingual-settings) caused model.fa to violate the proportional odds assumption for ordinal regression models (Mangiafico 2014: 375). While this was overcome by adjusting the model formula, the model.corrstruct was preferred in the interest of caution.

Figure 4: Variable-network structure based on the Fruchterman-Reingold algorithm. Items CC_3, DC_2 and DC_3 (development of L2, discussion, and promotion of multilingual settings) are those least related to DV (response variable: quality). S_L is student confidence in English.
In summary, based on the regression models, there is strong evidence that all three categories (linguistic, communicative and didactic) are essential components in the construct of EMI lecture quality in students, thus validating their inclusion in the trained-rater tool. However, given the lack consistent agreement in assessments, there is some evidence of the counterclaim that the tool will not lead to scores that consistently represent the student perspective in its current form. The trained-raters also gave higher evaluations compared to students. This could be improved through a training program especially on the communicative and didactic scales. The higher assessments are likely related to unexpectedly high EMI lecturing quality compared to their local environment.

Regarding the items that the preferred model identified as candidates for removal, it is possible that these were not pertinent to the type of lecture assessed. CC Formal discussion and meetings, DC: Facilitating development of communication skills in L2 and DC: emphasizing value of multicultural setting) were not found to be relevant to lecture quality among students based on the data, but may be relevant in other types of learning units, especially if they are explicit learning goals. This suggests the need for different assessment instruments depending on the type of learning setting in question.

4. Questionnaire 2/Item Pool development

The second student questionnaire was subsequently developed to test items, contributing to a pool of empirically-tested items for use in EMI student feedback instruments, through newly developed reliability indices. The questionnaire was constructed by a) removing those items flagged above, b) adding items and c) adding variables to collect item-reliability data (students' understanding of, perception of relevance of, and ability to recall the questionnaire items). The added items were, by category: LC: 1) students' understanding of lecturer's words; CC: 2) whether the Lecturer asked students questions to involve them; DC: 3) classroom atmosphere, 4) flow of information, 5) lecturer's knowledge of topic, 6) content relevance, and 7) whether students improved their knowledge. These items are based on the Freiburg University EMIQM student forms and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LR Chisq</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Pr(&gt;Chisq)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC_1 (points_clear)</td>
<td>7.797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_4 (voc_range)</td>
<td>10.543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_1 (flow)</td>
<td>7.685</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_4 (manage_unit)</td>
<td>8.203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_2 (interaction)</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0622</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_5 (plan_study)</td>
<td>2.581</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1**
student feedback forms used at the ZHAW (Gautschi & Studer 2017). This questionnaire (with no corresponding trained-rater assessment) was implemented in five classes (within the same Business administration programme) in the spring of 2017. This expanded student form used continuum scales (ticks marked on a line where end points are defined) rather than Likert scales to reduce loss of information from ordinal data.

To determine the degree to which students understood items, found them relevant to the lecture, and were able to remember the item at the end of the lecture, reliability indices were newly developed and calculated (u-index, rel-index and rem-index respectively). These indicate the probability of scores above a threshold of 75% on each index. Possible values range from 0 to 1. The discrimination index, which measures the degree to which items distinguish between performances, is a commonly used measure. Values of .40 and greater indicate good items, .30 to .39 are reasonably good with the possibility of improvement, .20 to .29 need revision, and below .19 are considered poor (Ebel & Frisbie 1991: 232). Discrimination is important to show that questionnaire items gather meaningful information. In addition to discrimination, demonstrating that students understand questionnaire items, are able to recall the requested information, as well as find them relevant, adds to the value of the questionnaire. To our knowledge, such indices have not been tested in prior studies.

4.1 Results

In total, 67 students evaluated five lecturers. Overall, the understanding-index shows that items were well understood, ranging from a minimum of 0.7 (indicating a 70% chance of being rated "I understand this well") to 1 (100% chance of being rated "I understand this well"). Regarding the relevance-index and the remember-index, while most items had values above 0.5 (50% chance of "This is relevant" or "I can remember this"), many had poor values in more than one index. For example, students had difficulty recalling, or seeing the relevance of rating lecturers' technical vocabulary range (rem-index=0.35; rel-index=0.28) or whether lecturers checked student comprehension (0.33 and 0.36 respectively). Surprisingly, lecturers' ability to interact with students scored low in terms of recall and relevance (0.5 and 0.56). Items had poor discrimination index values overall, most likely due to the high quality of the sample lectures under study. Thus, this index is not a suitable reliability indicator for the present dataset. No particular patterns within categories were found.

The consolidation of item characteristics for both questionnaires 1 and 2 provide valuable information for the validation and continued development of both the

1 Each index uses an AUC (area under the curve) approach: \( (x) = \frac{\int_{0}^{100} f(x)dx - \int_{75}^{75} f(x)dx}{\int_{0}^{100} f(x)dx} \), where \( f(x) \) is the probability distribution curve of variable scores with scores ranging from 0 to 100.
student questionnaire and the trained-rater tool. Analyses provide an empirical basis for subsequent action in the iterative process of assessment tool development (see column ACTION in the Appendix). It should be noted that this information, which reflects student perspectives, must be taken together with other validation considerations (Messick 1990: 21). For example, items that have been identified here as not contributing to the student perspective of quality (e.g., Didactic: emphasize value of multicultural lesson) may, upon review, be deemed necessary. If, as part of programme quality, drawing attention to this aspect is an explicit programme goal, then it may be appropriate for this item to be part of a programme evaluation, but not necessarily in student feedback forms.

5. Conclusion

In summary, the present study has shown that there is student-specific validation support for the original trained-rater assessment tool. All categories contributed to student perceptions of quality, thus confirming that communicative and didactic competences, in addition to linguistic, are essential to successful management of EMI settings. However, individual items, especially in the communicative and didactic scales, lack evidence, suggesting that further modifications to the rater tool is necessary as part of the ongoing process of assessment tool design. The study has also, through the development and implementation of original tools and approaches, contributed to a pool of assessment items that provides an empirical basis for the development of assessment instruments. In addition, the study has demonstrated that the combination of statistical modelling and item analysis can provide quantitative evidence of EMI lecture quality measurement.

Notwithstanding, questions remain. For instance, while the approach used is to take student assessments as evidence, it may be rightly asked to what degree the student perspective should be reflected in a rater tool. It is also recognized that student feedback has limitations especially in terms of the quality and reliability of responses (tickbox instruments may result in superficial, let's-get-this-over-with answers), or concerns regarding the comprehensiveness of information gathered (Hand & Rowe 2002: 149). Furthermore, student feedback, especially with respect to the chosen dependent variable of satisfaction with quality, may be idiosyncratic, and entail multiple latent variables such as lecturer personality and class entertainment value that go unmeasured in the present study. Also, with respect to the dimensionality of the construct of lecture quality, random effects such as individual students who evaluated more than one lecturer were not measureable due to missing student identity data in the anonymous paper-based survey.

While there is a good number of student assessments in the data collected, the number of raters and lecturer performances is small. In addition, the high quality
of the lecturing performances makes it difficult to assess the ability of the tools
to distinguish between performances. Further research would therefore benefit
from a broader quality range and number of classes observed to verify the
findings presented here, as well as more in-depth analysis of random effects
such as individual raters, accurate student English proficiency levels and other
attitudinal factors that may impact student evaluations. It is also suggested that
the construct of EMI lecture quality be examined more closely by means of a
questionnaire design that incorporates a validated scale of lecture quality,
consisting of a number of items rather than a single response variable. This
would lead to improved psychometric properties in subsequent questionnaires.
This would also facilitate the reduction of the number of items per category to a
more manageable number without sacrificing information on the construct of
interest.
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## Appendix – summary of all analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item ID</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Questionnaire 1</th>
<th>Questionnaire 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC_1</td>
<td>The lecturer effectively found a way to keep the flow of his/her communication even when encountering difficulties (e.g., searching for words).</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_2</td>
<td>I understood the lecturer's pronunciation without any extra effort.</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_3</td>
<td>I was able to follow the lecturer's speech rate (speed of speaking).</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_4</td>
<td>The lecturer has language and vocabulary to express him/herself and to support the content of the lesson.</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_comfort_in_E</td>
<td>The lecturer spoke easily and confidently about this topic in English.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC_voc_fam</td>
<td>It was easy to understand the lecturer's English (words, phrases).</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_1</td>
<td>The lecturer introduced and explained topics clearly and convincingly.</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_2</td>
<td>The lecturer knew how to talk with us to create a lively and interesting learning environment.</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_3</td>
<td>The lecturer invited counter arguments and stimulated discussion/debate about the subject.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_4</td>
<td>The lecturer gave us opportunities to contribute and checked our understanding.</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_5</td>
<td>The lecture's body language showed confidence in teaching through English.</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_6</td>
<td>The lecturer checked that he/she understood students' contributions by asking questions to clarify.</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_check_S_under</td>
<td>The lecturer checked that we understood communication in the class.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC_involve_Ss</td>
<td>The lecturer frequently got the students involved by asking questions.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_1</td>
<td>Aids (powerpoint, handouts, wordlists, vocabulary work) effectively helped my understanding at an appropriate English level.</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_2</td>
<td>The lecturer effectively created opportunities for us to communicate in English (group activities, presentations).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_3</td>
<td>The lecturer drew attention to the value of a multicultural or multilingual classroom.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_4</td>
<td>The lecturer explained where we were and what we were doing at every stage during the lesson.</td>
<td>✓  ✓   Disc (+/-)</td>
<td>✓  ✓  Disc (+/-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_5</td>
<td>The lecturer took our level of English and different cultural backgrounds into consideration when planning this lesson.</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_atmos</td>
<td>The atmosphere was good.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_flow_info</td>
<td>The flow of information was good (not too slow or fast).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_Lknows_top</td>
<td>The lecturer has good knowledge of the topic.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_recontent</td>
<td>The content was relevant and practical.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_S_learn</td>
<td>My subject knowledge improved from this lesson.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ticks indicate items included in the respective questionnaires. Disc = discrimination (<0.3 poor). Dark grey indicates poor values, light grey acceptable values. ACTION is marked "review" if two or more indices are poor.
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1. Introduction

The shift from teaching in the local language to teaching in English has become a growing trend in higher education in Europe over the past two decades. Wächter and Maiworm (2014: 37) report on a 239% growth in the number of English-taught degree programmes at European universities between 2007 and 2014. In absolute numbers, most of these English-medium instruction (EMI) programmes are offered in the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden. Looking at relative numbers (i.e. including population size, number of higher education institutions, number of enrolled students etc.), EMI is not exactly a mass phenomenon in Germany as not even half of all universities offer programmes in English and the percentage of EMI programmes in relation to the total number of programmes lies around a mere 6% (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 40).
Nevertheless, within the past seven years, the number of EMI programmes in Germany has increased almost fivefold from 214 to 1030 programmes in absolute numbers (ibid.: 43; see also Wächter & Maiworm 2007: 32). Despite its exponential growth, no common quality standard for university teaching in English has been established yet, either at federal or at state level. The only existing policy is summarized in the National Code of Conduct for German Universities Regarding International Students (HRK 2009), a self-commitment signed by the rectors of 139 German universities:

[…] 4. Degree programmes offered by German universities are generally taught in German. If another language, in most cases English, is specified as the language of instruction for part or all of the degree programme, the university will ensure that the teachers have the necessary language proficiency and skills required and that appropriate foreign language teaching materials are available. For students who are not adequately proficient in the German language, any important information – including information on general everyday life at university – will be made available in the respective languages of instruction. (Extract of the National Code of Conduct for German Universities Regarding International Students, HRK 2009; emphasis by the authors)

While it is common practice in EMI in higher education to require students to prove a given threshold level of English in the admissions process, assessment of teachers’ language proficiency is still a major lacuna in the German university landscape, despite the declared intentions in the above-mentioned code of conduct. This article will outline the EMI teaching quality assessment at the University of Freiburg. After a brief overview of the context of EMI and teaching quality at the University of Freiburg, we will introduce a procedure developed to ensure and enhance teaching quality in English-taught programmes. An analysis of the benefits and limitations of this procedure will then build the basis for recommendations for its implementation at other universities and/or in other higher education contexts.

2. Teaching quality at the University of Freiburg

The University of Freiburg (hereafter UFR), founded in 1457, is a comprehensive university with currently eleven faculties, ranging from theology, law and medicine over philology, economics and humanities to mathematics, chemistry, biology, environment and engineering. In the academic year 2016/17 more than 25,000 students were enrolled, 17.1% thereof being international students.1

2.1 English medium instruction programmes at the University of Freiburg

The University of Freiburg currently offers 257 different degree programmes, 18 of which are entirely taught in English as of 2018. Thus, EMI only makes up for

---

1 International students are defined as students with a nationality other than German who are enrolled in a university in the German federal territory (Statistics glossary, University of Freiburg: http://www.statistik.uni-freiburg.de/gloss/aus_stud).
7% of the total number of programmes, but it is a steadily growing niche to which roughly one programme per year is added. Many of these programmes are interdisciplinary and most of them are specifically advertised as international programmes, some even maintain quotas per world region in order to achieve a balanced mix of students in their programmes. Except for one Bachelor's programme, all EMI programmes at UFR are offered at Master's level. In light of this focus on graduate education, it is no surprise that language admission requirements for students are in most cases rather high with a C1 level based on the Common European Reference for Languages (CEFR) or an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) band of 7.0 respectively. Academic teaching staff in these EMI programmes – at least permanent or long-term staff – predominantly consist of German native speakers, with few exceptions especially at the faculties of engineering and environment and natural resources. The first EMI programmes were established in the mid-2000s and up until 2015, no specific assessment of teaching quality in English had been in place.

2.2 Ensuring teaching quality at the University of Freiburg

The UFR addresses teaching quality from numerous angles. First of all, there is the strategically-oriented Stabsstelle Lehrentwicklung (teaching development unit) whose aim is to give advice and support to the President for Academic Affairs, to the senate commission and to faculties on measures to improve the quality of teaching. This unit also coordinates and assists ancillary projects dedicated to the quality of teaching and learning at UFR such as awarding funding to advance innovative teaching concepts and mentoring programs.

Secondly, the Arbeitsstelle Hochschuldidaktik (higher education didactics unit) offers workshops and consultation for teaching staff and programme directors in order to foster the development of teaching competencies at the UFR. Teachers interested in a thorough training in higher education didactics can undergo a 200-hour, module-based training programme which culminates in obtaining a state certificate of higher education didactics (Baden-Württemberg Zertifikat für Hochschuldidaktik), signed by the state minister of education. Occasionally, the didactic training workshops cover relevant topics for those who teach in international and/or English-taught programmes, but there is neither an obligation to offer these topics nor a top-down obligation to take part in them – participation in didactic training is entirely voluntary.

Thirdly, the Zentraler Evaluationsservice (central evaluation service) carries out comprehensive course evaluations. All courses taught at the UFR must undergo a standardized procedure with questionnaires filled in by students either on paper or electronically at all faculties at a given point during the semester. The results of the evaluation – a quality control tool - are directly delivered to the individual teachers and the only other person allowed to review the results is the
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respective Dean of Studies. Negative evaluation results may result in a conversation with the Dean of Studies and do not have any consequences on the teacher's status, contract or else. In the same manner, positive results will largely go unnoticed since most deans lack the time and resources to evaluate the details of all the results. While these three units have helped ascertain and promote the quality of teaching, little is done on a University policy level to address the quality of teaching in English-taught programmes.

With regard to EMI-specific quality assessment, programme accreditation by external agencies has been implemented with most EMI programmes. However, programme accreditation focusses on assessing programme features such as the curriculum, syllabi and infrastructure, but does not consider actual teacher performance. If students raise concerns about their teachers' language competencies, the university's Sprachlehrinstitut (language teaching centre) and the Freiburger Akademie für Universitäre Weiterbildung (Freiburg academy for university continuing education) are recommended to teachers as a language support option. However, up until 2011 none of the language courses offered had been specifically geared towards English for teaching purposes and again, participation is entirely voluntary.

2.3 Specific support for EMI

In 2011, the UFR, together with 185 other universities, successfully won the bidding for a grant of around 6 million Euros over a period of almost 6 years, sponsored by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research. This grant is called Qualitätspakt Lehre (quality pact for teaching) and has allowed for the implementation of seven measures to improve the quality of teaching at the UFR. One of these measures is the English medium instruction support unit (hereafter EMI team), structurally integrated at the university's language teaching centre and tasked with offering tailored support for EMI teaching staff.

In the first two years of the project, the EMI team primarily focused on providing classic language training and language coaching by native speaker trainers. However, after a number of needs analyses, field observations and informal conversations with teachers, coordinators, directors, deans, etc., it was clear that the focus needed to change. To begin with, a classic language training approach seemed to be inappropriate since many if not most of the EMI teachers whom the EMI team had contact to via workshops or classroom feedback already had very high proficiency levels in spoken academic English and would not benefit from general (spoken) language training. Secondly, many

2 Programme accreditation is of course not restricted to English-taught programmes. In a recent development, the UFR has changed its strategy and is currently getting ready for a system accreditation approach as this will replace time-consuming individual programme accreditation. The new approach will work with randomized internal evaluations of all programmes and a thorough analysis of quality management of the entire institution.

3 This grant has been successfully renewed for the follow-up period from 2016 until 2020.
teachers with whom the EMI team had worked expressed concerns and difficulties regarding the interplay between language, interculturality and didactics when teaching in an international EMI programme (see also Gundermann 2014). Thus, appropriate training measures needed to be more specifically oriented towards English for teaching purposes and include intercultural training and didactic contents. Thirdly, EMI teaching staff already deal with the extra preparation burden of having to teach through English instead of their native language and thus have little to no extra time left for time-consuming training measures. Based on these three findings from the field and additional findings from research on EMI in other countries, the EMI team reorganized its training offers, with the focus shifting from training and feedback based on language skills per se towards training measures that incorporated EMI best-practice skills as found in the literature (Airey 2010; Hellekjær 2010; Suvinitti 2012; Björkman 2013, to name but a few) and recognized the special lingua franca situation in the EMI classroom. In other words, emphasis was placed on intelligible and accessible language for instructional purposes in interaction with non-native speaker interlocutors. To this end, workshops and courses were reorganized to also include didactic and intercultural content, and e-learning modules were created in order to cater for the needs of those teachers with too little time for face-to-face training measures.

Despite all these changes, one big lacuna remained: all EMI support measures were aimed at quality improvement, not at quality assessment. Thus, in 2014, the EMI team was tasked with developing a quality assessment procedure for EMI programmes to document the skills of all permanent and long-term EMI teaching staff and to provide tailored feedback. When deemed necessary, the EMI team subsequently provides suitable training measures to overcome weaknesses.

3. EMI quality assurance at the University of Freiburg

The EMI team began developing a quality assessment procedure that would complement the existing quality improvement measures for EMI. This EMI quality assessment – to our knowledge unique in the German higher education landscape – combines three key characteristics which will be outlined in the following subchapters.

3.1 Naturalistic assessment conditions

Standardized language tests such as the IELTS or TOEPAS (Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff) are carried out in a test environment, i.e. in a setting that has specifically been constructed for the purpose of testing. Yet, the benefit of controlled test settings, namely the elimination of interference factors with the aim to assure (more) objectivity, is detrimental to assessing teaching quality since it is the unforeseeable interaction between learners and
teachers which makes teaching a challenge. While test settings allow for teachers to be assessed on their monological performance skills and on their answers to prompts, they neglect other communicative skills for a real teaching context, like promoting discussion or reacting spontaneously to unpredictable questions or comments from students. Further, assessing teachers in a controlled test setting would require additional time from the teachers' already busy schedules. In light of these two factors, it was decided that an EMI quality assessment was best carried out in a naturalistic setting, i.e. through on-the-job observations in real EMI classes.

3.2 Pluriperspective feedback

While most language or teaching assessment is solely based on expert assessors' ratings (e.g. in the TOEPAS, see Kling & Dimova 2015), the EMI quality assurance procedure at UFR goes a step further and also includes the primary stakeholders involved in the EMI classroom: the students and the teachers. Students are involved by means of a questionnaire in which they judge elements of the teacher's performance and comment on their learning progress, e.g. by stating what particularly helped them to follow the lesson well. Instead of judging the teacher's language skills – which would be challenging for non-experts in linguistics and would not reflect their role as learners – students for example rate their own effort necessary to follow the teacher's pronunciation or the degree to which they felt involved and integrated in the lesson. The teachers also get a self-assessment questionnaire which contains the same items as the student questionnaire but with a tweak in perspective: the teacher rates his/her performance, e.g. to what degree he/she thought he/she spoke with an intelligible pronunciation or the degree to which he/she involved and integrated students in the lesson. In addition to these two sources of feedback, two EMI experts also give feedback on the teacher's performance with the help of a more detailed criteria catalogue (see subchapter 3.3.). All three sources of feedback are then triangulated and build the basis for in-depth individual formative feedback on the teacher's performance from three different perspectives. The benefit of including three different perspectives in the assessment is not merely to give stakeholders a voice but also to encourage and establish reflective practice on the part of the teacher and secondarily also on the part of students. Continuous reflections on processes (be they learning or teaching processes) are vital if formative feedback should be sustainable and effective (cf. Biggs & Tang 2011: 45f.).

---

4 Interaction here is of course not limited to verbal interaction, but can also include non- or para-verbal interaction in the classroom.

5 The degree of detail is higher in the expert feedback as the experts have the necessary linguistic and pedagogic expertise – as opposed to the vast majority of students and teachers who are (aspiring) experts in their fields but do not have detailed knowledge of language-related criteria like for instance the distinction between articulation and pronunciation.
3.3 EMI-specific assessment criteria

In order to define EMI-specific assessment criteria, we started our investigations by looking into language competence descriptors from a range of standardized language frameworks such as the CEFR, the IELTS, or tailored tests like the TOEPAS. Although the CEFR can be seen as a model whose elements can feed into frameworks for special purposes (Fulcher 2004), our experience from classroom observations has shown that CEFR descriptors alone fail to describe important competencies for EMI teachers operating in a learning environment largely comprised of second and foreign language users of English.

Furthermore, in line with current research on EMI (Pilkinton-Pihko 2013; Gundermann 2014; Studer 2015, 2016, to name but a few) it was decided that solely general language criteria are neither sufficient nor expedient for assessing teaching competencies in English. General language proficiency is just one side of the coin, since competent EMI teachers also need to have appropriate instructional skills. Thus, after analysing literature on language testing and EMI as well as engaging in discussions with colleagues\(^6\), several sets of criteria were iteratively piloted and benchmarked in real EMI classrooms with volunteer teachers. Upon conclusion of this phase, ten quality assessment criteria divided into two categories were established (cf. Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Competencies for English-Medium Instruction</th>
<th>Communicative Competencies for English-Medium Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.1 Fluency</td>
<td>C.1 Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.2 Articulation and Pronunciation</td>
<td>C.2 Prosody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.3 Grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>C.3 Initiation and integration of student input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.4 Lexical accuracy and range</td>
<td>C.4 Responses to student input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.5 Code consistency</td>
<td>C.5 Intercultural transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overview of the assessment criteria in the EMI quality assessment

The category *Linguistic Competencies* comprises the five criteria fluency, articulation and pronunciation, grammar, lexical accuracy and range, and code consistency. The category *Communicative Competencies* includes the five criteria cohesion, prosodic variation, initiation and integration of student input, responding to student input, and intercultural transparency. Dividing the criteria into two categories gives teachers a more nuanced idea of their strengths and weaknesses in English-taught classes. On the one hand, linguistic criteria primarily focus on language skills proper while communicative criteria focus on a teacher's language use for instructional purposes in an EMI context. The

---

\(^6\) We would like to express our thanks here to Patrick Studer and Paul Kelly from the Language Competence Center at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences Winterthur, and to David Lorenz and David Tizón from the English Department at the University of Freiburg, for sharing their thoughts and helping shape our quality assurance procedure.
following benchmark descriptions in Table 2 provide an overview of how the criteria outlined in Table 1 are assessed in practice:\textsuperscript{7}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Linguistic competencies benchmark</strong></th>
<th><strong>Communicative competencies benchmark</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A certified lecturer speaks fluently with no or few instances of language-related hesitations, articulates and pronounces clearly with no or few instances where confusion might occur, and uses grammar accurately with minor inaccuracies. The lecturer’s lexical choice is accurate and the lexical range is broad enough to explain subject-specific content and to compensate occasional lexical gaps, while avoiding opaque idiomaticity. He/she consistently uses English in speech and writing and any use of a language other than English is followed by an explanation or translation in English. The overall linguistic performance might occasionally require extra listener effort but does not impede comprehension.</td>
<td>A certified lecturer produces coherent speech through a range of cohesive devices to structure the session, speaks at an appropriate rate and uses prosodic variation (intonation, stress, pauses) to support communicative intention. During a session, he/she facilitates student input through questions, integrates student contributions into ongoing discourse, responds appropriately to student input and negotiates comprehension through adaptation of his/her (non- and para)verbal communication if necessary. Locally specific concepts and matters are contextualized and explained in advance for the multicultural classroom. The communicative performance stimulates student participation and facilitates comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Benchmark descriptions of linguistic and communicative competencies in the EMI quality assessment

### 3.4 Assessment procedure and the EMI quality seal

The assessment procedure does by no means aim at singling out top performers or underachievers, but aims to reward teacher communities with a quality seal. In practice this means that EMI programme directors can encourage their teaching staff to strive for a quality seal for the programme (see Figure 1). The seal is awarded if at least 80 per cent of teaching staff have demonstrated the appropriate linguistic and communicative competencies for teaching in English.\textsuperscript{8}

With a validity of five years, the seal can be used for marketing purposes, e.g. on EMI programme websites to inform prospective students about the teaching quality in English. After expiry, the seal can be renewed. In addition, the programme – usually represented by the programme director or committee – receives a printed and framed quality certificate signed by the vice-president for academic affairs, the head of the board of the language teaching centre and the EMI team who assessed the teachers in the programme.

\textsuperscript{7} For more detailed descriptions of the criteria, procedure and scoring scheme, see Dubow & Gundermann (2017).

\textsuperscript{8} The decision to award the seal if at least 80% of teachers are certified – instead of aiming for the full 100% - is merely pragmatic: Due to unforeseen staff turnover, parental or sickness leaves in the course of the assessment over usually one year, it would practically be impossible to reach 100%.
The in-situ implementation of the three key features of the EMI quality assurance procedure builds the basis of assessment. The EMI team individually arranges classroom visits with all participating teachers in the EMI programme under assessment. The EMI team video-records and assesses each teacher on the basis of the criteria mentioned in section 3.3. At the end of each observed lesson, students and teachers receive their respective questionnaires and evaluate the lesson. Within the next five to ten days, the EMI team triangulates the pluriperspective feedback sources and arranges a feedback meeting with the individual teacher, who then receives both qualitative feedback (based on student evaluation, expert feedback and teacher self-assessment) and quantitative feedback (scores based on student and expert feedback with a weighting of 1:2), and tailored instructional recommendations if appropriate. If the teacher has met the minimal quality threshold, he/she counts as certified and subsequently counts toward the 80% threshold of certified teaching staff in a programme. If a teacher has not met the minimal quality threshold, detailed improvement measures are suggested and offered (e.g. one-on-one coaching, participation in workshops or work with e-modules) and an appointment for re-assessment is scheduled for the next semester. The first assessment of an EMI programme in engineering started in the summer term 2015. As of the time of writing, four EMI Master’s programmes have been successfully certified and awarded the EMI quality seal. The EMI team envisages assessing further EMI programmes at UFR in the coming years.

3.5 Benefits and constraints of the EMI quality assessment

The EMI quality assessment at UFR comprises benefits and limitations, both of which are outlined in this section. One benefit lies in the broad applicability of the individualized qualitative feedback to different international classroom contexts, including teaching in languages other than English.

A further benefit voiced by teachers is the fact that it applies context-specific criteria, i.e. criteria covering not just language but teaching through English for a diverse and in most cases international student body. During feedback meetings, teaching staff have voiced appreciation for the fact that teaching skills - not just general language proficiency – were assessed.
In addition to feedback based on the context-specific criteria, the qualitative feedback also includes suggestions on didactics. For example, teachers may need to (re)formulate learning objectives at the beginning of a lesson. In addition, teachers receive recommendations on instructional strategies and methods to encourage and engage students in active learning in small and larger classes. Although the feedback refers to one lesson, strengths as well as didactic recommendations are transferable to other teaching scenarios and most often not only limited to teaching in English but also applicable to native language teaching, as various teachers reported in personal communication to the authors.

A further benefit is that the assessment encourages reflective practices – an important element in professional development – as a result of the lecturer's self-assessment being combined with student feedback on the quality of teaching. As a side-effect, teachers learn that in most cases students are generally content with the teacher's English and, if anything, they comment on features of the lesson such as the didactic structure and methods. This phenomenon contradicts typical teacher concerns about their language proficiency being inadequate (cf. Gundermann 2014: 107ff.), thus relieving many teachers and allowing them to dedicate more time and energy to the design and methodology of the lesson. In fact, several teachers have requested follow-up classroom observations to receive further feedback on their adapted design based on the recommendations.

Nevertheless, the outlined procedure also entails limitations. The first limitation concerns the compatibility of the procedure in different teaching formats. The assessment was originally designed for classic lecture settings, i.e. for teacher-centred classes. Student-centred learning formats such as seminars, problem-based learning or blended learning, all of which predispose students to theoretically take more ownership of the learning process with teachers acting more as guides or facilitators, would likely impact the criteria used and the items which the students feedback regarding quality of teaching in English.

A second limitation of the assessment lies in the considerable (wo)man hours required for the procedure. The 45 to 90 minute classroom visit is a small part of the assessment, and much more time is required to administrate the procedure. This includes communicating with teachers in a programme to schedule classroom visits, preparing questionnaires for automated processing, coordinating feedback meetings, and ensuring the 80% threshold of certified teaching staff in the programme is met for the five-year quality seal. Most importantly, substantial time is needed for thorough analyses of the video material, data triangulation with student feedback and teacher self-assessment, and EMI team discussions and preparations of feedback. On average, sixteen to twenty (wo)man hours divided between two assessors are necessary to certify a single teacher.
4. Implications for implementing EMI quality assurance in other contexts

Given the fact that more and more higher education institutions offer English-taught programmes, it is conceivable to implement the outlined EMI quality assessment in other contexts as well. The following three guiding questions should help for orientation and serve as recommendations for other institutions. Firstly, the feasibility of the procedure needs to be scrutinized: How much human resources are available to administer and perform the assessment? At UFR, the EMI quality assessment is carried out by two full-time staff members. While we have emphasized the substantial amount of (wo)man hours invested in assessing each teacher in a programme in order to maintain the high quality of the formative feedback, other institutions may have to take different approaches due to limited human resources. These resource-based decisions can subtract from the perceived scope of the feedback and from the procedure as a whole. Moreover, our procedure is designed in a way that teachers only need to invest little time in the assessment which was one of the preconditions in the UFR context. However, this design may not reflect other institutions' policies on quality assessment in internationalized higher education, thus rendering a design strength in one context as a weakness in another.

Secondly, the suitability of the procedure has to be examined: Which teaching formats and learning environments should be assessed? The procedure at the UFR has been tailored for its specific context, i.e. for graduate level education in English with highly diverse groups of students whose entry language level lies at the C1 level of the CEFR. None of these programmes includes language learning as part of the curriculum or innovative teaching formats such as blended or problem-based learning. Thus, teaching strategies specific to content and language integrated learning (CLIL) or to innovative formats are not considered in the existing assessment criteria catalogue. As a consequence, implementing the EMI quality assurance procedure at other higher education institutions requires thorough appropriation to fit the respective context.

Thirdly, effective quality assurance demands sustainability: What human and financial resources are available to sustain long-term quality in programs? For instance, if an institution has a hiring policy in place that entails high staff mobility and turnover, assessments of EMI quality would have to be carried out more often to evaluate new incoming teachers. Furthermore, if degree programmes adapted their underlying instructional design after having undergone quality assessment, such a shift would likely require additional skills of teaching staff, like more facilitation of project-based learning. Consequently, criteria would have to be adjusted or added accordingly and teachers reassessed. In countries with noticeable and ongoing cuts in higher education (cf. Estermann & Pruvot 2011: 79ff.), the sustainability of the procedure might be difficult to guarantee.
The following table summarizes essential questions for implementing the EMI quality assurance procedure at other institutions (Table 3):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>How much human resources are available to administer and perform the procedure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>Which teaching formats and learning environments are to be assessed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>What human and financial resources are available to sustain long-term quality in programmes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Essential questions when considering implementation of EMI quality assessment

Despite the aforementioned caveats, implementing this EMI quality assurance procedure also provides two opportunities. Firstly, such a quality assessment has the potential to encourage intra-institutional friendly competition between English-taught programmes. Once a first programme has been quality assured, others might be more motivated to undergo quality assessment. In addition, assessment is a tool to earmark funding for training specific skills deemed weak during the quality assessment.

Furthermore, integrating student feedback in the assessment tells current students that quality is taken seriously in the program; moreover, recognizing quality in the programme projects the same message to prospective students, which in turn likely attracts more applicants and allows the institution to select brighter students in the admissions process. In the long run, the EMI-hosting institution becomes more attractive for researchers from abroad to work and teach in a quality-conscious environment. Anecdotal evidence from the UFR is indicative of this trend (personal communication with a programme coordinator) but more systematic qualitative research in the form of interviews would be necessary to find out about positive long-term effects of EMI assessment.
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1. Introduction

This article provides an account of the experiences made when implementing an English-taught bachelor (ETB) at the Bern University of Applied Sciences (BFH) Business School. The authors attempt to highlight both challenges and opportunities this implementation has had for various stakeholders in the institution over the past decade. Evidence collected at staff meetings, student counselling sessions as well as statistics collated from the International Office (IO), the Language Service Centre and Administration form the basis for the analysis and conclusions drawn with regard to how the BFH Business School
has come to deal with cross-cultural contexts, changing mind-sets, service offering for faculty/staff and students as well as global skills development.

Our article presents the reasons behind the decision to introduce an ETB and what form it should have (Replica vs Unique) as well as what was undertaken to obtain a buy-in from the key stakeholders. Further it highlights the impact the introduction of an ETB had on stakeholder attitudes and what attempts were made to positively influence these. The article closes by presenting the role the International Office had and has supporting and driving the decision to create an international profile.

The term "internationalization", according to Bartell (2003: 46)

"….conveys a variety of understandings, interpretations and applications, anywhere from a minimalist, instrumental and static view, such as securing external funding for study abroad programs, through international exchange of students, conducting research internationally, to a view of internationalization as a complex, all-encompassing and policy-driven process, integral to and permeating the life, culture, curriculum and instruction as well as research activities of the university and its members."

In today's competitive HEI environment, the goal of a school such as the BFH Business School should be to establish itself at the end of this continuum which is all-encompassing and policy-driven.

Sandström & Neghina's (2017) paper on ETB trends highlights the impressive growth of ETBs in Europe in the last ten years as a reaction to increased competition, the need to attract international talent as well as develop domestic students' global skills. These ETBs often originated as translations of local-language programmes. Some have evolved into specially designed programmes taking the needs of the diverse student population into account, while others still find EMI, staff skills and the provision of suitable training a challenge. Experiences made at the BFH Business School are aligned to these trends, as will be discussed below.

2. Processes of Addressing Challenges and Opportunities

The BSc Business Administration (BScBA) International Programme (henceforth IP) is the result of an incremental internationalisation process in response to a need to adapt to external forces, such as competition, demographic changes and policy decisions taken at national and local level, rather than a motivation from within the organisation for organisational development. It is, therefore, not surprising that, as the internationalisation process progressed, it was necessary to address the challenges which arose while at the same time identify the opportunities.

One such challenge is that the BFH Business School, a state-funded, not-for-profit institution, is required by the Canton of Bern to charge the same minimal tuition fee for both international students and local full-degree students (Ali-Lawson & Beck 2014). This posed the first challenge as it meant that the
development and implementation of a bilingual programme, which was followed by the establishment of a full IP, had to take limited resources and funding into account, considering it was not possible to recoup its investment costs through its tuition fee structure, as is done by many European universities (Crosier, Purser & Smidt 2007).

The BFH Business School decided, for a number of reasons, one being the limited opportunity to recoup investment costs, not to develop and apply for state accreditation of a completely new ETB in the area of business administration. Rather, the decision was taken to open up a class where the original BScBA is offered in English, the so called IP. This meant that the programme needed to reflect the content of the state accredited BScBA degree offered in German. This provided fewer opportunities to increase the international scope of the core curriculum beyond that of the programme offered in German. The opportunity to develop a unique programme aligned to a strategic positioning of the BFH Business School was not given.

The special nature of the IP, i.e. it being a replica of the German-speaking bachelor degree programme, poses more challenges in some subject courses than others. The financial and cost accounting lecturers reported having little difficulties replacing the German course books with ones originally published in English. What seemed to be a challenge for them turned out to be an opportunity when they realized how much support they got from certain publishing houses (e.g. slide sets, additional cases, tests, further reading). Also the design of the publications, the layout and style of writing, was perceived to make the contents more accessible so leading to a positive impact on the learning experience. One German-speaking lecturer reported that the author seemed to be talking directly to the student so making it personal and easier to understand. The law lecturers’ situation, however, was incredibly difficult as the official law documents, fundamental to their courses, had not all yet been translated when the IP was launched. This has changed in the meantime, however, lecturers do not have a wide range of course readers on Swiss law published in English to choose from and translating the course reader used in the German-speaking programme is, for many reasons, not a feasible option.

It is still a challenge for some lecturers who teach or have taught predominantly in the German-speaking degree programme, to develop a vigilance to cater to the fact that international students do not have the cultural awareness or background information necessary to understand messages transported in examples or case studies as used, for example, in marketing or HR modules. In particular, when an IP course reader is a translation of a Swiss publication used in the German-speaking programme, the examples used need to be either supplemented or supported with additional information based on the background and needs of the student group being addressed.
Addressing the critique that the IP was not truly "international", it was postulated that this was not necessarily a drawback. The argument went that, as many of the domestic IP students were likely to work for Swiss companies or organisations, who themselves are to varying degrees internationally active, a generalist BScBA curriculum offered in English and focusing on the Swiss political, economic, social and legal environment as well as business practices would best prepare not only local but also international students wishing to remain in Switzerland for professional or personal reasons.

However, the creation of the IP did lead to the development of an additional ETB specialisation option, namely International Business Management, to complement the specialisation in Banking and Finance which was selected from the specialisations offered in German to be offered in English only. These are also open to the German BScBA programme students. Therefore, it can be argued that the introduction of the IP has indeed led to an "internationalisation" of the original BScBA curriculum.

With regard to the BFH Business School specialisation offering, the introduction of the IP also enabled the development of double degree programmes with partners thereby providing all BScBA students a wider selection of specialisations to choose from in their final year. This also increases the school's attractiveness as a study destination for local students and also boosts mobility figures.

2.1 A "50:50 Mix" versus an "International Ghetto"

In order to prevent the development of "international student ghettos", which could arise amongst exchange students, and to reduce the stress for local students due to a high fluctuation rate amongst exchange students in the IP, it was decided that the IP should not only offer local students the opportunity to obtain a high quality BScBA Swiss degree in English, but that this should take place in a multi-cultural environment with a 50:50 ratio of local and international full-degree students. This would allow for the multi-cultural group of full-degree students to get to know one another better so helping the integration of the international students. Additionally, lecturers were and still are encouraged to ensure that student project teams consisted of a mix of local and international IP students as well as exchange and double-degree students.

Furthermore, it was believed that a multi-cultural teaching body would best "promote understanding through interpersonal, cross-cultural, international and shared experiences" (Bartell 2003: 51), so preparing students for professional careers in multi-cultural work environments, which are the norm, considering that c. 25% of the population in Switzerland are "non-Swiss". Therefore, the BFH Business School took the decision not to simply recruit native English-speaking lecturers for the IP.
2.2 Getting a "buy in" from Key Stakeholders

Administrative and lecturing staff initially criticised the amount of staff and financial resources being allocated towards internationalisation when, at that time, international students comprised about 1% of the BScBA student body. This was countered with the argument that the organisation had to prepare for demographic changes leading to a future drop in local student registrations and that, with the IP, the BFH Business School would not only greatly support the organisation's overall internationalisation goals but also be able to target new student segments. Another argument emphasised that an ETB enabled the BFH Business School to address the changing needs of local German-speaking students who could potentially decide to enrol at competitor institutions offering ETB degrees.

Besides offering a full-time IP study option, it was decided, in 2016, to open a part-time/work-study class, commencing in autumn 2017, in order to address the needs of two distinct student groups. A number of local students who enrolled for the part-time/work-study model offered in German reported being disappointed about not being given the opportunity to join the IP as it was offered only as a full-time model. The second group consisted of international students who either needed to work part-time in order to partly finance their studies in Switzerland or of international spouses of expatriates or locals with family commitments, making it impossible for them to study full-time.

The current 2017/2018 intake shows a strong growth in IP registrations, now accounting for c. 25% of total BScBA enrolments, with a large number of the international students already residing in Switzerland prior to their enrolment in the IP. An additional group of persons benefitting from the IP are qualified professionals or students who had to quit their studies and who are now refugees in Switzerland. This is an indication that the IP is catering to the needs of local students to develop global skills and intercultural competences for future professional careers in business while, at the same time, facilitating the upskilling or reorientation of foreign nationals residing in Switzerland and their integration into the Swiss job market.

The decision to not have a predominantly English-native speaking teaching body had a positive effect on lecturers' attitude towards the IP and internationalisation, in particular amongst those fearing a drop in student numbers in the German-speaking programme and the need to either accept teaching in English or face a certain level of redundancy.

Fortunately, the lecturing body already included members who had an international background, whose mother-tongue was not German and who were open to the idea of teaching in English. The big task was to win over the German-speaking Swiss and German members of staff in order to be able to offer the entire curriculum in English.
The challenge of internationalising the BFH Business School also possibly lay in the fact that lecturing and research staff did not seem to view internationalisation as a part of their brief. Childress (2017: 16) analysed faculty involvement in the internationalisation process and concluded that "by connecting internationalisation goals to departmental and disciplinary priorities, academic departments can strategically support faculty to advance their scholarly agendas through the lens of more than one national or cultural vantage point." This remains a challenge for the BFH Business School especially in terms of linking professional development within the area of internationalisation to performance goals, however, a different attitude can be perceived amongst newly recruited and younger staff members.

2.3 More than just EMI

Initially it was believed that the main challenge in the internationalisation drive would be the introduction of EMI. However, being truly international meant that the BFH Business School could not simply attract exchange and then later full-degree students to then simply leave them in the lurch by expecting them to successfully orientate themselves in a predominantly German-speaking environment. This meant that the organisation as a whole needed to undergo a linguistic adjustment process which required the support of both lecturing and administrative staff.

What was initially a translation process of class material or emails needed to become embedded in the BFH Business School culture, i.e. the understanding that all processes, publications, media etc. are bilingual. This is increasingly becoming the norm and the need to draw attention to the fact that information must also be available in English is diminishing amongst those employees who are in closer and continual interaction, virtually or personally, with students. However, others, not so close to students, need to be regularly reminded about the need to have messages of all kinds translated in order to support the internationalisation efforts in all areas of activity. This is aligned to Brandenburg's (2008: 12) view that "...the service environment is of major importance, especially in the area of teaching and learning... services are often considered rarely, if at all".

3. Managing Attitudes

Connecting with a target group from an administrative or a teaching perspective can be a daunting task when having to use a foreign language. However, it has also become evident that the challenge this poses varies amongst stakeholder groups within the BFH Business School.
3.1 Administrative Staff

While internationalisation has led to an increase in exchange student numbers and the establishment of the International Office to deal with this particular group of student needs (see below), the development of the IP meant that Student Administration had to ensure that they could serve the international full-degree students lacking German language skills. This led to the establishment of a Language Service Centre, providing all staff support with developing their English language competences as well as a proof-reading/translation service. Brandenburg (2008: 11) states the importance of deploying resources to ensure a "continuous process of internationalisation," in particular the role administrative staff play when HEIs aim to provide a holistic international concept. It must be noted that internationalisation entails more than language support, rather it requires "an internationally-oriented administration which supports the international momentum in an HEI and the international attitude of the staff, and which incorporates this through its everyday work" (Brandenburg 2008: 11).

The front desk administrative staff was the group of stakeholders who immediately rose to the challenge and saw the internationalisation process as an opportunity to make use of their language skills which had been lying dormant. One possible interpretation is that the hurdle to take on the challenge was slightly lower than that for lecturers, considering they communicate with students predominantly via electronic platforms. International students only occasionally go to the Administration Office in person with questions that are often similar in nature and specifically related to organisational aspects of their studies, such as registration deadlines, course schedules or how to respond to correspondence from the BFH Business School. This allows administrative staff to develop, over time, a personal repertoire of standardised responses supported by documented processes and regulations. Examples are standard email responses to recurring questions, the creation of a FAQ, as well as individualised responses developed and practised during coaching sessions with language experts.

As international students' perceptions of staff addressing them in English are generally positive, this could potentially boost staff self-esteem. Interestingly, the experiences made with the administrative staff at the BFH Business school seems to differ to that reported in the 2014 institutional survey report on ETBs in European higher education where "English proficiency of administrative staff, especially those in central administration … was regarded as least satisfactory by the survey respondents … [and that] administrative staff are not only unprepared to deal with students in English, but also unwilling to do so" (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 22).
3.2 Lecturing Staff

For lecturing staff, however, image and status carry a different value as they are supposedly the experts in the lecture hall or seminar room. This makes the decision to teach within an ETB extremely challenging as it "...may place severe strains on their performance and authentication or construction of their academic authority, which is traditionally based on teaching through their L1" (Werthera, Denvera, Jensenb & Meesa 2014: 456). This challenge was reported by a number of German-speaking and initially older IP lecturers.

One particular case experienced at the BFH Business School was that of an experienced finance lecturer who had taken preparatory steps to teach in English in the form of an intensive two-week language programme in Dublin focusing on EMI. This course had boosted his confidence and he was able to compare his abilities with Italian and Spanish lecturers who were also teaching or preparing to teach in EMI contexts. Nonetheless he reported, just before the semester started, still being extremely concerned as to whether he would measure up to student expectations. It was a little piece of advice passed on informally over a coffee by the Head of the IP that he should inform his students at the very beginning of the semester that he was an expert in finance and not in English which proved to be the most valuable to him. This helped him gain a new perspective on his self-perceived role in the IP.

Research done on lecturer attitude to EMI at a Danish university provides evidence that younger lecturers and those with higher teaching loads in EMI are more likely to have a positive attitude towards the increasing use of EMI (Jensen & Thøgersen 2011). This means that, in the future, EMI may have less of an impact on lecturer attitudes to ETBs. The introduction of a second IP class for work-study/part time students in autumn 2017 had a positive impact on the IP lecturers' attitudes as they could benefit from a higher return on their investment in their IP module and keep their language skills from becoming rusty as they would be teaching in the EMI context each semester.

It seems to be not only the lecturer's language abilities but also the degree of lecturer motivation and commitment in an ETB context as well as personal characteristics which influence teaching performance and student perceptions. One study (Studer 2015) suggests that, even if the lack of linguistic competence is given by the students as the greatest barrier in EMI settings, the mastery of the English language in a formal sense plays a lesser role in their assessment of positive classroom experience. The lecturer in this study who was assessed positively by students was perceived to have "overt didactic aims", be "enthusiastic and lively", maintain eye contact and ask questions in addition to other dialogical aspects such as speaking smoothly and at an adequate pace and communicating clearly.
In line with various research findings that teaching is more demanding and requires more effort on the part of the non-native English speaking lecturer (Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra 2011), management decided to reduce the workload of non-native English-speaking IP lecturers and provide support through the Language Service Centre in the form of translations, proof-reading, coaching sessions and intensive language courses.

Unfortunately, some lecturers found themselves teaching on the IP at relatively short notice. This is not ideal and indicates that there is room for improvement in the area of language policies and the management of offers "...which are tailored to the individual's professional requirements, existing language skills, career development, teaching and mode of academic publication" (Werthera, Denvera, Jensenb & Meesa 2014: 458). However, such support does not guarantee a positive EMI teaching/learning experience if lecturers either fail to plan ahead their preparation work (e.g. translations) or lack the necessary time due to poor organization. This will inevitably impact both administrative processes and student perceptions.

Tange (2010) points out that more experienced EMI lecturers also emphasise intercultural and pedagogical challenges in addition to linguistic issues. With regard to teaching methodologies, the authors argue that an EMI lecturer is likely to show the same or similar competences in teaching methodologies as in their L1 environment. However, one can contend that a higher level of language ability in the language of instruction frees up resources to potentially allow lecturers to develop a broader repertoire of classroom methodologies needed to improve the teaching/learning experience in ETB contexts. To support the development of larger didactic repertoires, Chang referring to Yeh (2014) argues that "it may be valuable to hold pedagogy courses or workshops where EMI instructors can share and discuss their teaching experiences and strategies for better learning satisfaction across the board." (Chang 2015: 2). A formal offering of courses has still to be conceived at the BFH Business School as a support structure for lecturers on the ETB programme.

Research done in four European countries on the role of cross-cultural competence on teaching performance in culturally diverse classes provides empirical support for the "positive association of a match in teaching methods as preferred by the student and used by the faculty member with students' evaluations of teacher performance" (De Beuckelaer, Lievens & Bücker 2012: 237). Thus, considering that culture influences our selection of teaching methodologies, sufficient attention needs to be paid to cross-cultural competence in recruitment of EMI lecturers. Alternatively, resources should be allocated to providing well-designed courses on culture and its impact in the EMI setting for those already teaching on ETBs.

When launching the IP, additional support in the form of voluntary intercultural training was provided for all those involved in the IP or affected by its introduction
in order to sensitise them to their respective audiences as well as their own, often unperceived, set of values and how these affect teaching/learning and interpersonal interactions. Ideally, such intercultural training should take place on a regular basis. However, it is a real challenge to instil the understanding that "culture" and "cultural competence" are vital and requires great commitment amongst lecturers to dedicate time to this aspect of ETBs.

Currently, IP lecturer meetings held each semester to present and discuss problems or show case best practice, is utilized by the Head of IP to ensure that the "culture" aspect of such problems is also taken into consideration. However, based on the findings of one of the few research papers dedicated to the role cross-cultural competence plays in perceived teaching quality in culturally diverse classes, it would be best to consider cross-cultural competence when recruiting faculty as well as training practices in HE as results "...demonstrate that cross-cultural competence, and – in particular cultural empathy and open-mindedness, is an important asset for business faculty whenever the educational programme relies on (frequent) interactions between faculty members and students" (De Beuckelaer, Lievens & Bücker 2012: 244).

3.3 Students

Feedback from local IP students highlighted the need to carefully manage the expectations of the ETB students. In particular the local students, whose English competence is generally very good, need to understand that the IP emphasises content and knowledge as well as cross-cultural skills development and is not solely designed for them to further improve their English. Messages to students need to emphasise the opportunities the IP provides to experience and learn how to deal with situations where language and culture may prove to be a stumbling block in international business.

While, in our BScBA programme, lecturers often have to be encouraged, on a voluntary base, to become aware of how culture impacts on their teaching and motivate themselves to actively address this aspect, e.g. by adapting their instructional methods, full-programme students are sensitised to culture and its impact in two core BScBA courses. However, these only take place in the second year of studies. As it is not possible to redesign the curriculum to deal with culture in the first year of studies, which would greatly benefit the IP teaching/learning experience, the Head of IP and the IO runs a seminar "Studying in a Multi-cultural Environment" for IP full-degree, double degree and incoming students one month into their first semester at the BFH Business School. This seminar more specifically focuses on the institution's academic culture and sensitises students to different working behaviours and allows them to discuss solutions to potential challenges they may face in an ETB multicultural classroom and how to deal with especially critical issues such as deadlines, punctuality, plagiarism and group work to name a few. Since this has
been on offer, the IO has reported fewer cases of exchange students approaching them for advice, e.g. on issues with group work, while the Head of IP reports that IP students now approach her sooner when experiencing either academic or personal problems.

In addition to the "Studying in a multi-cultural classroom" seminar, pilot walk-in support sessions were launched in the 2016/17 academic year for IP students who faced challenges in first year mathematics, financial and cost accounting courses. However, due to several factors, these sessions were not well attended. This type of support seemed to come too late and at a time when students were overwhelmed with their regular study workload. Additionally, cultural orientations towards learning seemed to prevent many of the international students from making use of this support. It was decided that a different approach was required prior to the commencement of the semester, which would help international full-degree students acclimatise to living in Switzerland and studying at a Swiss university of applied sciences. A needs analysis, conducted with students and lecturers, showed that it would be a good idea to pilot a pre-bachelor course in the hope that it may lead to a drop in the number of international students who needed to repeat the first year of studies.

This three-week course is designed to help them settle in, gain a better understanding of what studying at a Swiss university of applied sciences is all about, get hands on experience of team project work, have the opportunity to fill certain knowledge and skills gaps and so be better equipped when the semester starts. As some of the first semester IP lecturers are engaged in this course, international full-degree student can ideally develop meaningful relationships and reciprocal understanding of their roles and duties before the academic year commences. Since this initiative is in its infancy, an evaluation of its impact needs to be conducted. This example highlights the need to be in regular dialogue with the IP students in order to identify issues they are experiencing and how these can be addressed.

4. An International Office supporting and driving internationalisation

As explained, it was not possible for the BFH Business School to recoup the development and implementation costs of the IP through student fees, however, as the IP was conceived as a further development of the Business School offer, it was financed through regular budget allocations for such purposes. Considering it was not possible to administer the IP without the necessary supporting staff positions dealing with internationalization, it was necessary to apply, incrementally over a decade, for additional cantonal funding of these new positions. Such funds were granted based on policy decisions taken by the cantonal authorities to internationalise the BFH (BFH, Rektorat/Kommunikation, Bern 2009).
Whilst the IP provided mobility opportunities for students and staff, new challenges arose and new functions were allocated to administrative staff who had to rise to the challenge of developing their skills and knowledge in the area of mobility on the job. As mobility numbers increased, additional resources were allocated to the IO resulting in more staff and sub-divisions such as Exchange, Double Degree, and Research & Services. A staff function Marketing, Communications & Events was established to provide the link between IP full-degree, incoming and regular students in the German-speaking degree programmes. This allowed the BFH Business School IO to develop into an integrated internal partner who could increasingly formalise internationalisation and scale up its international activities.

4.1 Global skills development

With the establishment of an ETB degree, the IO was able to initiate and implement the following offers, listed below, in order to support the internationalisation process and the development of global skills.

These offers are an initial response to drive mobility and the internationalisation of the BFH Business School:

- The Certificate of Global Competences (CGC) is a BFH add-on certificate for the acquisition of intercultural competences, a soft skill in high demand as per the UNESCO Sustainable Development Goal 4.7 which emphasises the appreciation of cultural diversity and the role it plays in sustainable development (UNESCO, n.d.). To obtain the CGC, students need to create a personal portfolio comprising of Knowledge, Activities & Engagement, Language and Personal Reflection points. Mobility and short-term programmes allow students to experience culture in action, thus making the CGC a particularly attractive certificate as students are able to combine experience more readily with their previously attained knowledge from culture and international-focused courses.

- The Double Degree Programme (DD) takes student mobility to another level as it requires a full year of study abroad in their final year. It involves studying towards two university degrees and completing them in the time that it would take to earn one degree. Since its inception in 2015, an increase in the number of DD applications can be observed, which has allowed for a more stringent approach to selection and quality assurance. Likewise it has built bridges and ensured closer collaboration with selected partners.

- The International Family Mentor Programme (IFMP), a buddy system implemented in the early stages of internationalisation for
exchange students, also caters to the needs of the international IP full-degree students. The aim is to provide international exposure opportunities for less mobile local students whilst supporting those far from home. The IFMP is closely linked to the CGC allowing students to collect "Activity" points.

- With regard to supporting international students in their acquisition of German, the IO has turned a need arising from internationalisation to an opportunity for collaboration between the BFH Business School and the PHBern, a university of teacher education. Besides providing the more standard German for Beginners courses for IP full-degree (non-credit) and exchange students (credits awarded), the IO offers German special speaking courses called *Learning by Talking* (LETA). This "for students by students" offer involves PHBern master students teaching BFH Business School international students while using a more applied and communicative approach so helping them integrate and better adjust in their new learning environment more readily.

- Lecturer mobility has greatly increased since the establishment of the IO and the launching of the IP. A report on the value of ERASMUS teaching mobility based on a survey of lecturers' views and perceptions comes to the conclusion that "...a wide majority of formerly mobile teachers report that they learnt about different teaching contents, concepts and methods. After return, many applied this knowledge … [and believe] … that their international experience has improved their advice given to mobile students" (Bracht, et al. 2006: 135). To what extent lecturers at the BFH Business School share the same views it yet has to be investigated. The IO also promotes other opportunities offered by partner institutions such as international staff training weeks in order to support internationalization in all areas, not only teaching.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we discussed the implications of introducing an ETB in a particular Higher Education Institution in Switzerland and the impact this has had within the entire institution. Challenges and issues which arose during the development of an international study programme often resulted in driving further change and the allocation of additional resources to finance programme development and the creation of staff positions to support the internationalisation process. The approach adopted by the BFH Business School was one of "small steps" and incremental change aligned to the culture of the organisation which, on the one hand, would not have accepted radical
change, and, on the other hand, did not have the financial resources, due to regulatory constraints, for such a major project.

However, the challenges and investments have also led to opportunities for all stakeholders, such as, acquiring global skills (students and staff) within a multicultural learning environment, benefiting from a broader selection of exchange possibilities (student and staff mobility, including double degree programmes) and improving English language skills.

A key realisation was that offering an ETB was not simply a translation task. The transition from a minimalist, instrumental and static approach to internationalisation, to a fully embedded approach impacting the life and culture (Bartell, 2003) of the BFH Business School, as a whole, has clearly proven to require more than simply focusing on EMI. The ETB became the internal driving force that influenced change processes, so allowing the BFH Business School to become an attractive international partner, as well as ensuring that all internal stakeholders were granted professional development opportunities and opening up new student market segments. A change in mindset was required at all levels within the organisation.

Nonetheless, one major challenge that remains is cultivating organisational-wide ownership of internationalisation so that it is not purely covered by the international study programmes and the responsibility of the International Office. Our recommendation is that organisations should embed internationalisation within local-language taught degree programmes as part of the core curriculum. This leads to less dependency on incoming international students and EMI programmes. Rather, internationalisation is truly owned by the institution as a whole.
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Mit den 2000er Jahren hat sich ein rasanter Anstieg in der Hochschulinternationalisierung vollzogen, die gerade in China mit der Akzentsetzung auf Transnationaler Erziehung (TNE) und dem Export englischsprachiger Bildung und Bildungsmodelle einhergeht. English als Unterrichtsmedium (EMI) steht dabei häufig im Mittelpunkt von Untersuchungen. Im TNE-Umfeld spielt das Englische jedoch darüber hinaus als Arbeitssprache in sämtlichen Prozessen des Hochschulbetriebs eine zentrale Bedeutung. Mit der Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University (XJTLU) unterhält China ein TNE Joint Venture mit Doppelabschlüssen, an dem über 50% der Mitarbeiter Nichtmuttersprachler des Englischen aus über 50 verschiedenen Nationen und die Studierenden zu 90% chinesische Muttersprachler sind. Der vorgelegte Artikel stellt eine Studie vor, die untersucht, ob und wie die Hochschule mit Englisch als Lingua franca (ELF) unter diesen Bedingungen funktioniert. Sie konzentriert sich zunächst auf die per beobachtender Teilnahme erhobenen ethnographischen Daten zweier Entscheidungsgremien (academic committees) und nimmt dort den Protokollierprozess unter die Lupe. Die ersten Ergebnisse der ethnographischen Studie verweisen darauf, dass erst die Einbettung des Protokollierens in die weiteren operationalen Prozesse sowie ein Reihe von Stützmassnahmen das Funktionieren mit (oder trotz?) ELF im Sinne kollaborativ situiertener Kognition möglich machen.
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1. Introduction

The 2000's have seen the rise of internationalized education, with Transnational Education (TNE) often a key aspect of internationalization strategies of higher education institutions. Knight (2016) suggests that TNE can be thought of as either the mobility of educational provision through examples such as franchising or double/joint degrees, or the mobility of educational providers across national borders through initiatives such as branch campuses or joint-ventures. Countries, regions and universities may be involved in TNE activities
for a number of reasons. Huang (2007) suggests that TNE is reacting to developments in information technology, today’s connected society as well as the growth of economic globalization. Universities may be responding to the demand for an international experience from students (UK HE IU 2016), as well as a desire to increase their (students’) attributes and employability (Olcott 2009). Jo Johnson, UK Minister of State for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation, at the 2015 Going Global conference on International Higher Education (HE) observed that ‘Global education leads to wealth, health and mutual understanding. It builds foundations for cultural and economic enrichment’ (UK HE IU 2016: 9).

TNE is typically associated with the exporting of English speaking education and educational models. Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) estimated that there were more than 220 international campuses globally, with the vast majority established by English speaking countries such as the USA, The United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. This has the effect of making English the common language - or lingua franca - in international higher education (Wilkins & Urbanovic 2014). It logically follows then that English is the language of instruction regardless of the location of delivery. The growth of these English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses is therefore an interesting by-product of TNE, with Walkinshaw, Fenton-Smith and Humphreys (2017) describing EMI as the new norm.

It is within this broader area of TNE environments that the present study is situated. In our case, English is not only the medium of instruction, but the working language and lingua franca for all purposes. This paper is part of a wider study that looks at how successful communication is within a TNE Joint Venture English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) setting, by analysing interactions at committee meetings and subsequent decision-making. The present paper looks at two committee interactions, using a participatory-observation methodology. In the following sections, we will first describe the research site by giving a brief overview of the wider TNE context within China before moving on to the specifics within the committee meetings, and then going on to discuss the research methodology and why it was chosen. In a third step, we will discuss two committee interactions in greater detail, focusing on the process surrounding minute-taking. The minute-taking process is described with examples that illustrate that communicative success is a function of the overall process and can best be explained within a framework of situated cognitive activity.

2. The wider context - TNE and China

China has been particularly active in promoting TNE (Huang 2007), and since 1983 a number of government regulations have been passed to make Chinese-foreign initiatives easier. These initiatives started with the passing of the 1983
Chinese Ministry of Education (MoE) Regulations of the People's Republic of China on Chinese-Foreign Cooperation in Running Schools ("中华人民共和国中外合作办学条例"), which allowed Chinese-foreign joint educational ventures. The latest situation is that since 2003 the government has issued a small number of licenses to foreign providers to establish 'universities' in collaboration with local partners, or joint ventures. To date, nine successful full joint ventures have been set up, with the initial two licenses issued in 2005 to the University of Nottingham Ningbo (UNNC), and United International College (UIC), and the latest license being issued in 2015 to the Guangdong-Technion Israel Institute of Technology.

One further outcome of this, albeit a significant one, has been the National Plan for Medium and Long Term Educational Reform and Development (Ministry of Education 2010), which has set out three strategic goals for the period from 2010 to 2020. These goals are: achieving educational modernisation; forming a learning society; and transforming China into a country with competitive human resources; and these principles from 2010 still guide higher education reform today.

3. The Research Site – Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University: A TNE Joint Venture Institution within China

Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University (XJTLU) is an EMI TNE university located in Suzhou in the Jiangsu Province of China. It was established in 2006, and is accredited by the University of Liverpool for delivery of provision leading to University of Liverpool awards at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. It is simultaneously a Chinese tier 1 university, accredited by the Chinese Ministry of Education to deliver Chinese degrees at undergraduate level. Such bachelor double degree programmes must meet the requirements of both UK and Chinese regulatory systems, and follow UK quality assurance purposes. Over 90% of students are Chinese native speakers, and over 50% of staff are non-native speakers of English. English is not just the medium of instruction but is the lingua franca for all purposes; it is the working language of the university.

The university website highlights the vision 'To become a research-led international university in China and a Chinese university recognised internationally for its unique features in learning and teaching, research, social service, and education management'. Like many similar EMI TNE joint venture universities, XJTLU faces a real challenge in creating 'a truly international university' with English as the medium of instruction and working language without compromising quality within its context.

4. The Study

The impact of the use of English at XJTLU has been the subject of an inter-university research project between XJTLU and the Zurich University of Applied
Sciences (ZHAW), Switzerland. The study makes a number of assumptions, and perhaps the most important as well as controversial one is that the institution is working in an English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) environment. This is controversial as Jenkins (2011) highlights the fact that many TNE institutions have a policy towards English meaning business as usual in looking towards native speaker standards. So English may well be the academic lingua franca, but the environment may not be considered an ELF one. In this case, however, as part of its language policy (see Perrin 2017) and in recognition that English native speakers are only a very small minority of staff and students, XJTLU has made a conscious decision not to enforce the concept of the idealised (English) native speaker (Leung, Harris & Rampton 1997) and the standards that this would suggest. Accordingly, we consider this to be an ELF context in which English is used by native speakers and non-native speakers with different first languages. Whilst for around eighty percent of students Modern Standard Chinese may be the first or native language, for staff the first language could be one of over twenty five plus languages, with over fifty different nationalities working at the university. In view of the multilingual background of students and staff and the English-only working environment, key questions therefore include 'what impact does ELF have on the decision-making within the TNE setting' or, to put it another way, 'does running a TNE institution work with English as the working language in an ELF context'?

The study aimed to look at communicative success in a TNE setting with a focus on analysing committee meetings. These were targeted for their central role in providing a framework for setting university policy within the TNE environment, though they are under-researched within such environments. Kosmutzky and Rahul (2016), in a review of the literature on research into TNE, highlighted that the most common areas of study are quality assurance, educational policies, cultural differences, the student experience, and academic staff attitudes. Within the XJTLU context, managers are usually those who make up the committees, and need to implement the decisions made. They may be academic or professional services, not necessarily English native speakers, but have usually substantial overseas or English speaking experience, which is in contrast to the secretaries who are servicing the meetings. However, as Wilkins (2016) highlights, managers within TNE environments are often ill-prepared, despite the experience that they bring linguistically, suggesting that management faces unique challenges often without appropriate experience or training.

One of the challenges revolves around this use of English among people with different English-speaking backgrounds. Committee meetings are conducted in English and the minutes are finalized in English. The chairs are invariably English native speakers, participants a mixture of native and non-native speakers, and the committee secretaries Chinese first-language speakers. The minutes, which act as summaries of the discussions as well as the final decisions, are usually taken in English by these secretaries, both in the draft
and final forms, but are discussed before finalization with the (native speaker) chairs in two consecutive (post-committee) meetings. The final minutes are thus the result of a cycle of two (and sometimes three) rounds of revisions leading to an expanded final version which reflects discussion with the native speaker, but is not proof-read by a native speaker and therefore usually contains some ELF-specific non-standard features.

Against this background and in order to determine whether running a TNE institution with English as the working language in an ELF environment works or not, the wider study addressed four research questions:

- What is the relationship between language and accuracy in note-taking in a TNE environment?
- What impact do different Englishes and accents have on note-taking in a TNE environment?
- What, if any, accommodation techniques or processes are needed to enable effective note-taking to take place?
- What is the relationship between professional services staff representations of their understanding of English/es in a TNE working environment, and their perceptions of English in intercultural minute-taking?

This paper analyses two committee meetings which took place at the university through the use of participatory observation, looking at the following research question:

- To what extent does the use of English under ELF conditions impact minute taking by Chinese secretaries and thus affect the communicative success of the committee meetings the minutes serve to document within the TNE environment at XJTLU?

5. Research Methods

For the wider study, data was collected using a multi-method qualitative framework based on a longitudinal case study at XJTLU. Data was collected through a combination of audio-recordings of meetings, draft and final versions of minutes, interviews and observations, enabling rich data to be collected and analysed such that it was possible to understand the committee setting as socially constructed. Ethical approval was granted through the XJTLU Research Ethics Sub-Committee for the interviews and observations to take place. This paper concentrates on observations from two committees, the Academic Quality and Standards Sub-Committee (AQSSC) and the Departmental Learning and Teaching Committee (DLTC). These two committees were analysed as they represent samples of the two layers of the committee structure, with one operating at university level while the other operates at departmental level.
Recognising the importance of language in this study, and how it is being used, we draw on the tradition of language socialisation, and collect data using participatory observation approaches. Duff (2010) suggests that a language socialisation perspective sees development as culturally situated and that 'language is learned through interactions with others who are more proficient in the language and its cultural practices and who provide novices explicit and (or) implicit mentoring or evidence about normative, appropriate uses of the language'. While much language socialisation research has been with relatively young language learners, there is also a tradition of research with older groups within education. Duff (2017) highlights that there have been many studies of academic socialisation within universities and schools. Cook (1999) for example looked at Japanese elementary classrooms and highlighted differences based on culture on Japanese and Western pedagogical practices, whilst Vickers (2007) conducted research on second language socialisation in project team meetings at an American university computing and electrical engineering department. Equally important has been research that looks at transitions from education to work-based practices. Bremner (2012) for example highlighted language socialisation practices of a bilingual Cantonese-English woman's in Hong Kong into professional communication at a public relations (PR) company.

In our case, the transitions that the secretaries of the committees within the university, who are typically Chinese first language speakers, go through as they adjust to Western work and language practices follow similar trajectories. The language being learned in the case of this study is the language of the committee as indicated through the acquisition of cultural norms of note-taking. Garrett (2017) indicates that a basic assumption of language socialisation researchers is that the acquisition of language cannot be separated from the acquisition of other kinds of social and cultural knowledge. In other words, as the language of committee note-taking is learned, so is the understanding of how committees function within the university.

Participant observation was chosen as the most appropriate (qualitative) research method to collect the data. This enabled the researcher to observe what occurred in the committee meetings and take notes, which was then complimented with audio recordings to build up a picture of what is going on. Gaining entry into the location of study was relatively easy as the site was the place of work of one of the main researchers, although ethical approval was needed and granted. Data for the full study was collected over two three-week periods by two master students from ZHAW as part of their MA thesis projects (Gantenbein 2016; Latheron 2016), ensuring that enough time was spent with the participants in their environment to collect rich data. The study was holistic in that a variety of data was collected, field-notes from the meetings, audio recordings and both pre-and post-committee meeting interviews, which also enabled the researchers to establish meaning to the actions they observed (Gobo & Marciniak 2016). The study also had elements of both researching up
and researching down (see Eberle & Maeder 2016) in that although senior management of the university and committee chairs were interviewed to establish what their expectations were from committee minutes (researching down), time spent with the actual committee secretary ensured that there was also a degree of researching up.

6. Data Analysis and Discussion

This paper focuses on two committees: the 'Academic Quality and Standards Sub-Committee (AQSSC)' and the 'Departmental Learning and Teaching Committee' (DLTC) of one academic department. The AQSSC meets twice a semester and approves changes to degree programmes and to changes to modules within the programmes. The committee consists of 10 members drawn from across the academic spectrum, and includes two members from professional services. One of these is a Chinese first-language speaker, as is the committee secretary. The chair is an English native speaker, as are two other committee members, whilst the remaining have neither English nor Chinese as their first language. The DLTC is the main decision-making committee within an academic department. In the DLTC observed as part of our study, the committee consists of 11 members representing all the different areas of business of the department. There are two student representatives, one Chinese and one an international student; the chair of the committee is an English native speaker, as are all non-student members except the Chinese and Spanish language representatives, and the committee secretary is a Chinese first-language speaker.

In both committees, the committee secretary follows the same procedure in that she takes notes during the meeting, and also audio records the meeting. The audio recordings are used to add to the notes in producing the committee minutes, which are agreed with the chair before being sent to all members as a record of the meeting, and being used as a basis for informing decisions made. They are also made available online through the intranet for non-committee members.

The minutes need to accurately reflect committee decisions, as well as serve as a summary and reference document, capturing the detail of the meetings. They also need to take into account the twin sets of regulations from the governing regulatory bodies of the University of Liverpool and the Chinese Ministry of Education as a result of its joint venture status. The minutes document the decision-making process and therefore safeguard transparency.

Discussions and interviews with the committee secretaries, as well as senior management were quite revealing in understanding the nature of the minutes produced and the procedures involved. The Director of Professional Services at the university described the minutes as needing to 'provide information on
cause-and-effect to facilitate progress monitoring’. One of the committee chairs indicated that for committees (at XJTLU) to be successful, it [the committee]

'needs first of all to make decisions. It [the committee] certainly needs to be transparent and inclusive. People need to feel that they are part of the committee. And it [the committee] also needs to be understandable'.

Referring to language, the chair goes on to say that 'the language itself needs to be clear and concise, but the action needs to be watertight, not necessarily the language. You need to obviously allow flexibility for our situation that we exist in here'. In other words there is a focus more on function, the outcomes of the minutes, rather than on form, i.e. on how specific and how ‘accurate' the language should be.

While the chair may be focusing on function, the committee secretary can only achieve this through the notes and audio recordings of the meeting. When the AQSSC committee secretary was asked about how she felt about taking minutes for the particular meetings we observed she commented as follows:

'Just like the usual standard, I guess. I mean I can't get everything written down in a meeting, I think I've got the key points mentioned by the committee.'

She went on to add that:

'... sometimes the chair and the members may talk about some academic-related topics, which may not be my professional area, so that will be a difficult part for me to understand'.

It is quite clear from this exchange that the secretary sometimes has issues both with her ability to record everything (in memory and on the note pad) and with her comprehension of what is being said. It is unsurprising that she may not be able to record everything, one reason being that she is working in a second language, listening to a range of other second-language English speakers, as well as two native speakers. However, what is interesting in the exchange is that the secretary attributes not being able to get everything down to her lack of technical or professional knowledge, rather than to her English language ability. This is perhaps not surprising, considering the nature of the committee, and its membership. The chair of the committee reinforces the type of knowledge that is required at the beginning of the meeting, stating that:

'The main things that we're often looking at is the aims of the modules, the aims of the programmes, the learning outcomes, and how those learning outcomes are assessed. We can take into account things such as syllabus, but they're normally dealt with at the department level'.

This type of knowledge is usually discipline specific, and unlikely to be in the lexicon of the committee secretary. Learning outcomes and module aims are usually written in a specific manner following UK quality assurance practices, and while committee members may not have the specialist knowledge of individual modules, they will have the knowledge of how the aims and learning outcomes need to be expressed. For the secretary, who does not deal with such concepts on a daily basis, however, this is not the case and it is interesting to see how she uses the idea of her 'professional area'. Duff (2010) discusses how
language is learned through interaction with others, which is reflected by the secretary who later goes on to say that:

'I will try to understand these stuff in my best, but sometimes it just goes away, and when I practice more, sometimes I will get to understand them in the future'.

The position of the secretary can also be analysed through Lave and Wenger's (1991) concept of a community of practice (CoP). These are formed by like-minded people in a collective process of learning in a shared environment of effort. Lave and Wenger indicated that a CoP develops when there is a domain, a community, and the practice. CoPs need an identity formed by shared domains of interest, which implies a degree of commitment and a shared competence. Members of CoPs develop shared practices, solutions to problems and experiences. Membership of a committee can be seen as being part of a CoP. This is illustrated by the chair of the committee highlighting the shared importance to the university that the members have by stating that:

'... this is possibly the most important committee from the academic perspective in the University, because this is the committee which determines whether new programmes, programme changes and module changes can actually be approved and go forward'.

He repeats himself later by again indicating that '... we’re the guardians of academic quality'. When the secretary is asked about her own role within the committee, she seems to recognize that she is not yet a member of the 'community', though her desire to move from being on the periphery to a member of the centre within the community is evident in her response that:

'Sometimes my colleagues just don't understand what we are doing for the modules and programmes, but since I am taking minutes and serving as a secretary in this sub-committee, I will get to know more'.

It is difficult to ascertain what would help the secretary in making the transition from periphery to centre. The specialist knowledge is known to play a role in ELF communication (Dröschel 2011) and the secretary sees her issue as being lack of professional or specialist rather than linguistic knowledge. What the data reveal, however, is that it is unlikely that the secretary had a full grasp of what was being discussed, because her handwritten notes are minimal and could not possibly have served as a basis for a final version that would fulfil their purpose of committee meeting summary and decision-making support. The secretary knows, of course, that she is also recording the meeting and, in addition, and as confirmed by one chair, the secretaries are aware that the chair will edit the final minutes to meet their own 'standards' before they are sent out, which may impact how the minutes are drafted. However, from a comparison of the various minute versions of the DLTC committee meeting – from the first hand-written version via those resulting from post-meeting discussions with the chair – it became apparent that out of a total of 12 agenda items only 5 had hand-written notes of any sizeable length. No notes were taken in the case of 4 agenda items and for three items all that was noted down was the word 'agreed'. For instance, for the agenda item 'To consider the minutes of the meeting held
on [date], this one word was jotted down in the original hand-written version which was then expanded, after a cycle of 4 revisions in meetings with the chair, to a final minute version to the length of five sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Minutes version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda item</td>
<td>To consider the minutes of the meeting held on xxth Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand written version from committee meeting</td>
<td>The committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on xx3th Jan 2016 were an accurate record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st edited version at the beginning of post-meeting no. 1</td>
<td>The committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on xxth Jan 2016 were an accurate record. It was mentioned that in relation to point 6a and 7, all actions were complete. With regards to point 8b, it noted that link was now available to UoL and will be a point of discussion at the Joint Liaison Group meeting between UoL and XJTLU on the xxth Mar. For point 8c there was no feedback received. Finally for point 8f it noted that [name] was the new MC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd edited version at the end of post-meeting no. 1</td>
<td>The committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on xxth Jan 2016 were an accurate record. It was mentioned that in relation to point 6a (CLT ALAs) and 7 (follow-up to Unmoderated Portfolio Assessment proposal), all actions were complete. With regards to point 8b (EAP information page in ICE), it noted that link was now available to UoL and will be a point of discussion at the Joint Liaison Group meeting between UoL and XJTLU on the xxth Mar. For point 8c (the LC staff-student communication area on ICE) there was no feedback received. Finally for point 8f (changes to BA China Studies) it was noted that [name] was the new Y3 EAP MC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final edited version after post-meeting no.2</td>
<td>The committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on xxth Jan 2016 were an accurate record. It was mentioned that in relation to point 6a (CLT ALAs) and 7 (follow-up to Unmoderated Portfolio Assessment proposal), all actions were complete. With regards to point 8b (EAP information page in ICE), it noted that link was now available to UoL and will be a point of discussion at the Joint Liaison Group meeting between UoL and XJTLU on the xxth Mar. For point 8c (the LC staff-student communication area on ICE) there was no feedback received. Finally for point 8f (changes to BA China Studies) it was noted that [name] was the new Y3 EAP MC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Revision cycle of minutes from first hand-written to final typed version (parts added in each revision phase in italics)

Note-taking is solipsistic in nature in that its production and reception is by one and the same person, the note-taker, and is meant for exclusive communication only for herself. In view of their function as a memory support, notes are also a highly reduced and incomplete ancillary text and can be understood only in conjunction with the previously memorized mental representation built up in the course of the communicative action during which the notes were taken (Albl-Mikasa 2016: 92). While this functional dimension is illustrated by the above example from the data, the example also shows that notes may be extremely minimalist to the extent that their successful functioning becomes questionable.
This has a bearing on communicative success which is at the core of our investigation. On one hand, minutes are an integral part of communicative success of the meetings as they act as summaries of what was discussed and decided upon and have to be comprehensible and understood by committee members as reminder and by outsiders to the committee as a source of information. As such communicative success in committee meetings depends on the degree to which the committee secretary, an ELF speaker, captures the communication that takes place within the meeting. On the other hand, it is almost impossible to determine the extent to which the non-native secretary could and did follow the English discussion and what comprehension problems she encountered. This is further complicated by the subjective dimension of communicative success. Kohn (2018: 11) highlights that successful ELF communication is difficult to define and that 'speaker or listener satisfaction' are an important endonormative criterion of communicative success. He suggests that with authentic communication, if the speaker and listener perceive success in terms of their performance matching their own subjective requirements or standards, then communication can be deemed successful. This is reflected in the data not only by the secretary's feeling that language is not a major issue, but also by the optimistic view of the chair of multiple committees. When asked whether the use of ELF at XJTLU committee meetings had an impact on the workflow or efficiency, he answered:

'[…] no, I don't think it has an impact at all. I think we're used to working with English or Englishes […]', an opinion seconded by the Committee Coordinator.

What is clear is that XJTLU functions regardless of whether the committee minutes meet all the expectations and that the minutes work and do what they need to do. This, however, seems to be achieved through a system of backup measures, i.e. audio recording of meetings, multiple rounds of (native speaker) chair interventions which compensate for what initial notes or versions of minutes do not contain and what cannot be reproduced from the notes themselves (had the secretary fully understood everything discussed during the meeting).

This adds a new dimension to the cooperative nature of ELF communication, which is highlighted by researchers such as Kaur (2010), Seidlhofer (2011) and Mauranen (2012), but which has so far been applied to immediate utterance exchange within one single encounter, as evidenced from the dialogic corpus data such as VOICE (see Seidlehofer 2011), ELFA (Mauranen 2006) and ACE (Kirkpatrick 2010) on which studies about cooperative ELF are based. What our study finds is that possible language problems may be offset by collaborative, co-constructive and supportive behavior that extends well beyond the immediate dialogic interaction, across and into the wider operational process. The web of embedding support action is best explained as an instance of situated cognition (Risku 2010), as measures become successful in the TNE
environment that they operate in through the interplay of various stakeholders and influencing factors.

Another point that came to the fore is closely linked to the situated cognition framework. Minutes are not 'standalone' but linked to other university documentation especially policies and procedures, and status of action documentation. Moreover, the readership comprises both, English first and second or foreign language speakers, people from numerous academic cultures and norms, early to late career academics and professional services administrators, attendees of the committee meetings and non-attendees. For some the process is familiar, for others it is not. Minutes should be written in such a way as to maximise the chances of each reader being able to create a coherent mental model of their content or what they are about, regardless of first language and educational culture backgrounds or experience of the actual meeting discussions. Ideally this would be an adequate representation of what was decided in the meeting. For some committee members the minutes are only a reminder triggering the mental model or memory of what they have heard during the committee meeting, while for others they are the sole carrier of information. This means that the ELF non-conformities left in the minutes after revision rounds with the native-speaker chair (see above) should have varying effects on different readers. Although it is theoretically possible in subsequent committee meetings, often it may be too late to influence output. It is therefore essential that the minutes are self-explanatory, adding further to the ELF discourse, especially in view of the fact that they are written, which reduces
considerably the potential for interactional meaning negotiation. Again, this means that language variety and accuracy should not be looked at per se, but that the functions and expectations minutes have to fulfill and meet as well as the scope of their influence would need to be taken into consideration when investigating further communicative success under ELF conditions and quality assurance in TNE environments.

7. Conclusion

The study presented here is situated in the context of a TNE joint venture which has English not only as a medium of instruction in the classroom, but as a working language for the running of the institution. It is perhaps more obvious to put the research focus on EMI. Here it is put on ELF, addressing, perhaps for the first time, the decision-making processes under ELF conditions in committee meetings in an internationalised university environment. The study zooms in on data gathered by means of participatory observation as part of a richer corpus collected in a broader study conducted by XJTLU and ZHAW. The focus is on the minute-taking process in committee meetings, a key component of decision-making and quality assurance as minutes serve not only a documentary function but also as a basis for future action.

Access to the site, the context, the participants and cues etc. as provided by XJTLU made it possible to take an ethnographic approach affording an emic perspective. Transferring the naturalistic data gathered into a corpus (of transcripts of recordings, interviews, field notes etc.) will make the investigated reality mediated by a dataset. While this will have advantages for follow-up studies in terms of a larger-scale analysis of multiple data, it will only give access to a product, rather than the iterative processes involved (Angelelli 2017). This paper, therefore, first starts by providing insights into the insider perspective gained through participatory observation of minute-taking in committee meetings.

Looking at the different minute versions – from the hand-written original via a cycle of revisions through post-committee-meetings with the chair to the final version – as well as the comments made by the minute-takers or secretaries and by the chair in retrospective interviews, it has become clear that, at this stage, it is not possible to assess the degree to which the use of English under ELF conditions may adversely impact committee communication in general and its manifestation or presentation in the minutes in particular. What can be shown, however, is that it is the embeddedness of minute-taking in the wider operational processes, support actions and intervention of various players that makes it work in the ELF environment. Language problems may thus be offset by collaborative, co-constructive and supportive behavior extending well beyond the immediate dialogic interaction that it is usually attributed to by ELF researchers.
Further analysis of the larger corpus of data will aim at unraveling this highly complex and cooperative process of producing minutes of a committee meeting from the first notes taken by the secretary, a non-native speaker of English, to its final consolidation through interaction with the committee chair, a native speaker of English. In order to identify the influencing factors, the study will be based on (a) a linguistic and content analysis of the (interim-) products involved (e.g. the different minute versions and their ELF-specific non-conformities), (b) an analysis of the key agents' linguistic/professional expertise, and (c) introspective comments by the key agents (e.g. interviews with secretaries concerning problems encountered and how they were addressed). This will allow us to seek more evidence of whether running this TNE institution works with ELF as a working language, or despite ELF.
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*Pour une lecture linguistique et critique des médias: Empathie, éthique, point(s) de vue.*
Limoges: Lambert-Lucas.

Professeur de sciences du langage à l'Université Lyon 1-Éspé, Alain Rabatel est connu pour ses très nombreux travaux sur l'énonciation, travaux appliqués fréquemment à différents cas médiatiques. Avec pas moins de 110 (!) articles, livres, chapitres publiés en 20 ans, la colossale œuvre scientifique d'Alain Rabatel, répartie entre différentes publications, dont certaines ont une diffusion restreinte sinon confidentielle, risquait de rendre son unité de pensée difficilement saisissable. Avec la publication de "Pour une lecture linguistique et critique des médias: Empathie, éthique, point(s) de vue", qui rassemble en quatre parties et 26 chapitres les publications les plus significatives de cet analyste de discours, Alain Rabatel donne une unité et une cohérence d'ensemble à une grande partie de son parcours scientifique tout au long de 517 pages denses, riches et incisives. Loin du simple collage d'articles, ce travail est véritablement repensé comme une démarche progressive entre propositions théoriques (chapitre 1), analyses médiatiques (chapitre 2), travaux sur l'émotion et l'empathie (chapitre 3), travaux sur le discours d'autrui (chapitre 4) – le tout précédé par une très utile introduction clarifiant tant le projet en lui-même que la posture de l'auteur ainsi que par la reprise d'un entretien accordé à la revue *Mots* qui donne un cadrage général permettant de mieux appréhender la suite de l'ouvrage. Outre cette dimension pédagogique, l'ouvrage offre une autre qualité: de nombreux chapitres sont des réécritures ou des synthèses de plusieurs publications et des échos entre chapitres sont faits tout au long des pages. Cette publication permet donc d'avoir une excellente synthèse sur le modèle énonciatif proposé par l'auteur, au centre duquel se trouve la question du point de vue (PDV), et de le voir appliqué à des exemples aussi différents que la rubrique de *fact-checking* "Désintox" de Libération, le traitement médiatique de l'affaire Dominique Strauss-Kahn, celui des suicides à France-Télécom ou encore le jeu des citations du site "Arrêt sur images".

Précisons pour les lecteurs et lectrices de ce compte-rendu que l'on ne peut pas résumer un tel ouvrage: une vingtaine de pages n'y suffiraient pas. Je vais me contenter de donner quelques perspectives qui souligneront à mon sens pourquoi ce livre est indispensable à quiconque entend analyser une production médiatique écrite. Précisons aussi que si l'ouvrage se destine à des chercheurs en sciences de la communication, ces derniers auront la tâche facilitée avec une solide connaissance en linguistique et analyse de discours: la première
partie de l'ouvrage demande une lecture lente et attentive pour saisir les finesse d'un modèle d'analyse de l'expression d'un point de vue qui permet par exemple de distinguer des PDV pris en charge des PDV quasi-pris en charge, lesquels peuvent marquer accord, consonance, prise en charge , prise en charge , désaccord ou dissonance. Mais une véritable lecture critique des médias implique de passer par de telles finesse d'analyse, pour au moins deux raisons: la première est la prévallence de l'"effacement énonciatif" dans les genres médiatiques d'information – voire de commentaire – effacement qu'on doit bien se garder de confondre avec une forme de neutralité. La seconde est la légitime insistance d'Alain Rabatel sur la centralité de la question de la dialectique entre responsabilité énonciative et empathie, qui est souvent un moyen pour les journalistes de presse écrite de cadrer un évènement selon une perspective alors que le texte lui-même ne semble pas présenter de point de vue subjectif. Rabatel défend, et plutôt bien, que sa notion technique de PDV, parce qu'elle permet tant de rendre compte des "biais" de l'effacement énonciatif comme de la co-construction collective de la référence, est une porte d'entrée idéale pour l'analyse des médias qui se prétendent trop souvent désengagés ou objectifs. De fait, toute analyse des médias se devrait d'être d'abord linguistique, selon lui.

Rabatel reproche en outre une certaine frilosité à des collègues linguistes trop descriptifs et résistants à une dimension critique et à une critique politique. Sans s'affilier pleinement à l'analyse critique des discours d'un van Dijk ou d'une Wodak, l'auteur plaide pour une analyse de discours engagée, en se fondant sur le fait que le déni de la subjectivité du chercheur est coûteux et peu réaliste, ne serait-ce que par rapport au poids des institutions, au rapport à soi et au monde. Il vaut peut-être mieux tenir compte de la subjectivité de chercheur en tenant de relever un double défi: "penser la subjectivité aussi objectivement que possible et [...] penser l'objectivité en faisant place à la subjectivité" (166). Ce double défi demandant de faire place à l'intersubjectivité, à la circulation des points de vue, on peut comprendre l'insistance de l'auteur sur la réflexion éthique, en particulier l'éthique des discours, et sur la mobilité des PDV qui implique la question de l'empathie, réflexions à partir desquelles peut se construire une forme d'auto-contrôle de l'engagement du chercheur ou, pour reprendre la formule oxymorique de Marc Lits plusieurs fois cité par l'auteur, un "engagement désengagé".

La densité philosophique, la finesse d'analyse du modèle théorique et le style volontiers abstrait de Rabatel rendent les 150 pages consacrées aux propositions théoriques assez ardues, heureusement soutenues par des exemples permettant de saisir la subtilité du modèle. Mais les chapitres 1 à 3 permettent de progressivement ancrer la notion de point de vue et les richesses de son analyse, notion qui permet de tenir compte de la manière dont un énonciateur – individuel, collectif ou anonyme – envisage un objet de discours, ainsi que sa posture, par exemple de sur-énonciation ou de sous-énonciation.
Tout au long de la construction de son modèle, Rabatel révèle bien son intérêt pour les énoncés non marqués, mettant en évidence la problématique de l'effacement énonciatif en ce qu'il fait apparaître les énoncés comme plus fiables ou plus assurément vrais. Dans un monde médiatique traversé par la recherche de la vérité, la distinction entre information et commentaire ou la métaphore de la fenêtre ouverte sur le monde, nul doute que l'apparente transparence de l'assertion non modalisée nécessite un regard aiguisé de l'analyse et des outils appropriés. Les cinq pages consacrées à un exemple relatif à la dénomination des policiers, entre "gardiens de la paix" et "forces de l'ordre", déploient de manière fascinante les plus fines subtilités de l'analyse de la prise en charge des énoncés, ce qui permet de finaliser le modèle d'analyse dans un tableau synthétique extrêmement précieux (p. 122). Après cette entrée en matière très linguistique, les quatre derniers chapitres de cette partie se placent sous une égide plus philosophique ou plus exactement éthique en traitant de questions, complexes et importantes, du rapport à la vérité, de la question de la responsabilité sociale, de l'engagement désengagé du chercheur mais aussi de la difficulté de l'invisible: comment l'analyse de discours peut-elle saisir les inégalités sociales si ces dernières sont invisibles dans les discours?

Avec la deuxième partie commencent les analyses de différents cas concrets où l'on saluera la démarche d'aller et retour entre un examen descriptif rigoureux et une dimension interprétative qui permet de relier le cas particulier à des réflexions plus générales. Ainsi les chapitres 9 et 10 présentent des exemples qui ouvrissent sur des réflexions importantes sur la question de la responsabilité journalistique (sans oublier celle de l'analyste de discours). Les chapitres 11 à 13, analysant des textes touchant d'une certaine manière à la peoplisation permet d'envisager des questions d'idéologies collectives, plus ou moins visibles, plus ou moins inscrites dans des présupposés ou des sous-entendus et des stratégies de mise en texte et de mise en page questionnables sur le plan éthique. Les chapitres 14 à 16, consacrés à la rubrique "Désintox" de Libération, seront aussi une lecture précieuse dans le contexte actuel de "fake news" ou d'"ère post-vérité". Le dernier chapitre en particulier évoque, derrière le caractère louable des articles de vérification des faits, les points faisant question, les taches aveugles du processus.

Dans la troisième partie, Rabatel ouvre le chantier "émotions et empathie" à travers l'analyse de plusieurs cas, dont les trois premiers touchent à des perspectives féministes. Dans le premier chapitre de cette partie, on notera que Rabatel met en évidence deux notions théoriques peu déployées dans la première partie de l'ouvrage: l'empathie et l'argumentation. Il faut dire que le compte rendu judiciaire analysé dans le chapitre 17, touchant à une affaire de viol, est tout à fait singulier et fascinant du point de vue de le démarche d'empathisation, même s'il est peu représentatif du genre. Commencer cette partie par ce chapitre est particulièrement fécond pour évoquer l'empathie saisie selon une perspective d'analyste de discours et pour défendre une définition de
l'argumentation qui s'inscrit assez résolument dans la tradition francophone de Jean-Blaise Grize et Ruth Amossy, à savoir une argumentation que Rabatel qualifie d'indirecte – "qui repose sur les inférences qu'on tire de la construction des objets du discours, très efficace parce qu'elle argumente sans y paraître" (27). On retrouve ici la préoccupation de l'auteur pour les discours non marqués qui disent bien plus que ce qu'ils ne paraissent dire. Mais aussi, en toile de fond, une certaine méfiance envers la pratique médiatique bien connue de la simple confrontation de paroles; tout comme la justice confronte des témoignages qui se neutralisent, les médias font souvent parler des acteurs qui s'opposent mais sans effort de se mettre à la place des uns et des autres, dans une position d'extériorité qui manque parfois l'essentiel. Le cas des suicides de France-Télécom analysé dans les chapitres 20 et 21 est exemplaire d'une lente prise en compte par les médias de la dimension invisible, au-delà des cas individuels.

Avec cette idée de confrontation des points de vue (au sens non technique du terme) qui doit, pour Rabatel, dépasser la simple juxtaposition de propos, on entre de plain-pied dans la dernière partie de l'ouvrage qui vise précisément à étudier la représentation des points de vue autres dans un discours citant. Poussant parfois l'analyse jusqu'à un cas de quasi-disparition du journaliste citant, chapitre 25, Rabatel montre que, même minimaliste, l'intervention journalistique ne l'exonère pas de sa responsabilité. Comme le dit l'auteur lui-même, au-delà de la diversité des cas qu'il analyse, les mêmes fils rouges reviennent sous sa plume: empathie, responsabilité, PDV malgré la transparence, l'invisibilité, le refuge de l'objectivité.

Cet ouvrage, qui "ne souhaite pas conclure", est une somme de réflexions diverses, importantes, par forcément faciles, car exigeant de ne pas se cantonner à la surface textuelle. Même si on peut reprocher une publication très compacte, aussi dense sur le plan de la mise en page que des réflexions et des analyses, ainsi que des inévitables redites liées à la reprise d'articles publiés, "Pour une lecture linguistique et critique des médias" réussit largement à convaincre de la thèse posée en titre. Si on ajoute une bibliographie monumentale, un index précieux et une table des matières détaillée, le chercheur en communication ou l'analyste de discours découvrira là un livre incontournable pour la réflexion sur l'énonciation dans le discours médiatique écrit. A l'image de Roselyne Koren qui, en 1996, soulignait le leurre de l'impartialité et de l'objectivité, Rabatel enfoncé ici le clou et redit toute l'importance de l'analyse de l'énonciation dans des énoncés qui semblent simplement asséter le monde.
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*Heritage and School Language Literacy Development in Migrant Children. Interdependence or Independence?*
Second Language Acquisition: 119.
Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Im schulischen Zusammenhang ist das Paradigma weit verbreitet, dass bei mehrsprachigen Kindern die Erstsprache gefördert werden muss, damit die Zweitsprache erfolgreich erworben werden kann. In den verschiedenen Beiträgen des Sammelbandes "Heritage and School Language Literacy Development in Migrant Children" wird dieses Paradigma hinterfragt und der vermeintliche Sprachentransfer untersucht. Im Zentrum stehen die Literalitätsfähigkeiten (literacy skills) in beiden Sprachen (heritage und school language) und die Beantwortung der Frage, inwiefern das Potential von geteilten und transferierten Ressourcen zwischen den beiden Sprachen beim Erwerb der literacy skills genutzt wird.


In den Beiträgen 2 bis 6 des Sammelbands werden die Resultate des HELASCOT-Projekts diskutiert. Im Zentrum des Projekts steht eine Langzeituntersuchung, welche die biliteracy-Entwicklung und verborgenen Transferprozesse zwischen heritage language und der Schulsprache von Kindern portugiesischer Muttersprache in der französisch- und deutschsprachigen Schweiz untersucht. In Beitrag 2 beschreiben die


Der Entwicklung argumentativer und narrativer Schreibfähigkeiten von portugiesischsprachigen Kindern in der Schweiz widmen sich Magalie Desgrippes, Amelia Lambelet und Jan Vanhove in **Beitrag 5**. Die bilingualen

In Beitrag 6 analysieren Jan Vanhove und Raphael Berthele die bisher vorgestellten Resultate auf mögliche Interdependenzen zwischen den Sprachen. Sie stellen fest, dass die Testresultate in den Sprachtests (zum Zeitpunkt T2 oder T3) durch frühere Testresultate (T1 oder T2) in der selben Sprache vorhergesagt werden können. Noch genauer wird die Vorhersage, wenn die früheren Testresultate in der anderen Sprache miteinbezogen werden. Zwar liegt hier oberflächlich gesehen Interdependenz vor, diese kann aber gemäss Vanhove und Berthele auch anders erklärt werden. Da keine klaren Einflussrichtungen zwischen L1 und L2 nachweisbar sind und die Sprachverwandtschaft ebenfalls keinen eindeutigen Effekt hat, zweifeln Vanhove und Berthele generell an der Gültigkeit der Interdependenz-Hypothese und plädieren dafür, auch die Resultate anderer Langzeit-Untersuchungen erneut zu evaluieren.


Raphael Berthele schliesst in Beitrag 10 den Sammelband mit einer Übersicht der Befunde, deren Einordnung in die Theorie und einer letzten Diskussion um die Gültigkeit der Interdependenz-Hypothese ab. Die populäre Forderung nach Erstsprachunterricht, um damit die Entwicklung der Schulsprache zu begünstigen, wird mit den Testresultaten des Sammelbandes in Frage gestellt. Berthele betont aber, dass damit nicht bewiesen sei, dass die HSK-Kurse nicht sinnvoll seien, nur sei deren Instrumentalisierung als notwendig für die Kompetenzentwicklung in der Schulsprache nicht gerechtfertigt.

Beim manchen Sammelbänden müssen sich die Lesenden fragen, was das Verbindende der Beiträge ist – dies ist hier sicherlich nicht der Fall. Gerade weil es sich aber um verschiedene empirische Studien mit thematisch ähnlichen Forschungsfragen handelt, lässt es sich wohl nicht vermeiden, dass gewisse Redundanzen zwischen den Beiträgen vorhanden sind – vor allem in den diskutierten theoretischen Ansätzen.

Hilfreich gerade für junge Forschende scheint mir der offensive Umgang mit Problemen im Forschung design von Longitudinalstudien (Beitrag 6). So wird davor gewarnt, sich beim Design zu sehr auf praktische (statt inhaltliche)
Überlegungen abzustützen, sich also z. B. nur davon leiten zu lassen, wie viel Zeit zwischen den Untersuchungen verstreichen muss, damit es für die getesteten Personen nicht zu viel wird.

Die empirischen Untersuchungen wurden generell genau beschrieben und sorgfältig designt. Dennoch gibt es einige Punkte, über die kritische Lesende stolpern: Bei den Ausführungen zum HELASCOT-Projekt ist unklar, ob sich in der Kontrollgruppe nur Monolinguale oder auch Bilinguale mit anderer Erstsprache befinden.
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