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Purpose of This Study

• To identify what comprises an effective EMI practice
• To explore a range of roles its actors play in that endeavor
• An area that perhaps has yet to be explored in a comprehensive manner
Outline

• Background
• Faculty situations in Japan and beyond
• Component elements of EMI practice
• Mutually complementary roles for professional development
• Challenges
Background

- Continued **growth** of EMI
- Chronic **shortage** of trained EMI faculty
- **Concerns** among stakeholders
- **Need** for professional development
EMI Faculty in Japan

- Nationwide survey in 2016 on EMI practice with a focus on its faculty such as their makeup, workload, needs and concerns
- 260 Japanese HEIs offering EMI course(s) as of 2013
- 99 responses including 78 HEIs and 21 academic divisions
EMI Faculty’s L1

Based on national survey conducted by the presenter in 2016
Teaching Load (N=99)

- EMI and JMI: 34%
- EMI and language: 24%
- EMI only: 25%
- EMI, language and JMI: 14%
- Other courses: 3%

Based on national survey conducted by the presenter in 2016
Employment status (N=99)

- Tenured faculty: 38%
- Tenured, F/T fixed-term and P/T faculty: 31%
- Mainly full-time (fixed-term) faculty: 10%
- P/T faculty: 8%
- Others: 3%
- No response: 10%
- Others: 10%

Based on national survey conducted by the presenter in 2016
# Faculty situations in Japan and Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japan N=99</th>
<th>Europe N=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make-up</strong></td>
<td>Mainly L1 Japanese (32)</td>
<td>Mainly L1 local language (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly L1 English (23)</td>
<td>Mixture of L1 local and others (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixture of L1s J, E and others (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 J and L1 E evenly (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns</strong></td>
<td>Workload (55)</td>
<td>Workload (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Appointment (50)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Language proficiency (12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical knowledge (46)</strong></td>
<td>Professional development (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource (29)</td>
<td>Pedagogical knowledge (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development (28)</td>
<td>Language proficiency (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>No (65) &gt; Yes (24)</td>
<td>Yes (13) &gt; No (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on two surveys conducted by the presenter in 2016
Component Elements of EMI Practice

- Skills
- Knowledge
- Motivation
- Identity
- Support
- Research
Skills

• Pedagogical skills
• Linguistic skills
• Communication skills
• Self-efficacy (e.g., Kim, 2009)
Knowledge

• Academic content and language
  General academic literacy
  Discipline-specific academic literacy
• Pedagogical approaches
• Knowledge of the local language
  Translanguaging (Baker, 2001)
Motivation

- Willingness to teach in an additional language
- Genuine interest in teaching across languages and cultures
- Professional and personal meaningfulness
- Assessment and feedback
Identity

- Professional identity, experience and authority (Kling, 2013)
- Own teaching styles in an additional language
- Teachers’ beliefs
Support

- Professional
- Linguistic
- Administrative
- Structural
Research

• EMI studies
  Macro & micro levels
• Interdisciplinary studies

- TESOL ITA SLL/FLE
- CLIL ILCHE
- Bilingual Ed
- EMI Disciplinary fields
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Educators (LE)</th>
<th>Content Specialists (CS)</th>
<th>Content-Language Specialists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFL: CBI/ EAP/ESP</td>
<td>LRI**: EAP/ESP</td>
<td>CBI/EAP/ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft CLIL</td>
<td>Hard CLIL</td>
<td>CLIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI for GE*</td>
<td>EMI for upper level</td>
<td>EMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching w/CS</td>
<td>Team teaching w/LE</td>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
<td>Language training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language educators and content specialists could be either L1 or L2 English speakers

* GE: General Education
** LRI: Linguistically Responsive Instruction (Gallagher & Haan, 2018)
Challenges

• EMI for enhanced value and quality in non-Anglophone higher education
• EMI as a legitimate study option in the mainstream undergraduate curricula
• Engagement with EMI by “right” language educators to their fullest capacity
• Sustainable working conditions for EMI faculty
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