palgrave pivot

LANGUAGE LEARNING AND USE IN ENGLISH-MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION

Lia Blaj-Ward

Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education

Lia Blaj-Ward

Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education

palgrave
macmillan

Lia Blaj-Ward
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham, UK

ISBN 978-3-319-63238-4 ISBN 978-3-319-63239-1 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017947748

Cover illustration: Pattern adapted from an Indian cotton print produced in the 19th century

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgements

A wise person taught me that there is never a wrong time to talk about umbrellas, and lately I've become acutely aware of the truth in those wise words. This book is about meaningful conversations or, more precisely, about how non-native speakers of English develop their communicative repertoire in that language. There is sustained criticism of English for leading to impoverishment and attrition of languages with a less powerful status. While this book acknowledges the importance of preserving the richness of linguistic landscapes, it nevertheless celebrates purposeful English language use in the context of higher education; it underlines the value of encounters that lead to learning and argues in favour of using language in contexts that enable personal and professional growth.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my research participants who kindly gave up their time to share their stories with me, as well as to the very special people I am privileged enough to call my family.

Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

3LU	Research project involving postgraduate interviewees ('From language learner to language user in English-medium HE contexts: Identities, strategies, trajectories')
AALL	Association for academic language and learning http://www.aall.org.au/
AcLitT	Research project involving undergraduate interviewees ('Academic literacy trajectories')
ASEAN	Association of southeast Asian nations
AWL	Academic word list
BALEAP	The global forum for EAP professionals (formerly the British association of lecturers in English for academic purposes) www.baleap.org
BNC	British national corpus
CEFR	Common European framework of reference for languages http://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/
CELEX	Centre for lexical information
CEM	Contextualisation embedding mapping
CET-4	College English test
EAP	English for academic purposes
EAQUALS	Evaluation and accreditation of quality language services https://www.eaquals.org/
EFL	English as a foreign language
EGAP	English for general academic purposes
ELFA	English as an academic lingua franca
ELF	English as a lingua franca

ELSHE	English language standards in higher education
EMI	English-medium instruction
ER	Extensive reading
ESAP	English for specific academic purposes
ESP	English for specific purposes
GPA	Grade point average
GSL	General service list
IELTS	The international English language testing system https://www.ielts.org/
L1	First language
L2	Second language
NNSE	Non-native speaker
PELA	Post-entry language assessment
QAA	Quality assurance agency UK http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en
SA	Study abroad
SLA	Second language acquisition
TED	Technology, entertainment and design conference https://www.ted.com/
TEQSA	Tertiary education quality and standards agency http://www.teqsa.gov.au/
TL	Target language
TNE	Transnational education

Note:
For data transcripts, the following conventions are used: R = researcher; A-G = individual participants in the AcLitT project; [interview A.3] = third interview with Participant A.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Abstract The writing of this volume was prompted by a qualitative interest in non-native English speaker students' language development during English-medium university study, and this chapter sets the scene for the discussion: it pinpoints corners of the applied linguistics and higher education research fields visited in preparation for the volume; it outlines the empirical research projects which underpin discussion of language learning and use; it elaborates on the three key threads running through the chapters; and offers an annotated list of eight texts which shaped the research for and the writing of *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, which readers are encouraged to consult. Methodological notes to guide the readers' journey through the volume are included (additional research design information provided in Appendix).

Keywords EMI · EAP research · Needs analysis · Language learning and use · Study abroad

1.1 Points of Departure

September. A sudden increase in footfall. The sleepy university town is coming back to life. Windows are shut to keep the crisp morning out. On the entrance steps, in stairwells, in the recently refurbished 'chill out' areas of the shiny new Learning Zone building (previously known as the

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_1

library), around sign-up desks, in lobbies, lounges, on covered walkways bypassing proudly displayed and carefully tended ponds and other water features, fewer languages are being spoken than might be expected from a quick glance at new academic year enrolment data. Teaching, learning and administrative exchanges officially take place in English, and English appears to be the language of choice for social and purposeful talk as well.

The extent to which English will continue to be heard around the campus beyond September, in public and in private spaces, and will be the medium for lively, meaningful and rewarding exchanges among those who use it as a second, foreign or additional language, very much depends on a number of factors. Among these, the attitudes towards the Englishes brought to the campus by their users; the interactional competencies and preferences of the permanent and temporary university town inhabitants; the wider, globally dispersed networks of (English or other) language users on which the campus residents will draw; and, to a greater or lesser degree, an on-campus department, centre or unit responsible for English language teaching and learning.

The substantial body of research into language development during study abroad that has emerged so far has predominantly attempted to measure linguistic gain or to explore the impact of specific variables on language development. The present volume focuses on English-medium instruction (EMI) contexts and brings together EMI participants' accounts of journeys from language learner to language user; these accounts are filtered through second language acquisition (SLA) principles and insights from research into the study abroad (SA) and higher education international student experience. These complementary bodies of research helped draw out key threads and formulate probing questions. The book is about the extent to which theories play out in individual language learners' experiences. The phrase 'EMI participant' here refers to a non-native or not yet fully proficient speaker of English, undertaking higher education in an English-speaking country or via a programme delivered through the medium of English in a country where English is used as a second or foreign language.

Underpinning this volume are three primary research projects which spanned two academic years (2014–2016) and explored the language learning and use experiences of a range of international students in the UK. The first, labelled 3LU, involved twenty-one interviews with postgraduate students at the end of the taught component of a postgraduate

degree in the UK, looking back at how they prepared for academic study in the UK and how their English supported them through this experience. The second, a series of semi-structured interviews conducted at the beginning, middle and end of the academic year with seven first-year undergraduate students, referred to as AcLitT in this volume. The third project was a case study of an exchange student, Olivia, travelling to the UK for a year of academic study in the middle of her degree; the case includes a combination of interviews, email communication, reflective written pieces and analysis of the student's academic work. A more detailed description of the projects is available in the appendix.

Throughout the book, snippets of data are included, in the body of the text, as direct quotes or as a summary of what participants said. Alongside this are a number of vignettes in italics, set out from the left-hand margin, which are a composite of several research participants' accounts of language use at university. Composite vignettes act as an invitation to readers to step back and reflect on possible scenarios of language use and their implications. The vignettes are abstractions from, not factual descriptions of, experiences recounted by participants, in order to preserve the anonymity of peers and tutors mentioned in the account.

Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education is a logical step forward from my earlier *Researching Contexts, Practices and Pedagogies in English for Academic Purposes* (Blaj-Ward 2014), which was an overview of research relevant to the English for academic purposes (EAP) profession, mapping the richness of the field and the range of potential research projects yet to be conducted. *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education* is written from the standpoint of a research-minded EAP practitioner wishing to learn more about students' language learning outside a formal language classroom. Ethnographic methods, as research methodologists (e.g., Mills and Morton 2013; Holliday 2016) usefully point out, help researchers explore interviewees' 'truths' about the settings and encounters they experience. The present volume attempts to capture and communicate 'truths' about English language learning and development in the context of studying for a university degree with a visual and/or creative design component (e.g., photography, graphic or product design, fine art and interior architecture), fashion-related management content or a focus oriented towards the built environment (e.g., civil engineering, construction or property management and development). It takes forward the

discussion in the fourth chapter of *Researching Contexts, Practices and Pedagogies*, by adding to the empirical research base on language development in EMI.

The early stages of the training I underwent as a language teacher privileged formal in-class instruction over other contexts in which learners might be exposed to language and, while independent autonomous learning was a core topic covered in the training, it was something to encourage students to do, passing on good language learning and teaching strategies recommended in methodology books, rather than explore through a research lens in order to understand more about strategies adopted by learners themselves. From more recent encounters with speakers of English as a foreign language in a university setting, I learnt that it would be useful to explore how individuals draw on their previous language learning experience to build themselves up as effective communicators in a range of settings connected with studying for a university degree.

My intention in conducting the research behind this volume has been to look at language development through the eyes of the learner rather than of the teacher. I explore the idiosyncrasies and the intricacies of the language learning process in the high-stakes setting of higher education; the experience of international students drawing on a range of English language learning histories with varying degrees of resourcefulness. Whole-of-university policies and strategies being developed in EMI settings in recent years have tended to focus primarily on formal language provision and on embedding this closely within the academic degree (e.g., Murray 2016). The empirical research which underpins this volume reveals a nuanced, multifaceted picture of students' language development during university, on and off campus. As such, it should be read in conjunction with institutional policies and strategies to support their effective implementation.

A sensitising concept (Charmaz 2014) which informed the research for and writing of this volume is 'trajectories'. On the one hand, 'trajectories' refers to research participants' journeys through a variety of settings in which they were formally taught English or in which they were exposed to the language and had the opportunity to make sense of it and use it meaningfully, with a smaller or greater degree of success. The sequence of settings, formal and informal, objectively listed, is the first layer of meaning in the concept. Language tests, especially ones which have a gatekeeping function in relation to higher education entry or that

involve specific in- and out-of-class learning, are included here. The second layer of meaning is added by participants' own engagement in learning—not the sequence of settings themselves, but the way in which the settings were experienced by participants and the way this experience impacted on their development as competent and confident language users. Trajectories in this second sense are research participants' subjective perceptions of their learning experience. Lastly, trajectories refer to potential paths to follow beyond the research conducted for this book, both to explore aspects in more depth and to formulate principles for pedagogic interventions.

Trajectories imply direction, but not necessarily linearity. In the case of settings, the trajectory is mainly chronological. In the case of learner perceptions, it is sinuous and subjective. While quantitative development (e.g., wider range of vocabulary or of language structures used to express complex ideas and fulfil communicative functions) underpins increases in proficiency, it is not the objective measurement of proficiency that matters in this research but research participants' evaluation of their performance (and others' response to this performance) in authentic communicative encounters. Quantification is an approach favoured by a number of studies (reviewed in Chap. 6) which track student progress and student language development by means of establishing statistical significance. The focus in the current project is people rather than numbers, personal rather than statistical significance, and diverse language development trajectories rather than average group scores.

1.2 Key Threads Throughout the Book

Three key threads run through the discussion in this volume: needs analysis; the potential complementarity of immersion and instruction; and the interplay between learner and user experiences. These threads guided the design of the research projects on which the book draws and the analytical dialogue between the data and the literature. The three threads are unpacked below.

1.2.1 Needs Analysis

Needs analysis is generally highlighted as a defining aspect of EAP (Bocanegra-Valle 2016). Needs are usually established in relation to the target academic discipline and students' language proficiency. A classic

approach to EAP places the 'A' (=academic) at the centre of provision and draws on the 'E' (=English) that most closely aligns with specific practices in academic disciplines. On some university courses with a strong vocational or practice-related orientation, traditional EAP input may be supplemented by functional language for specific purposes (e.g., language for facilitating meetings or language to reflect on one's practice). A broader take on EAP, however, would acknowledge that EFL/ESL speakers in an English-medium higher education setting bring with them a range of language learning and language use experiences, capitalise on these on and offcampus during their academic sojourn and carry their enriched language profile over into subsequent professional practice settings. The discussion in the present volume is informed by this broader stance and is itself the outcome of an extensive exercise in needs analysis, which informs discussion in Chap. 6 in this volume about institutional provision and facilitating language development in EMI settings.

1.2.2 Immersion and Instruction: Contexts of Learning and Use

A second key thread running through this volume is that of the tension between and complementarity of immersion and instruction. The former is arguably the main way of adding value to a formal language learning experience through travelling to an English-speaking country. In terms of language gain, however, immersion in a setting where the target language is used for day-to-day as well as academic interaction is not on its own sufficient to facilitate development of linguistic proficiency. Currently accepted SLA theories support the view that explicit attention to language is needed to facilitate acquisition, complemented by meaningful, negotiated interaction and feedback. The amount of exposure to formal language instruction, compared to potential access to unscripted encounters in which participants do not receive explicit developmental feedback on their performance, is disproportionately low in study abroad that does not have language learning as its primary purpose. This means that formal language instruction which prepares students for or which supplements academic courses should ideally be weighted towards language learning strategies, while learners' experience of unscripted encounters should be tapped into, and insights capitalised on to facilitate learners' development. A complementary view is presented by Kalaja et al. (2008), who emphasise participation over acquisition—language learning as a social as well as cognitive activity and one which involves

creating personal, subjective meanings, social communication and relationships. This volume reflects on the nature of preparatory courses for university study, the extent to which ongoing language support is fit for purpose and the way in which formal language support provision articulates with sources of support that students access themselves.

1.2.3 The 'Good' Language Learner/the 'Competent' Language User

The developmental transition from language learner to language user, the tacit goal of studying, is very much dependent on the contexts of learning and use and the extent to which these facilitate the deployment of a range of effective language development strategies. In a 2001 article questioning the landmark SLA concept of the 'good language learner', Norton and Toohey argue in favour of broadening the original focus on characteristics internal to individual learners to explore these learners' 'access to a variety of conversations in their communities', how they are 'situated in specific social, historical and cultural contexts and how [they] resist or accept the positions those contexts offer them' (p. 310). They illustrate this through the case of Eva, a participant in an earlier study by Norton (2000). Eva, a young Polish woman, immigrated to Canada with little English initially, but was able to make substantial progress compared to a number of other research participants with similar proficiency levels. Norton relates Eva's progress to her ability to 'negotiate entry into the Anglophone social networks in her workplace' (p. 313). Eva was initially engaged in low-skilled employment which required very little use of language and gave her no opportunity to reveal the depth and breadth of her knowledge in other areas of life and her more complex *self* outside the very limiting boundaries of the workplace role she was performing. Gradually, however, she developed a different set of relationships through the social outings organised by her workplace. In communication with her co-workers in these outings, she was able to project the more valued identity as an experienced traveller and multilingual resource rather than the less powerful one of an ESL immigrant.

The example of Eva summarised above can be read alongside Perrin's (2015) account of Meredith, a Chinese postgraduate student at a British university, who withdrew from interaction with speakers of less privileged varieties of English, in support of the view that there is a very complex interplay between identity and language use; university campuses are one setting in which this complex interplay carries high stakes. In higher

education teaching and learning settings, there is no formal equivalent of the low-skilled role that Eva performed, and there is official recognition that facilitating language skills development is an institutional responsibility. However, the extent to which this institutional responsibility is resourced and plays out varies widely. At the same time, by not fully exercising agency, students may place themselves in positions equivalent to Eva's low-skilled employment role, not making full use of the resources available and therefore failing to claim for themselves more powerful identities. The following scenario aims to illustrate this:

> In a spacious and well-lit studio with less than perfect acoustics in an Anglophone context, two tutors and a group of first-year students are sitting or standing in a fairly tidy semicircle, facing a display of design-work-in-progress. Behind the semi-circle, rectangular tables arranged in a block. Behind the block of tables, three East Asian students.

The size of the visuals in the scenario above, the softness of the voices discussing them, the colloquial word clusters in the tutors' comments, usually associated with higher proficiency levels (*start the ball rolling*, *bring it alive*, *zing it up a bit*, *just have the joy of making it*), the novelty of the teaching and learning situation (sharing work-in-progress, providing peer feedback) and the face-threatening potential of the social situation (exposing unfinished work to critique) may help or hinder the engagement of the three East-Asian students sat away from the group—and indeed of those in the semicircle. From the point of view of language, the situation is ripe with opportunities for development. The extent to which those opportunities materialise themselves very much depends on how the more powerful speakers scaffold others' engagement in the language practices that constitute the work-in-progress critique—and how the less powerful speakers take up those opportunities.

Magnan and Lafford (2012) usefully acknowledge, however, that study abroad participants may not necessarily approach their sojourn with the mindset of a foreign language student or a linguistic ethnographer. Study abroad research to date (oriented towards linguistic gain and/or the broader experience of participants) has been conducted mainly with participants travelling abroad with language learning as their primary purpose. Before answers can be found to the very pertinent questions that Magnan and Lafford ask about the link between linguistic gain, on the one hand, and individual, social and contextual variables,

on the other, it is important to examine individual experiences in more depth. The aim of this book is to illustrate and problematise rather than develop an explanatory theory; the diversity of learner experiences pre-empts the formulation of a one-size-fits-all solution.

As the data discussed in subsequent chapters show, students differ in terms of the extent to which they see themselves as language learners and consciously set out to develop a native speaker level of competence (e.g., Macalister 2015) or become an 'X speaker of English' (Harvey 2015), where 'X' is to be replaced by the student's national identity, as a way of reconciling the various identities associated with being a speaker of more than one language. The *'good' language learner /'competent' language user* thread in this volume teases out the tensions between tutors' and students' view of a good language learner, the way in which contexts impact on the choice of language learning strategies, and the ensuing identity implications.

1.3 The Eight Texts Which Shaped This Volume

Research is never carried out in a vacuum—the disciplinary footing of the researcher, their familiarity with the literature in the field offer vantage points from which to start research journeys. Eight influential studies which have shaped the research for and writing of this volume are listed below. These texts are not a homogenous collection but a range of different sources that can be confidently recommended to researchers exploring similar topics. Book-length studies and individual journal articles are listed together, not least because researchers should read broadly in order to fine-tune their ability to construct meaningful accounts out of research data. The titles are accompanied by annotations which offer the kind of glimpses into the research journey that is often edited out of formal accounts of research but that might carry learning value for developing researchers wishing to take aspects of this project further.

Norton, B., and Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(2), 307–322. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587650.

Discussed further above, this article reminded me that the worth and scope of language knowledge are fundamentally dependent on opportunities to put this knowledge to use in meaningful ways.

Benson, P., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., & Brown, J. (2013). *Second language identity in narratives of study abroad*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Benson et al. offer some telling accounts of sojourn for academic purposes in English-speaking countries: they analysed narratives about Hong Kong students' experience of studying abroad in a range of English-speaking countries. The links they made between development of language and development of a learner's self-identity inspired me to explore learner/user trajectories in the research projects which underpin this volume: '[the] focus [of existing study abroad research] on language learning outcomes often comes at the expense of opportunities to understand study abroad as a holistic experience with multiple language and identity-related outcomes' (p. 38). I endeavoured to look at the experience holistically when collecting and analysing my data.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Language Learning and Study Abroad is a systematic overview of the empirical research base into language learning in study abroad: as it combines synthesis of insights with methodological commentary, it gave me an in-depth understanding of the field. Reading about one piece of research in particular, the poignant account of two study abroad participants avoiding service encounters that challenged their ability to use language, prompted me to probe deeper into the kind of language exchanges that my research participants engaged in outside formal learning and teaching settings on campus.

Peters, P., and Fernández, T. (2013). The lexical needs of ESP students in a professional field. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*, 236–247. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2013.05.002.

I came across this article after transcribing several interviews with students who apologetically noted that Google was their source of choice when looking up new word meaning, and the findings it put forward resonated with my practitioner concern that suitable training in dictionary use is required, particularly when transitioning from a general English context to an academic/professional one.

Waters, J. L., and Leung, M. (2013). Immobile transnationalisms? Young people and their in situ experiences of 'international' education in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, *50*(3), 606–620. doi:10.1177/0042098012468902.

An insightful piece about immobile transnational education in Hong Kong, and the reality of linguistic gain and language use on degrees taught through the medium of English in the students' home country. The article projects an image of mobile international students as 'possess[ing] a different quality of English proficiency' (p. 616), however, this is not always necessarily the case and the article offers a useful point of comparison for the experiences discussed in Chap. 4.

Blair, B. (2006). At the end of a huge crit in the summer, it was 'crap'—I'd worked really hard but all she said was 'fine' and I was gutted. *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education*, *5*(2), 83–95. doi:10.1386/adch.5.2.83/1.

The studio was one salient context that recurred in my research participants' accounts of their language user experience on the course, and Blair's article was a useful point of reference when considering the stakes that communication carries in the higher education environment—not just leading to a mark on work assessed (the pragmatic rationale behind EAP provision) but shaping the way students engage with the remainder of the course or with the wider professional world beyond graduation.

Dunworth, K., Drury, H., Kralik, C., & Moore, T. (2014). Rhetoric and realities: on the development of university-wide strategies to promote student English language growth. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *36*(5), 520–532. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2014.936088.

Drawing on a substantial piece of research into 'the provision of strategies and activities to enhance student language development for all students regardless of enrolment status or language background' (p. 521) in the Australian context, Dunworth et al. flag up the importance of whole of institution involvement in developing and implementing strategies and activities. Senior management with responsibility in this area provided information from which Dunworth et al. derived eight success factors, very likely applicable across national contexts. These inform my discussion in Chap. 6.

Holliday, A. (2016). *Doing and writing qualitative research* (3rd ed). London: Sage.

Now in its third edition, this is my go-to book for guidance on qualitative research in applied linguistics. More than a how-to guide, it puts forward a view of research as considerate engagement in and with an education setting, giving back more than it is taking away.

1.4 Notes on Methodology

The three projects underpinning this volume (3LU, AcLitT and Olivia's case study) are distinct yet inevitably interconnected. The methodological framework to which the research across the three projects is indebted is constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2014)—up to a certain point. It is constructivist because it acknowledges that research data are co-constructed in the interaction between the researcher and the research participants. It is grounded because the explanations it creates are derived from continuous questioning of the data. As regards theorising, it develops explanations, at a higher or lower level of generality, weaving insights from data, from reading, from my professional practice as an EAP tutor and from my experience as a researcher. The research subscribes to the ethos of constructivist grounded theorising, without working with a too literal and constraining interpretation of its method. Mercieca and Mercieca (2013, p. 236) argue that a method should be 'a process to engage with the other, and not create, order and code the other'. Olivia and the participants in the 3LU and AcLitT projects participated in the process of creating, ordering and coding by offering individualised insights into the learning development process and subtly steering the research into slightly different directions. Each interview followed a set of core questions, to give the project a coherent frame, but experiences shared by each participant led to a refining of additional probes and follow-on questions for subsequent interviews.

The principle behind one of the distinctive features of grounded theory, theoretical sampling (i.e., a form of purposeful sampling on the basis of insights derived from the analysis), underpinned the transition from the 3LU project to the AcLitT one. The 3LU interviewees were students at the end of the taught component of a one-year postgraduate degree and, having experienced undergraduate education in their home country, were in a privileged position to talk about the differences between two education systems as well as between two education levels. AcLitT involved students in the first year of an undergraduate degree, being interviewed at three different points during the academic year, to capture not staged development but salient aspects of language learning and use in university settings at the beginning of the academic journey, when students have a point of comparison for their language learning experience but not for academic work. Analytically, the case study of Olivia acted as a bridge between 3LU and AcLitT, in that Olivia was on an exchange

programme in the UK for a year, having completed part of her undergraduate education in her home country.

1.5 An Overview of Chapters

Chapter 2 (*Language Learner Histories: Points of Departure for University Study*) is divided into two main sections. The first offers a synthesis of relevant socio-cultural SLA theory and insights from study abroad research (the theoretical underpinning of the book), as a premise on which to build discussion of English language development in the context of studying for an academic degree. The second section illustrates the range of starting points for higher education journeys from a language point of view, through vignettes of the research participants' previous language learning experiences, noting how they became language-ready for university study in an English-speaking country. This section acts as a bridge between the earlier theoretical discussion and the subsequent data-based chapters.

Chapter 3 (*Words, Words, Words…*) turns the spotlight on vocabulary. It shows the range of vocabulary needed in academic contexts, based on a synthesis of published research findings and looks at recommendations based on research into learning and teaching lexis. It provides an account of practices adopted by AcLitT participants to increase their lexical knowledge, some effective and following acquired wisdom, others that would make language teachers frown, and yet others that defy recommended practice and emphasise the necessity to think about lexical gain in EMI in more socio-culturally aware ways. It reflects on the dissonance between recommended and adopted strategies and makes recommendations for increasing the visibility and salience of key language on campus for the benefit of EMI participants, as well as highlighting relevant avenues for further research.

Chapter 4 (*Spoken English on the EMI Campus*) focuses on spoken interaction, starting from the premise that study abroad research indicates greatest gains in fluency. It explores opportunities for language use in formally scheduled learning and teaching events as well as in other course-related environments, and strategies for negotiating these opportunities. It suggests avenues for further research and reflection on meaningful interaction on the EMI campus.

Chapter 5 (*Reading in Academic Settings*) maps the summatively assessed work that research participants were required to do at university. Working

from the premise that reading necessarily feeds into summatively assessed work and scaffolds language development through exposure to appropriate ways of conceptualising and communicating about practices in the students' chosen fields, this chapter brings together key threads in practice- and research-informed EAP debates on reading. It foregrounds research participants' reported experiences of coursework-oriented reading and draws out implications for further exploration as well as pedagogic action.

Chapter 6 (*Parameters of English Language Development Provision in EMI*) provides an overview of recent initiatives setting up EAP provision closely embedded within subject areas; it synthesises studies which track the effectiveness of language support; it then contrasts these to research participants' answers to the question 'If attendance at language classes was required on your course, what would these classes be like ideally? What would happen in them?' and discusses quality assurance in EAP contexts.

Chapter 7 (*Conclusion*) brings together key threads from the book. It considers connections, overlaps and divergences between EAP and EMI, further emphasises the relevance of this volume for English-medium degrees outside the UK, and makes recommendations for practice and further research.

References

Benson, P., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., & Brown, J. (2013). *Second language identity in narratives of study abroad*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Blair, B. (2006). At the end of a huge crit in the summer, it was 'crap' – I'd worked really hard but all she said was 'fine' and I was gutted. *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education, 5*(2), 83–95. doi:10.1386/adch.5.2.83/1.

Blaj-Ward, L. (2014). *Researching contexts, practices and pedagogies in English for Academic Purposes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bocanegra-Valle, A. (2016). Needs analysis for curriculum design. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 560–576). London: Routledge.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Dunworth, K., Drury, H., Kralik, C., & Moore, T. (2014). Rhetoric and realities: On the development of university-wide strategies to promote student English language growth. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36*(5), 520–532. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2014.936088.

Harvey, L. (2015). Beyond member-checking: A dialogic approach to the research interview. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 38*(1), 23–38. doi:10.1080/1743727X.2014.914487.

Holliday, A. (2016). *Doing and writing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Kalaja, P., Menezes, V., & Barcelos, A. M. F. (2008). Narrativising learning and teaching EFL: The beginnings. In P. Kalaja, V. Menezes, & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL* (pp. 3–14). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Macalister, J. (2015). Study-abroad programme design and goal fulfilment: 'I'd like to talk like a Kiwi'. In D. Nunan & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Language learning beyond the classroom* (pp. 235–243). New York: Routledge.

Magnan, S. S., & Lafford, B. A. (2012). Learning through immersion during study abroad. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 525–540). Abingdon: Routledge.

Mercieca, D., & Mercieca, D. P. (2013). Engagement with research: Acknowledging uncertainty in methodology. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 36*(3), 228–240. doi:10.1080/1743727X.2013.806470.

Mills, D., & Morton, M. (2013). *Ethnography in education*. London: Sage.

Murray, N. (2016). *Standards of English in higher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. London: Longman/Pearson Education.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(2), 307–322. doi:10.2307/3587650.

Perrin, S. (2015). Why does Meredith wish to sound like the Queen? An investigation into identity issues surrounding spoken English usage of Chinese ELF speakers in London. In A. H. Fabricius & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Transcultural interaction and linguistic diversity in higher education: The student experience* (pp. 278–299). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peters, P., & Fernández, T. (2013). The lexical needs of ESP students in a professional field. *English for Specific Purposes, 32*, 236–247. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2013.05.002.

Waters, J. L., & Leung, M. (2013). Immobile transnationalisms? Young people and their in situ experiences of 'international' education in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies, 50*(3), 606–620. doi:10.1177/0042098012468902.

CHAPTER 2

Language Learner Histories: Points of Departure for University Study

Abstract Key terms and theoretical concepts on which discussion in the present volume is anchored are unpacked in this chapter, drawing on study abroad as a research field, EMI as a range of settings in which higher education is delivered and socially oriented second language acquisition as a set of theoretical principles. EMI participants enrolled on non-language-related degree courses may or may not bring with them attitudes and behaviours that facilitate the systematic attention to language generally recommended by language learning specialists and leading to noticeable gains in language proficiency. The theory-driven first section is followed by the language learning and use backgrounds of participants in the three primary research projects underpinning this volume, illustrating a range of pathways into EMI and of entry language levels.

Keywords Study abroad · SLA · ELF · Language learning histories Proficiency gains

2.1 Second Language Acquisition and Study Abroad

2.1.1 Key Threads Revisited and a Definition

A noteworthy comment on English language development as a result of experiencing higher education through the medium of English is made by Benson et al. (2013):

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_2

> Many of the Hong Kong students whom we have worked with, for example, return from a semester at an overseas university with the feeling that they are no longer 'learners' of English. They feel that they have become 'users' of English, who can best improve their competence not by studying, but simply by continuing to use the language in their everyday lives. (p. 3)

The present chapter maps various points of departure in the journey from language learner to language user that Benson et al. mention. Participants in English-medium instruction (EMI) are invited (or firmly required) to join an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course either prior to or from the start of their EMI experience. A defining aspect of EAP—thorough and comprehensive needs analysis—will ensure maximum relevance of EAP provision. At the same time, however, EAP provision may run the risk of being too narrowly framed around the academic word list (AWL) and assessed academic coursework and thus of overlooking some valuable but perhaps less rigidly academic language learning and use experiences that impact not only on academic performance as measured through summative scores but also on EMI participants' development as confident communicators in globalised settings. A broader take on needs analysis (one of the three key threads in this volume) underpins the present volume and justifies bringing together in this second chapter insights from research into sociocultural second language acquisition (SLA) and into language development through study abroad (SA). The English language learning backgrounds of participants in the 3LU, AcLitT and exchange case study who contributed research data for the present volume are presented in this chapter, not only to contextualise discussion of findings throughout the volume but also in keeping with the principle of a more broadly defined needs analysis approach which stipulates that future experiences are enhanced if they capitalise on insights into past ones. Greater depth of understanding of language experiences in EMI, when built on an awareness of language experiences prior to EMI, can effectively lead towards strategies for enhancing formal EAP provision, as well as opportunities for language development in EMI more broadly.

The second key thread in the volume—contexts of learning and use—gains clearer contours in Sect. 2.2 in this chapter, as participants reveal significant moments and relationships related to instructed language learning prior to the start of their EMI journey, or, conversely, to unscripted encounters with other English language users. The language

learning backgrounds in themselves are not included for the purpose of establishing which research participants were 'good' language learners, likely to develop into 'competent' language users (the third key thread in this volume). Rather, they illustrate the diversity of immersion and instruction experiences that EMI participants carry with them and point towards the necessity to develop not models of instructed EAP but strategies to facilitate language enhancement that respond sensitively to emerging needs and acknowledge that university English goes beyond accumulating the kind of knowledge about formal register and specific genre conventions that they can deploy successfully in formal assessments. Discussion of the three key threads in this volume is informed by the SLA tenet that for language learning to be successful it is essential to have an appropriate combination of input and interaction. It is also underpinned by a close reading of recent SA research and draws on higher education research in relevant places.

Clarification is required on the use of the phrase 'study abroad'. Coleman's (2013) generous definition of 'study abroad', which informed the writing of this volume, is 'simply undertaking all or part of university education abroad' (p. 22). This includes whole-programme ('degree') mobility and within-programme ('credit') mobility, as well as arrangements which include language teaching assistantships or other types of work placement. However, the label 'EMI participation' is preferred in this volume to 'study abroad' because the latter appears to imply travelling to a country where the target language is the medium of everyday communication, whereas EMI also covers situations in which English is not necessarily the main language used outside the teaching and learning spaces on campus, participants may or may not be fluent in the language spoken outside the campus gates, and travel to a different country may or may not be involved (see also Humphreys 2017).

2.1.2 Exploring Language Gain and Learning Practices in Study Abroad and EMI

The example of Eva, a newcomer in an English-speaking country and employment setting, discussed in Sect. 1.2.3 was one of successful language development through purposeful language use. A similar positive experience of immersion, albeit starting from a different knowledge base, was highlighted in Benson et al.'s (2013) research with Hong Kong students studying abroad in English-speaking countries. The positive

trajectories of Eva and of Benson et al.'s research participants should, however, be read alongside DeKeyser's (2007a) more cautious account of study abroad contexts not being the ideal context for comprehensible input and for practice that leads to proceduralisation of declarative knowledge (i.e. language being used for communicative purposes rather than being 'drawn on for fill-in-the-blanks tests and other paper-and-pencil activities', p. 213) and ultimately to the automatisation stage where rules are internalised and interaction is effortless. DeKeyser (2007b) unpacks the concept of practice starting from the premise that learners need opportunities to engage in interaction which leads to processing existing language knowledge and new language input into an increasingly more complex (and more accurate) interlanguage. He points out that 'the initial stages of proceduralisation […] require careful, deliberate use of the relevant declarative knowledge in the execution of the target task' (p. 216) and that learners who have undergone at least some initial proceduralisation are in a stronger position to make progress. Whether this initial proceduralisation has taken place is likely to differ from learner to learner and it depends on their language learning experience prior to EMI.

The extent of language gain and learner progress, however, DeKeyser (2007a) points out, 'may be both overestimated and underestimated, depending on what is assessed and how' (p. 212). Language development is highly interactive and nonlinear. In the primary research which underpins this volume, participants' subjective views about their English took precedence over objective information about their English language qualifications. Relatedly, Copland and Garton (2011) note that students' perception of their ability to use English may have greater impact on how they engage in useful language practice and meaningful communication than any objective score of language ability and they cite research which shows that students with good academic English may have difficulty participating in social situations and interacting with their course peers due to a less strong command of social English. The artificiality of the classroom environment in which some learners have had the most substantial degree of exposure to English may have a detrimental effect on these learners' ability to step outside a formal instruction scenario. Indeed, DeKeyser (2007a) mentions, some students have the tendency to

> treat native speakers like teachers, to ask for more classroom explanations while abroad, and to focus their attention during their stay overseas on the discrete items of grammar and vocabulary that can equally well be learnt at

> home, while being unable to acquire the idioms, discourse skills and elements of strategic competence that study abroad is ideally suited for. (p. 214)

DeKeyser is writing about study abroad participants whose main purpose is to further develop their proficiency in the language spoken in the destination country. However, it is likely that journeys in pursuit of a higher education degree may bring up similar scenarios if participants' language learning backgrounds are predominantly of the traditional non-communicative type. Additionally, native or non-native speaker interlocutors who have not received focused language training may not have the necessary degree of language awareness to respond appropriately to the implicit metalinguistic questions that students ask. They may indeed not provide corrective feedback in face-to-face or email exchanges as this runs counter to expectations of politeness, and, if in a subject lecturer role, they may not provide developmental corrective feedback on written assignments.

Syntheses of study abroad research highlight the range of individual, background and contextual variables underpinning conclusions about the extent of gain in specific language areas (e.g. grammar, lexis, phonology, discourse), language use (e.g. accuracy, fluency, complexity) or skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing). DeKeyser (2014) emphasises that these variables, when explored through systematic juxtaposition of qualitative and quantitative research approaches within large-scale studies, can help deconstruct the 'almost magical image of a stay abroad as the one and only way to achieve high levels of proficiency' (p. 313) and formulate strategies that deal with the actual uneven progress during immersion reported across the full range of published study abroad research. In the introduction to a landmark volume 'chart[ing] a course for future research' (Kinginger 2013, p. 2), from social and cultural angles, into language learning in study abroad, Kinginger similarly emphasises that while findings about gains (at least modest if not always substantial) and about the development of social interaction abilities are reassuring, existing research also highlights highly noteworthy individual differences among students who return from a sojourn in a country in whose language they intend to develop proficiency. To arrive at an in-depth understanding of individual differences and draw relevant conclusions about their implications, Kinginger argues that 'we need to frame language learning as a dialogic, situated affair that unfolds in intercultural contexts and includes significant subjective dimensions' (p. 5), echoing Coleman's view that

> study abroad research can escape the narrow confines of cognitive second language acquisition (SLA) [which focuses on individual psychological processes], and see its subjects not just as language learners, but as rounded people with complex and fluid identities and relationships which frame the way they use the study abroad experience. (Coleman 2013, p. 17)

She also argues in favour of longitudinal studies and greater diversity in terms of national contexts from which participants in study abroad research originate. The present volume contributes to that debate by mapping kinds of participation available to non-native speakers in EMI settings—and the variety of ways in which these are taken up.

One determinant of success that DeKeyser (2014) foregrounds is learners' ability and willingness to engage in the 'right learning behaviours' (p. 314) although it is unclear to what extent what counts as 'right learning behaviour' can be fully explained through research and/or pedagogic lenses. The right learning behaviour in a language classroom may be rather different from what counts as 'right' in an EMI participant setting. As previously noted, the learner facet may be a stronger component than the user facet of the identity of some international students with limited exposure to English outside formal classrooms. The 'language learner' facet of EMI participants' identity is another aspect that SLA and SA research have attempted but—not surprisingly—not succeeded in fully explaining. Coleman (2013), by his own admission not a 'conventional applied linguist' (p. 17), argues that framing study abroad participants as language learners by focusing on language gains only is reductive; even in the case of students whose primary purpose is to learn the target language, what is gained from a sojourn abroad goes beyond 'enhanced TL lexis and mean length of utterance' (p. 28) to broader personal development in the areas of self-esteem, self-awareness and 'capability to operate effectively in new linguistic and cultural contexts' (p. 24). Coleman is careful to underline, however, that both identity and contexts are 'fluid, dynamic, situated, and constantly reconstructed through interaction' (p. 25).

Duff (2012) also supports a more recent strand in SLA thinking that views identity as continuously negotiated; she writes that 'with future research combining approaches to identity that include the multiple facets of learners' languages, lives, and modes of expression, SLA research will be enriched and transformed' (p. 422). She contrasts labels attached to learners of English. In one category, she lists labels that

convey 'incomplete processes and outcomes of learning and acculturation' (p. 410). In the opposite category, she includes 'bilinguals, multilinguals, advanced L2 users (not "learners"), multicompetent speakers, or lingua franca speakers/users' (p. 410). The latter group offer recognition that aspects of identity such as gender, first language and ethnicity are dynamic social constructs rather than 'easily categorised, relatively homogenous, and static group variables' (p. 411).

2.1.3 Language Learning Histories

Language learning histories prior to entering higher education can offer useful insights into how students are likely to take up opportunities for English language development, much more so than scores in language proficiency tests. The experience of fictional language teacher Aya (Cowie 2008), a 'new teacher who recently started to teach English to 35 freshman fashion design majors at a women's junior college in Japan' (p. 165), tellingly illustrates this. Aya's students showed very little interest in learning English, not opening their language textbooks when asked to do so and putting on make-up in the classroom instead of focusing on the language to be learnt. By exploring what she perceived as 'resistant' behaviour on the part of her students, Aya became increasingly aware that the 'way in which different students react to different tasks seems to be reflective of their prior experience of failure and success and their self-confidence' (p. 174), and that her own background as a successful language learner may have led her to adopt a teaching approach not sufficiently sensitive to her learners' needs. Extrapolating this to English language development outside the language classroom in English-medium higher education, Aya's students may well be enrolled in a higher education institution in an English-speaking country, having achieved the minimum required score for enrolment. They may or may not be there due to their own expressed desire and determination to learn English; reasons for engagement in EMI, as Waters and Leung (2014) show in their discussion of Hong Kong's 'educational non-elite' (Brinton 2011, p. 29), may be linked to prior experience of failure in the more prestigious and highly competitive segments of the local education system.

Some of the students travelling abroad for an English-medium degree in an economically more powerful country may associate language learning with black-and-white, locally produced textbooks; locally trained

teachers without experience of travelling to a country where a prestige variety of English is spoken; rote memorisation; formal grammar rules; high stakes assessment; large monolingual groups; complying with or resisting knowledge transmission by an authoritative teacher figure; or, alternatively, being in an environment loosely managed by a demotivated teacher. It is not uncommon for students who perform well as language learners in classrooms in their home country to find the communicative demands in EMI settings quite challenging. At the opposite end of the continuum—glossy, colourful textbooks ranked highly by the global ELT industry; expert, mobile teachers; internationalised formal learning settings; periods of study abroad either for academic qualifications or specifically for language development; use of English while travelling abroad for leisure; exposure to a multilingual social network through family connections or work. The extent to which students are willing to put themselves in the language learner position during EMI is likely to differ depending on their previous experience of being in a language classroom or of receiving other—structured or informal—forms of tutoring. Their perceptions of their language level, either subjectively held or externally validated through a formal test, their pragmatic considerations about course workload, and strategies they use to compensate for a lower level of competence than would be ideal on the course, all contribute to this.

Language learning histories inevitably bring up a range of contexts in which learning takes place. In the first chapter of a volume exploring how languages are learnt and taught 'beyond the classroom', Benson (2011a) draws attention to an imbalance in research across the full range of social spaces in which learners are exposed to target languages, which nevertheless should not be interpreted as a sign that some settings take precedence over others. Benson adds that attention to the location of learning and the set of circumstances associated with that location, the extent to which learning is formalised through a qualification, the types of pedagogy involved and their corresponding modes of practice lead to greater understanding of learning (and of teaching) in 'beyond the classroom' settings. Overlap and cross-fertilisation across settings and modes of practice are inevitable, with fuzzy boundaries allowing insight into the complex practices and processes which culminate in language learners becoming competent language users. Study abroad as defined in the opening section of this chapter or EMI participation offer access to social spaces which are not primarily language classrooms but which entail language development. Discussion in the volume is organised around not

specific 'standard' variables in SLA but specific academic practices, taken as a starting point to explore how these yield opportunities for language practice.

2.1.4 Englishes in EMI

A mention about Englishes in EMI is required here. Participants in the research which underpins this volume (and indeed, in EMI more broadly) prepare to engage in language development experiences which would challenge the assumption, tacitly underpinning English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) research, that ELF should be discussed with reference to non-Anglophone countries. The scenario described in Björkman (2011), namely that

> In Swedish engineering education, it is not uncommon to have a German scholar lecturing a group of students from different language backgrounds, or for a group of Chinese, Spanish, Indian and Italian students to work on a group project, all through the medium of English. (p. 82)

would not be uncommon in an Anglophone country either, given academic mobility both of students and of staff. The range of Englishes and of interlanguages used in EMI means that what is prioritised is communicative effectiveness over lexico-grammatical accuracy (Jenkins 2013), in Wicaksono's (2013) words, 'proficiency in English is a practice-based, adaptive and emergent phenomenon. Lingua franca communication succeeds where the speakers are willing, and able, to monitor each other's talk and determine mutually the appropriate grammar, lexical range and pragmatic conventions that are most likely to ensure intelligibility' (p. 247). The range of Englishes also means that the balance between social interaction abilities and level of sophistication of language used will be more successfully judged by EMI participants themselves, taking account of the multiple subjective and sociocultural dimensions of encounters, rather than by observers with language teaching or language testing expertise. A participant in Evans and Morrison's (2012) longitudinal research with undergraduate students at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Eric, 'saw little need to use Standard English […] "because maybe most of our lecturers are Hong Kong people, so they would know what you are writing into the paper when you are using a Chinese style English"' (Evans and Morrison 2012, p. 41). A participant

in Hino's (2017) research makes a similar comment with reference to a Japanese EMI context:

> We already hear a lot about America and Britain, but I think it is more with Asians that Japanese are actually likely to encounter or work with… This class is very useful in getting accustomed to non-native English spoken by Asians, especially with a view to the cultural diversity of Southeast Asia including Singapore… (p. 125)

Beyond ensuring academic success, ability to communicate in English opens up employment opportunities within the global market, and professional Englishes deployed in the global market reflect the variation found among inner, outer or expanding circle English language users.

2.2 No Two Are Alike: Research Participants' Language Learning and Use Backgrounds

Journeys from learner to user in English-medium higher education start from a variety of vantage points. With specific reference to Chinese students in the UK, Li and Zhu (2013) exemplify the range of English learner/user histories that these students could potentially bring with them into the university context. A research project they conducted focused on a transnational network of students at a London university; the network included

> Chris, a British-born Chinese student; Lawson, son of two Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong; and Roland, who came to the UK from mainland China when he was aged 15 years. The other two young men are Bradley, who came to the UK from mainland China with his parents when he was aged 4 years and received all his school education in England, and Stephen, who was born in China and went to New Zealand when he was aged 5 years with his parents. The family moved to Singapore when Stephen was aged 11 years and stayed there for 5 years. They came to the UK when Stephen was aged 16 years. (Li and Zhu 2013, p. 6)

As Li and Zhu illustrate, the label 'Chinese' covers a multitude of English language learning and use experiences. The heterogeneity immediately apparent in the AcLitT, Olivia and 3LU projects (the range of first languages spoken by participants included Arabic, Chinese, Vietnamese, Hindi, Malayalam, Marathi, Gujarati, Persian, Yoruba, Dutch, German, French,

Italian, Portuguese, Romanian, Hungarian and Czech) was also evident when comparing accounts by participants with a shared first language.

Another source of heterogeneity is the variety of pathways through which international students gain admission in English-medium universities (e.g. Arkoudis and Doughney 2014): language tests, pre-sessional or preparatory courses facilitating transition to university, certificates and diplomas which offer direct entry into the second year of an undergraduate degree. The extent to which these pathways offer a seamless transition into the subjects which students choose to study at university varies. Some but not all of the participants in the research on which this volume reports had been admitted onto university degree courses on the basis—partly—of standardised language scores. A study by Leung et al. (2016) is one among many which problematises the use of standardised, commercially available proficiency tests to predict student performance on university degree courses. In support of their argument, they state that 'language competence is but one of the many intertwining components of academic participation' (p. 57); additionally, the relationship between language proficiency test constructs and real-life communication is at best a tenuous one, given that use continuously enriches the language system and that effective communication can be achieved without necessarily adhering to standardised norms. A number of universities in English-speaking countries have adopted locally developed diagnostic post-entry language assessments (PELAs) as a means of gauging more accurately the level of ongoing support to make available to non-native speaker students (Read 2015).

With the exception of one participant settled in the UK through marriage to a British national and another who had a sibling in a similar position, AcLitT and 3LU participants fitted more standard international student profiles, with immediate family who did not match the migratory profile of those in Li and Zhu's research. Some AcLit and 3LU participants had completed a preparatory university course (A-Levels in the UK in the case of one participant) but otherwise the great majority of participants had not experienced sustained immersion in an English-speaking context. Olivia, the exchange student, was in a similar situation with the latter. Incidentally, language levels were not assessed post-entry.

The wealth of language learning experiences that my research participants brought to their academic study is represented below, in three different formats: a synthesis of settings, approaches and strategies from the one-off postgraduate student interviews in the 3LU project; individual

vignettes for the first-year undergraduates, drawn up on the basis of what they revealed across the three AcLitT interviews; and a narrative of her experience of learning English written by Olivia, the exchange case study participant herself.

A methodological note of caution is required here. The language learner histories co-constructed during (and on the basis of) the interviews contain a mix of factual detail and subjective interpretation. As any research narrative, they reveal what research participants believed to be true at a given point in time and may change once participants have undergone different experiences. Students' evaluation of their own performance in the events they recounted may or may not be accurate from an external observer's point of view. However, the focus of the research was not to gauge objective improvement but to understand how the language development strategies students draw on in the EMI context build on or deviate from past language learning experience. The accounts provided in this volume are necessarily provisional and incomplete, but reveal what participants themselves believe to be relevant experience in the run-up to and during university study. In the present chapter, the histories provide some context against which students' language-related experience on the course can be understood in greater depth. The label 'histories' is loosely applied here. Benson (2011b) prefers the concept 'language learning careers', which, he argues, has more analytical purchase as it is linked with 'broader process of socialisation' (p. 547), both institutional and informal, and with identity development. Language learning careers are built on critical incidents, i.e. 'incidents that were recounted in order to account for a change of direction or a transition between phases in the learning career' (p. 548). Benson himself, however, cautions that 'the capacity to articulate a narrative of one's language learning career is variable' (p. 552). Rather than impose the concept of 'careers' onto the data, the decision was made to develop analytical tools in dialogue with the data and present the data in a format that best captured participants' own perceptions of their trajectories in real time.

2.2.1 Journeying Towards a Postgraduate Degree (The 3LU Project)

All twenty-one postgraduate students who took part in the 3LU project had learnt English in the formal education system, with most starting in primary school. Participants' degree of exposure to English prior to their UK course varied widely. At one end of the continuum, Xanthe,

who came from a small town in China, where there were 'hardly any native speakers' and books in English were expensive. She felt embarrassed to use English when talking to her Chinese classmates in school; her exposure to English was limited to classroom settings and was very much examination-driven. There was less urgency for Xanthe to continue to develop her English during her undergraduate degree in China because of a lack of examination-linked external motivation. To gain admission on the postgraduate course, Xanthe made several attempts to pass IELTS, using a combination of self-study and input from 'language agency' tutors, and eventually enrolled on a pre-sessional course which enabled her to become a postgraduate student on her chosen master's.

At the other end of the continuum, Carla. Carla attended an English-medium high school in a top-tier Chinese city, where she was taught by teachers from a range of different countries. Extra-curricular activities organised by the school and holidays abroad with her family meant she was exposed to social English and many different accents. She obtained A-Levels and passed the IELTS test. Carla completed her undergraduate degree in the UK in a subject indirectly related to the master's course. While an undergraduate student, she acquired a British boyfriend and gained access, through her hobby, to a professional network which involved sponsored travelling across the UK and using English in a range of non-academic contexts.

In between these two contrasting cases, the postgraduate students who took part in the 3LU project had a range of experience with English, as follows: completing an undergraduate degree in English in their home country; some level of work experience in a setting where English was used alongside local languages or in a multinational workplace; some work experience but no education experience in an Anglophone country; completing a different, unrelated master's at another UK university; substantial experience of travelling to the UK due to a parent's professional links with this country.

Some of the postgraduate participants had grown up in nuclear or extended households in which at least one other family member spoke English. Antonia's aunt was an English language teacher with a Ph.D. in English literature. Ella's father travelled to the UK regularly for professional purposes. Bella's sister worked in the UK in the same field that Bella was studying for a master's. Some participants came from an aspirational background where English was held in high esteem but had reached a competent level as English language user not through literacy

support provided by their own families (e.g. the parents of two participants could not read or write in their own language) but through access, sometimes sponsored by the community in which they grew up, to formal education as in the case of Harry.

2.2.2 Journeys Prior to Embarking on First-Year Undergraduate Study (The AcLitT Project)

Participant A

Participant A studied English in an Asian country where the American variety of English is more widely taught. Her experience of language classes in the formal schooling system consisted mainly of learning grammar and lists of vocabulary, with limited skills practice. With encouragement and support from her mother to develop her English, Participant A attended a language-oriented high school as well as supplementary private classes, the latter including a group of friends and family members. Prior to arriving in the UK, Participant A had been taught English both by local and by native speaker teachers.

In the UK, Participant A completed a preparatory course for university study which comprised of both subject and language classes. Her greatest gain from her preparatory year was confidence in her ability to deliver presentations in English. The variety of English to which Participant A was exposed prior to her arrival meant that she needed to spend some time adjusting to a different range of vocabulary for day-to-day life (e.g. *aubergine* instead of *eggplant*). However, in terms of using language in general, Participant A felt quite comfortable.

Participant B

Participant B believed that speaking a language is an essential part of the language learning process. He did not use English to communicate with his immediate family. He was inspired by an English language teacher in his high school to pick an accent and use it consistently in order to become a competent speaker of the language. Consistent accent and a grasp of the three main tenses in English were the building blocks of his identity as a competent language user. A move to a larger city with greater educational opportunities when he began his secondary schooling meant that Participant B had access to a wider range of language teaching materials and activities, such as reading newspapers in English. A combination of circumstances on the test day meant that Participant B did not receive the required score in the required language examination

for university entrance, and he completed a preparatory course in the UK prior to starting his university degree. Language study was a component of the preparatory course but focused mainly on preparing for a language examination. On arrival in the UK, Participant B felt that his 'basic English' (i.e. everyday language use) was OK.

Participant C

Participant C was a keen traveller and language learner. He completed his secondary education in a private school where English was used as a medium of instruction for most subjects. He then studied on a preparatory course in the UK to achieve the required academic credentials for university enrolment. In between his secondary schooling and the preparatory course, he spent approximately two years in a German-speaking country, learning the language with a view to studying there, but eventually settled on academic study in the UK. His long-term goal was to secure a position in an international company using English as a medium of communication. At the beginning of the project, Participant C described his language level as 'not bad for an international student [compared to] university standard study level in the UK'.

Participant D

Participant D grew up in a bilingual household. Her parents relocated from Asia to Europe. Participant D spoke two Asian languages and four European ones, as well as having some knowledge of Latin, which was compulsory in school. While in high school, Participant D spent about six weeks in Canada as an exchange student and visited the UK briefly about a year before the start of her degree course. She did not attend private language classes. She did not have to take a separate language test for university entry because her end-of-school examination provided sufficient proof of language competence, nor did she undertake any special preparatory language classes.

Participant D did not particularly enjoy grammar in school, but found English grammar easier than that of other languages she had learnt. In the final two years of high school, she was not taught new grammar but recycled language previously taught, stayed in touch with friends she had made in Canada and absorbed language through reading/listening for pleasure rather than formal language study. She enjoyed her language classes in high school, where she participated in general discussion about books and films or about current affairs.

Participant E

Participant E attended a high school with intensive English classes and also had a private tutor who supplemented the in-class material and checked Participant E's homework. This was because classes are fairly large in her country and the tutors cannot pay enough individual attention to students, especially in regard to productive skills (writing and speaking). Some of the language classes in school were aimed specifically at preparing students for a Cambridge English language examination (Cambridge Advanced). In school, Participant E learnt many 'fancy expressions' (e.g. phrasal verbs which she currently does not consciously use and does not hear spoken around her). She did not do any specific preparation for university language-wise.

Participant F

Participant F started learning English in preschool. As a teenager, she attended a language camp in her country and had the opportunity to talk to native speakers, which kindled her enthusiasm for English. She then travelled to Portugal as an exchange student for a year of secondary education, where she used ELF because at the beginning of the exchange, she did not speak any Portuguese. On her return, she continued to speak English with the exchange students that her own school was hosting. In between her secondary education and starting a university degree in the UK, she worked for a few years in a café frequented by foreign tourists and then in a company where ELF was used as the main medium of communication. She admitted to probably speaking English more than her native language in the past few years. To prepare for university, she spent a summer watching British films to familiarise herself with the accent. Participant F described herself as an enthusiastic language learner and felt she learnt better from other people than from books. At the start of the project, she was aware that she had reached a level where 'it's hard to find the right resources to get better'.

Participant G

Participant G completed her final high school year in England and took her examinations there, after which she returned to her home country to complete her studies in her national school system as well. This was followed by a gap year as an au pair in a foreign, non-English-speaking country, where she also taught English to the children she was looking

after. Participant G was in a long-term relationship in which she used English for communication, as her partner spoke a different first language from hers. To meet language requirements for university entry, Participant G took the Cambridge Advanced examination about a year prior to starting her degree. She attended preparatory classes offered by her high school for the examination, to familiarise herself with the test format. Participant G's secondary school curriculum included Latin and ancient Greek classes, which helped her with understanding academic English vocabulary. Participant G liked learning grammar and was a keen language learner in general, interested in word etymology and the meanings of idioms and phrases. She felt confident about her language level at the beginning of her university course.

2.2.3 Embarking on a Mid-Degree Academic Exchange Experience: Olivia

Olivia joined the second year of an Art and Design degree, having already completed two years of undergraduate study in her own country, Brazil. She described her previous experience of language learning and her first impressions of language use in the UK as follows:

> Before I came to the UK this year, I had already finished my English advanced course two years ago. But in my very first week here, I had some trouble to communicate with people, till the point that in the first lunch to meet the design teachers staff I almost left the room. I felt very embarrassed when everyone was laughing and smiling and I had no idea what they were talking about. At least now, one and a half months later, I feel that my English skills have never been better.
>
> Back in Brazil, I couldn't watch a whole movie without feeling insecure or lost, or even understanding some songs lyrics. Nowadays, even when I get a little lost in translation, I feel able to catch the essence of what people are saying. I do struggle a bit on understanding different accents—foreign or not. And people here also find it a little difficult to understand me sometimes. But, predictably, I notice that it's harder to understand what people say in a restaurant than in an university environment.
>
> Sometimes I feel my English is very good, but there are occasions when I make some little silly mistakes, such as say 'teachers doesn't'. And when I make my first mistake, I can't help making other ones, because I get a little nervous and feeling that people find me stupid. That's just because I

know my English level, and I pressure myself for knowing I could be doing just a tiny bit better. There are also some pretty rares times when someone speaks to me and I understand every word, but not the meaning of the whole sentence. And since I feel embarrassed to ask them to repeat more than one time, if I don't understand, I leave it that way. But I have learned here that I do not need to have the most perfect English; I just need to make myself understandable.

As for the materials for language learning and teaching, I think every single one of them has its value—CDs, TV, reading news and/or books, learning song lyrics… Because in the end, every person is unique, so some of the materials will fit some people, but won't fit other ones. But for me, my favorite techniques are those which explore some more 'reality', where you can experience 'real' language—not that recordings with a trained actress. 'Real' speakers, native or not (this last one only after you've achieved a certain learning level. It makes the student feel better when he notices it's not a problem to have an accent). [Olivia written piece 1]

References

Arkoudis, S., & Doughney, L. (2014). *Good practice report: English language proficiency*. Sydney, NSW: Office for Learning and Teaching. Retrieved from http://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/1489162/GPR_English_language_2014.pdf.

Benson, P. (2011a). Language learning and teaching beyond the classroom: An introduction to the field. In P. Benson & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Beyond the classroom* (pp. 7–16). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benson, P. (2011b). Language learning careers as an object of narrative research in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(3), 545–553. doi:10.5054/tq.2010.256793/epdf.

Benson, P., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., & Brown, J. (2013). *Second language identity in narratives of study abroad*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Björkman, B. (2011). English as a lingua franca in higher education: Implications for EAP. *Ibérica, 22*, 79–100. Retrieved from http://www.aelfe.org/documents/04_22_Bjorkman.pdf.

Brinton, M. C. (2011). *Lost in transition: Youth, work, and instability in postindustrial Japan*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, J. (2013). Researching whole people and whole lives. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 17–43). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Copland, F., & Garton, S. (2011). 'I felt that I do live in the UK now': International students' self-reports of their English language speaking experiences on a pre-sessional programme. *Language and Education, 25*(3), 241–255. doi:10.1080/09500782.2011.566617.

Cowie, N. (2008). Observation. In J. Heigham & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction* (pp. 165–181). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

DeKeyser, R. M. (2007a). Study abroad as foreign language practice. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 208–226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeKeyser, R. M. (2007b). Introduction: Situating the concept of practice. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 1–18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeKeyser, R. M. (2014). Research on language development during study abroad: Methodological considerations and future perspectives. In C. Pérez-Vidal (Ed.), *Language acquisition in study abroad and formal instruction contexts* (pp. 313–325). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Duff, P. (2012). Identity, agency, and second language acquisition. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 410–426). Abingdon: Routledge.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2012). Learning and using English at university: Lessons from a longitudinal study in Hong Kong. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(2), 21–47. Retrieved from http://journal.asiatefl.org/.

Hino, N. (2017). The significance of EMI for the learning of EIL in higher education: Four cases from Japan. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific* (pp. 115–131). Cham: Springer.

Humphreys, P. (2017). EMI in anglophone nations: Contradiction in terms or cause for consideration? In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific* (pp. 93–114). Cham: Springer.

Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Kinginger, C. (2013). Introduction: Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 3–15). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leung, C., Lewkowicz, J., & Jennings, J. (2016). English for academic purposes: A need for remodelling. *Englishes in Practice, 3*(3), 55–73. doi:10.1515/eip-2016-0003.

Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics, 34*(5), 516–535. doi:10.1093/applin/amt022.

Read, J. (2015). *Assessing English proficiency for university study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Waters, J., & Leung, M. (2014). These are not the best students': Continuing education, transnationalisation and Hong Kong's young adult 'educational non-elite. *Children's Geographies, 12*(1), 56–69. doi:10.1080/14733285.2013.850851.

Wicaksono, R. (2013). Raising students' awareness of the construction of communicative (in)competence in international classrooms. In J. Ryan (Ed.), *Cross-cultural teaching and learning for home and international students: Internationalisation of pedagogy and curriculum in higher education* (pp. 241–250). Abingdon: Routledge.

CHAPTER 3

Words, Words, Words…

Abstract Communication in English at university relies on a wider range of vocabulary than is captured in the Academic Word List or specific purpose corpora. Chapter 3 signposts some key studies which identify vocabulary that poses difficulty in EMI settings and explore ways in which students approach unfamiliar language and develop their lexical repertoires. It juxtaposes findings from these studies to accounts, by the AcLitT interviewees who provided primary data for the present volume, of how they tackled the new language needed during the first year of an undergraduate degree in a variety of visually oriented and creative fields. The chapter closes with notes on developing and researching vocabulary for the university experience.

Keywords EMI · Academic word list · Dictionaries
Vocabulary learning strategies · Lexical repertoire

3.1 Vocabulary Learning Scenarios in Academic Contexts

It is widely acknowledged, in applied linguistic literature, that one cannot communicate successfully unless one is sufficiently familiar with relevant vocabulary, and this is certainly the case in academic contexts. Murray (2016) helpfully reminds his readers that students cannot be expected to know all relevant vocabulary at the start of their university

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_3

degree (particularly but not only at undergraduate level), and places emphasis on embedding language provision within the academic subject areas. The present chapter collates insights from published research into the kind of vocabulary that is likely to prove problematic in an English-medium instruction (EMI) setting. It follows this up with accounts by AcLitT research participants of new language they came across in the first year of their undergraduate degree, at the stage where they were just beginning to build their subject knowledge base, and of their perceptions of opportunities for vocabulary development. This underpins a discussion of the lexis that students need to know in order to develop their understanding of the subjects studied, and of the less or more formal ways in which this lexis makes its way into the students' active or passive language repertoire. The discussion focuses not on research participants' language gain but on the strategies they use to learn vocabulary. While supportive of the view that institutional resources should be deployed to enhance language proficiency in subject areas (Murray 2016), as illustrated in the fictional scenarios below, the chapter looks more broadly at language proficiency development in the context of university study and considers not only general Academic Word List (AWL) items and specialised lexis and but also other categories of language that carry subject messages across.

One possible point of departure for a discussion of vocabulary and university study is the question 'How might students' knowledge of vocabulary be developed in-sessional EAP contexts?'. Consider the following scenarios:

> Room M05, on the ground floor of one of the newer buildings on the campus. The in-sessional tutor is standing at the front of the classroom, whiteboard marker in hand, and is preparing to pre-teach a list of twenty-five new words the students will come across the next day, in their lecture on phenomenography. The teacher hands out vocabulary cards – A6-sized rectangles of thick paper. She wants the students to retain some very useful information about each word – pronunciation, word class, how to integrate the word in a sentence. The group of eight students look rather reluctantly at the vocabulary cards. It has been a while since they were last asked to learn word lists. The teacher is keen to stress that these new words will help the students unlock the meaning of the lecture and that knowing them will make an important difference. All students nod politely in agreement, but some have not so fond memories of language classes in their school days, and of vocabulary notebooks.

> A few doors down the corridor, in room M08, a different in-sessional tutor and a different group of eight students are gathered round an oval table. There is laughter. The students are sharing new words they had picked up the previous week. They all attend the same lectures but are in different seminars and project groups. The tutor elicits the words, writes them on the tablet in front of her, elicits the sentences in which the students encountered the words (or sentences in which these words might be used), displays them on the wider screen behind her, clarifies meaning. Some students take pictures with their phones, others ask the tutor to email (airdrop) the new language to them. The lesson is punctuated with brief anecdotes about struggling and succeeding to make sense of new language – and laughter.

The two scenarios above both illustrate language support embedded into an academic degree, as advocated by Murray (2016) among others. The students have started their chosen university course. Some have come via a pre-sessional on which they were taught some core academic vocabulary from the AWL, others may not have had exposure to this. Both groups are now exploring not core, generic words but language that they will come across in lectures and readings on their course and that they are expected to build into their spoken and written output. However, attendance at in-sessional language classes has been reported to be low (e.g. Lobo and Gurney 2014), and one reason for lack of student engagement in the M05 vignette might be that the tutor is potentially working from the assumption that her students closely approximate the language learning profile of fictional Amira:

> On Amira's desk, an English-English dictionary for advanced learners sandwiched between two grammar reference books, one monolingual, the other with explanations in Amira's native language. Amira consults these on a regular basis. Next to these is an A5 notebook, in which Amira dutifully records chunks of language she picks up from her lectures, seminars and reading. And next to the A5 notebook a laptop switched on to concordancing software, which Amira uses to check and correct her collocation and grammatical pattern errors.

The brief description of Amira's approach is one possible scenario of a student in an EMI setting—one that may be commended (hoped for?) by language tutors who strongly believe that systematic attention to language is essential to make the transition from language learner to

language user. The degree of plausibility of this scenario, however, remains to be verified. While this may be the case for some students, a range of different strategies will more likely be adopted among any one group of learners. Amira may respond positively to the M05 vignette scenario, while the M08 is more likely to lower the affective barrier of others with perhaps less positive attitudes towards formal language tuition, such as the students in Sakui and Cowie's (2008) account. These students, non-English majors, studying fashion and interior design in Japan and enrolled in an English as a Foreign Language class 'had had a very difficult time learning [English grammar points] all through their previous school experience' (p. 101) and little confidence in their ability to learn this language or in the amount of use to which they would put English in the future. Some EMI participants have similar experiences, and their involvement in EMI may be due to failing to meet entrance requirements in their home country's university system rather than willing investment in developing their English. Yet another scenario may be required to complement or altogether replace M05 and M08, by making new language more salient within the main spaces of the course (content lectures, seminars, tutorials, studio work and study groups) rather than drawing attention to it in the separate space of the EAP classroom.

Existing research into vocabulary learning has focused primarily on formal language classroom settings, in which learners are exposed to a pre-defined supply of language that they are expected to accumulate and whose acquisition can be tested and measured straightforwardly. A 'good vocabulary learner' profile is available in the literature but variations and deviations from this norm are far less well documented, and it is these variations and deviations that would help paint a richer picture of how language development occurs and can be scaffolded in EMI.

3.2 New Vocabulary in EMI and Strategies for Further Development

Discussion of vocabulary in academic contexts cannot sidestep the AWL (Coxhead 2000), derived from a written academic corpus covering a range of subject areas in order to 'guide decisions around learning, teaching, and curriculum and materials design' (Coxhead 2016a, p. 181). The list contains 570 word families occurring with a uniformly large degree of frequency in over half the subject areas in the corpus, which ensures their relevance regardless of the specific university course

that students might be enrolled on. As well as serving as a pedagogic tool, to maximise student exposure to and engagement with relevant vocabulary, the AWL informed further research into various aspects of lexis in a range of academic genres. Similar approaches have been adopted in order to generate academic collocations list (Ackermann and Chen 2013), lexical bundles (Ädel and Erman 2012) or formulaic sequences (Simpson-Vlach and Ellis 2010); a comparison of recurrent word combinations used in writing at different proficiency levels (Appel and Wood 2016); or the extent of overlap between the AWL and academic spoken English (Dang and Webb 2014). The corpora on which these studies are based, however, make it necessary to look critically at the extent to which the content of the AWL and findings from related studies have immediate relevance for EMI participants whose profiles approximate those of the students taking part in the research which underpinned this volume.

Further answers to the pertinent pedagogical questions of what and how vocabulary should be taught (learnt) and through what carrier content are provided by Coxhead and Walls (2012). Coxhead and Walls explore these issues through corpus analysis of (approximately) six-minute-long TED talks, an appropriate length for use in language classroom listening comprehension activities. Comparison with several general and academic corpora revealed that the vocabulary load of the selected TED talks is closer to that in novels, newspapers and academic texts than spoken material, requiring knowledge of 8000–9000 word families as well as a number of proper nouns to achieve the 98% coverage that Nation (2006) deems ideal. In the corpus that Coxhead and Walls compiled, the

> lower coverage figures of the EAP Science list over the TED Talks corpus suggest that the talks might contain more specialised and current vocabulary (such as *crowdsource* and *cymatics*), as well as more everyday spoken language that is not reflected in the GSL/AWL and EAP Science lists, such as *guys* and *amazing*. (p. 61)

This finding signals one of the limitations inherent in academic vocabulary corpora, namely that they risk becoming out of date very soon after compilation given that academic disciplines and subject areas are continuously developing and strengthening the links with wider ongoing professional and intellectual debates. Another limitation of corpus research is that it tends to privilege expert texts rather than comparatively explore

transition from one stage of development to another, charting students' journey through higher education.

The kind of language that is likely to cause difficulty for international students entering university at a level between the officially set minimum language requirement and near-native speaker proficiency has been documented in a number of studies that take a different approach from corpus analysis. Among these, Littlemore et al. (2011) and Peters and Fernandez (2013). Littlemore et al. focused on metaphoric uses of language in lectures. One component of their research involved giving a multinational group of international students transcribed extracts of a lecture the students had attended and asking them to identify words and word clusters that posed problems. Not surprisingly, a large proportion of the difficult language (about a quarter) involved figurative usage, and students were not aware that they had misinterpreted this language; examples included *stem from X* and *social network*, *far-flung* and *foolproof*. Metaphor, Littlemore et al. point out, is 'a valuable teaching tool. Lecturers use it to explain, clarify, summarize, evaluate; to remind or challenge; and above all, to make their lectures easier to understand' (p. 20). To a certain extent, lecture transcripts would be a useful pedagogic tool in that seeing word boundaries—rather than hearing stretches of incomprehensible, connected language without being able to identify individual words—takes students one step closer to making sense of lecture content. However, educational establishments may lack the resources to produce lecture transcripts prior to or immediately after each lecture. Lecture transcript production may not be a sustainable activity as some of the learning-oriented interaction in lectures arises spontaneously, is specific to a particular group of students on a particular occasion and may not meet the learning needs of subsequent student cohorts. Overdependence on transcripts, however, may mean that there is less interest and effort put into ability to process live discourse.

A similar user-oriented angle on the kind of language international students may grapple with is taken by Peters and Fernandez (2013). The textual basis for their research was an architectural reading, which postgraduate Spanish-speaking students were asked to go through in order to identify at least 20 lexical items that they would look up in a dictionary. The authors organised the language identified by students into three broad categories: (A) terms specific to architecture and building systems; (B) terms for concepts common to scientific and other academic

disciplines; and (C) ordinary words for raw materials, everyday phenomena (p. 240). Category B items were flagged up most frequently by the research participants. Following Welker (2010), Peters and Fernandez then explored whether students were able to extract relevant meanings from dictionaries as well as critically selecting the most appropriate dictionary type for their lexical needs. Students' self-reports of dictionary use practices were compared to narrative accounts of completing a task set by the researchers. The task asked the students to select six items they had underlined and look them up in mono- or bilingual dictionaries, general and/or specialised. The accounts revealed that students at a range of proficiency levels all accessed several dictionaries to clarify word meaning, with a greater or lesser degree of success:

> *demise* [context: '*when a structure is built out to its demise*'] The student had difficulty (not unsurprisingly) with the architectural use of this rather formal word from the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, and could find no adequate translation equivalent in a bilingual dictionary. He then sought to decode the contextual meaning by referring to monolingual (L2) general and specialized dictionaries. Using information extracted from them, he could paraphrase the expression in his L1: *cuando se ejecuta una estructura sin posibilidad de ampliación* ('when a structure is built out to its ultimate extension'). The student's knowledge of the architectural issue helped to translate the word in the larger context. (p. 243)

The example above is an illustration of one of the study's key findings, namely, that the language posing difficulty to the students taking part in the research was not primarily the technical terminology but the language used to develop and connect technical concepts in the specific subject area of architecture.

Interestingly, both studies appear to challenge, more or less directly, the usefulness of the standard AWL that underpins some current pedagogic work in EAP. In terms of their relevance for practitioners, the studies' value lies not in the list of words identified as problematic (such a list would be invalidated given the diversity of proficiency levels and subject area specificity across the full range of educational settings); they are useful because, combined, they draw attention to the lexical layers that students need to negotiate, and to the necessity to offer a range of methods of instruction and sensitise students to a range of self-study options in order to enable them to expand their lexical repertoire.

Both Littlemore et al. (2011) and Peters and Fernandez (2013) focused on in-sessional settings and aimed to highlight challenging language in oral and written texts, respectively. Some very useful insights into vocabulary development over a duration of time in a pre-degree EAP context can be found a piece of longitudinal research by Dóczi and Kormos (2016). The 120 international student participants in the research were taught EAP for fifteen hours a week in a UK university, without explicit vocabulary or grammar instruction. Their recognition vocabulary knowledge increased if looked at as a group average, however, almost one-third of the participants 'either did not improve or went down in their scores' (p. 34). Dóczi and Kormos note that attrition was evident both in students with a low level at the start of the programme and in students at higher levels of proficiency. The incidental learning context did not yield consistent outcomes across all participants. The authors also found that vocabulary expansion did not take place 'linearly across the lines of the frequency bands of the BNC' (p. 39) although a slightly clearer relationship was found with the CELEX corpus. Word concreteness and L1 influence appeared to have an impact on attainment, but, more importantly, with regard to exposure, which they highlighted as an essential element, the authors note that frequency of occurrence in input 'is a much more reliable indicator of exposure than the frequency of a given word in native speaker corpora' (p. 63). A positive outcome of incidental exposure seemed to be participants' increased ability to make word associations, due to the reorganisation of their mental lexicon, especially at a more abstract level, and between less frequently used lexical items. This is consistent with findings from Ife, Vives Boix and Meara's (2000) research into study abroad settings with regard to the development of lexical repertoires and their more native-like organisation. Dóczi and Kormos argue in favour of interventions to support vocabulary development in incidental rather than formal instruction settings. Before this can be put into practice, however, it would be useful to conduct additional research into EMI participants' exposure to more complex English than they were previously used to and strategies for dealing with this.

Alongside appropriate exposure, Dóczi and Kormos (2016) note that some form of output has been found to support vocabulary development, whether in the form of less authentically contextualised practice activities, negotiation of meaning or natural interaction. Negotiation of meaning, however, may occur less frequently than necessary in lectures,

seminars or other subject-oriented teaching and learning events at university because of its face loss potential, while summative assessments may not be seen by international students as a setting in which to 'push themselves to experiment with new vocabulary or expand their productive vocabulary knowledge' (p. 136), particularly if it is perceived that intelligibility is a more straightforward path towards a positive outcome than lexical sophistication.

Careful consideration of the relationship between lexical research and teaching practice is offered by Folse (2011), who emphasises that closing the lexical gap faced by non-native speakers of English preparing for higher education through that medium can more effectively be achieved through explicit instruction compared to taking a 'natural approach involving substantial communicative interaction with authentic language' (p. 363). Folse defends word lists (for a while out of favour with some lexical researchers), supports the use of vocabulary notebooks and notes that vocabulary acquisition is facilitated by multiple retrievals and spaced rehearsals. The teacher plays a central role in setting up such opportunities in Folse's view, though learners' responsibility is at least on an equal level as in order to be successful they should 'have a very specific concrete plan of action and consistently carry it out' (p. 365) in order to recuperate some of the advantage that native speakers have through years of exposure to language in naturally occurring contexts. This would be entirely appropriate in the context of intensive preparatory courses for university study, however, at the post-enrolment stage, the degree and nature of exposure to language pre-empts the level of formal instruction that Folse recommends. Section 3.2 illustrates, with the help of data from the AcLitT project, the spaces in which exposure to language occurs, salient language that EMI participants grapple with and the strategies they adopt to make sense of it, effectively or perhaps less so.

3.3 From Dictionary Meaning to Building Meaningful Narratives Around Words

Linguists working to provide descriptive and explanatory accounts of English, both as an abstract entity and as a means of communication, as well as their more applied colleagues who seek to understand how English is learnt have developed their own sets of labels—specialist terminology not readily available to those without a specialist interest in

the area. Lexicographers put language into boxes; they devise categories for vocabulary items, build corpora and use tools to explore word frequency and behaviour, salience, keyness. Language tutors select appropriate vocabulary for their learners. Language learners and users, on the other hand, bring words alive by creating personally meaningful connections. This section focuses on how words are brought alive in EMI settings: new words that AcLitT participants learnt and how they learnt them.

The AcLitT interviews explored new language that the research participants came across during their first year of undergraduate study. Rather than using texts as prompts as in Peters and Fernandez' (2013) research, or focusing on specific lectures or communicative events, participants were asked to comment on the vocabulary load throughout their experience of undergraduate study up to that point and to identify themselves the words that were either new to them or that they had some general knowledge of but now had had the opportunity to use in relation to their academic work. The new language that the research participants flagged up came from a wide variety of sources. The lexical items they put forward were characteristic of higher levels of language proficiency.

Fashion design, the subject area of Participant E, may appear to place more emphasis on the visual impact of its practices, but at the same time stretches students' language repertoire in ways that go beyond the standard work of vocabulary classes or vocabulary learning episodes. Work Participant E was required to do for her course involved choosing a keyword or phrase from a set list of abstract concepts (e.g. *authenticity*, *artificiality*, *transparency*) and building a coherent context around it, drawing on reading from a wide variety of sources, most of which would not usually make their way into a typical EAP syllabus or contain a high percentage of items from the AWL:

R: so when you try to explain your idea where do you get the words from

E: well usually from the things related to the concept like for example I'll tell you about the project I'm doing now it's about a Japanese concept which means to repair with gold and it's about repairing old pottery that has been broken with gold and this one is related to another Japanese philosophy and it has some other concepts related to it like asperity and asymmetry

and things like that and those are doors I'm using for the project now so I picked up the words from my research and from different areas and I felt like in relation to these I found a song called 'Beautifully Broken' which I really liked and expressed this idea it was quite it had nothing to do with the Japan or anything but just because it was expressing the same thing I chose this 'Beatifully Broken' as a title for my project and that's

R: where does the information mainly come from is it the internet or is it magazines

E: the main concept I found it through internet but I had I went to London and looked at some exhibitions and I read some article from theirs those things you can pick up like those small things

R: from the exhibition

E: yeah I took some of those and went home to read them and then went to the website of that artist and looked into his work [interview E.3]

Participant E's fairly confident command of grammar and her ability to organise her thoughts into coherent stretches of language meant that she could integrate higher-order, low-frequency words such as *asperity* and *asymmetry* seamlessly into her presentation and sketchbook. Participant E placed more emphasis on use rather than learning, and on naturally picking up words from the context rather than being formally taught. The Internet visits to art exhibitions and the texts surrounding the exhibition were Participant E's main source of language for a project. She also drew on her first language, as follows:

> I also try to translate words from my own language if it makes sense because probably in my own language my vocabulary is much wider so it just kind of think of interesting words and then trying to translate them for example for the group project we have about technology addiction there were some interesting pictures and the word I've thought about was enslaved and it wasn't a word that I knew in English but I knew it in my language and translated it. [interview E.3]

Rather than hindering English language development, Participant E's sophisticated repertoire of lexical items in her first language supported her attempts to explore complex concepts through the medium of English.

AcLitT participants spoke about vocabulary development with different degrees of enthusiasm. For some, new vocabulary was a matter of resourcefully exploring topics they had a specific interest in, fashioning meaningful contexts for language. For others, lectures and interaction on the course were the main source of information, and they preferred to assimilate the language offered them. When asked about new language she had learnt on her fashion-related course, Participant A mentioned two categories of words: keywords from lectures (she gave examples of theoretical concepts such as *surrealism*) and technical language. *Surrealism* posed some difficulty:

> I think it was just generally like I understand a general part of it but then it's quite fake like the word itself and the meaning itself I find it quite fake and then um it's a really broad part of art as well and then I was because I was looking at how it got applied into fashion so it makes it even more challenging for me as in I wasn't sure how like how surrealism should look like when it's an artwork or whether how it should be seen so I keep having to search for articles or images about it to see and then reading about artists that are I guess significant in when applying surrealism to fashion. [interview A.3]

By 'fake', Participant A meant 'abstract', and not the kind of word that would crop up in a spontaneous conversation among students on her course or become part of that student's communicative repertoire. By contrast, techniques related to pattern cutting were demonstrated practically and therefore easier to remember:

> around four weeks before we hand it that's the time that we actually make our garment so we come to the studio a lot so we would just see a lot of people in there and a lot of people's work and then sometime I see someone's work really interesting and just come up to them ask how did you do this oh you have a really good design just start up conversation like that and then we just talk about our work and ask how it's make and yeah just remember how to make it. [interview A.3]

Some subject lecturers explicitly singled out language that was likely to cause difficulty. On an architecture degree, the meaning of the word *precedent* was explained by a tutor at the end of a lecture (the information was included on a slide, 'because even the British students didn't understand it at the beginning' [interview C.3]). Not all lecturers

presented language explicitly in this way, however. Some used the sessions as an opportunity to supply useful language in an authentic communicative context. Participant D was helpfully reminded of a word during a seminar:

D: one of the first seminars I had I had to bring in two garments one that we particularly liked and one that we didn't like and I found it a bit hard to describe why I didn't like it cause I knew I didn't like it but I didn't look up the vocabulary which is really stupid cause I don't know why I just forgot about that and then I brought in a blouse that was really lightweight but the material was really thin so like a lot of holes which is came over time and also it was creasing quite a lot so loads of creases and I just didn't look up the word crease so I didn't know how to say it I think in the end I said something like just crumples easy something like that I don't remember so I just tried to use something else that I knew but I didn't know like those specific word

R: and what was the reaction to that

D: the everyone understood it so it was fine and I think my lecturer then wrote down creases [on the whiteboard] so I remembered the word creases [interview D.3]

One question to ask is whether subject lecturers did provide language input in a way that facilitated language development given that learners at different levels of proficiency need different information about new vocabulary. The extent to which this was effectively done varied.

> I only had one lecturer that tends to sometimes spell words which is nice but we never like I never get the start of her spelling I just miss like half of that and I'm I'm just confused cause I don't know what she was saying but so that's not really helpful and otherwise it's like on the slides so you sort of know like how to write it but yeah. [interview D.3]

The process of getting to know (new) language that would enable them to speak and write knowledgeably about their practice and/or subject on which their undergraduate degree focused was partly influenced by assessment and feedback practices. Participant D was externally

motivated to remember specific words which came up in lectures, because she had to prepare a set of topics for an end-of-year examination.

R: do you think if you hadn't had the exam you would have learnt these words
D: well it was only one image that we had on a slide so you sort of more likely to just miss that because it's only one image they didn't tell us specifically that we had to know that but I mean I read through [the slides in preparation for the exam] so I knew it [interview D.3]

Conversely, Participant E failed to pay sufficient attention to two key concepts in the lecture, and as a result, her visual analysis earned her a lower mark and feedback which highlighted the importance of those concepts when discussing the meaning of an image. The feedback made the key concept language more salient to Participant E than the initial lectures had.

When they encountered new vocabulary, research participants deployed different strategies to work out meaning. Googling and looking for synonyms was one approach. Prior understanding of specialist notions helped make sense of new terminology in English, though this was not an entirely effortless process:

> I knew quite a bit about marketing already so it was really helpful because our scenario was about marketing and um I remember before the first meeting I was just brainstorming and preparing everything and then we got together for the meeting and went through my list and everyone was really impressed cause they didn't know how to tackle that and yeah also I had to look up quite a few words because these are like specialist words and I knew all of them but I had to learn them in English so that was a bit inconvenient but yeah so I think it was more about the knowledge than like anything. [interview D.3]

New technical terminology could be demonstrated in the context of the studio, but more abstract language from theoretical lectures required a more systematic approach. Participant F's pursuit of word meaning was rather more complex. Her group had to analyse an article and do a presentation about it, and the whole group struggled to understand the key points in that text. The word around which text meaning seemed to revolve was *vernacular*.

R: so what happened with vernacular did you look it up in a dictionary

F: first yes and then we looked at every other dictionary and like synonyms you know anything and we then started looking in like context and I asked several people like I have a few friends who are like language enthusiasts but not here I asked them if they could give me examples with that word and so on and then slowly started to make sense and then I started noticing it elsewhere I was watching a documentary and someone was using it and then an interview and someone was using it and then I mean a month later but it just starts to build into your understanding more or less [interview F.3]

The use of new language in an interactive context, in the studio with peers, was a method more likely to guarantee that students would remember it: 'I don't think that if I write it I remember it I'm not that kind of person' [interview C.3]. While a linguistics student would arguably pay more particular attention to how the new language behaved in a sentence or utterance, the participants in the AcLitT research were less likely to notice this; Participant C, for example, noted that he didn't know how the word fitted into a sentence, 'it comes naturally' [interview C.3]. Participant F found that for her the most effective approach to learning new language was to meet a 'language enthusiast', someone with a keen interest in language and willingness to share their knowledge. She had two note-taking apps on her phone where she recorded lists of new language; she did not revisit these regularly but was able to recall specific words that fitted into naturally occurring contexts. Participant F was at a more advanced level and in a better position to make decisions about new language to keep or let go:

> generally for me the way that I remember words like first of all I notice right away someone says something that I don't know because you know the majority of the words people use around me I am familiar with so if there is one that I don't know I notice it and I actively think of that word and I think like 70% of the time based on the context you just know what it means more or less and you can decide whether based on the context again if you know what it means if you have enough words for that that you're satisfied with you can just let that go and not care but sometimes you feel like oh my god this is actually so spot on I want to remember this word so based on that I decide whether I want to care about this word or not I'm

> very good at not caring about words and then if I care about the word I normally write it down just to have it once written down but I just write it in my phone and then I start noticing it a lot more so probably I heard that word before but I never noticed and then once I realise what it means I keep rehearing and someone told me a number once like if you hear it x times then it becomes part of your vocabulary and you can start using it I don't know the number but for me it's like I have to hear it a few times before I can start using it again if it's like [technical word] you can start using it right away because you're confident about what it means and how to pronounce it but when it's like *vernacular* or *facetious*… [interview F.3]

3.4 Some Notes on Teaching and Researching Vocabulary for the University Experience

The potential for vocabulary development inherent in university study is not necessarily actualised unless all stakeholders in the process actively contribute to this, by increasing the quality of the exposure and facilitating students' engagement with the new language. The studio vignette in Chap. 1 introduced some metaphoric and colloquial language with which students were less likely to be familiar (*start the ball rolling*, *bring it alive*, *zing it up a bit*, *just have the joy of making it*). Unlike the AWL items, this kind of language is particular to a lecturer's style of giving feedback and thus more difficult to capture, process and rehearse in other contexts, yet it is important to understand because it offers students guidance on what aspects of their work they should develop further. By contrast, practical workshops yielded language that could be easily demonstrated visually or through practice and that research participants, therefore, found easier to remember. 'It would be unfeasible,' Evans and Morrison (2012) write, for even the most finely tuned, vocabulary-oriented EAP course to meet students' immediate (let alone long-term) disciplinary needs. These needs could only begin to be addressed through close and continuing collaboration between EAP professionals and their colleagues in the various disciplines. (p. 29)

Evans and Morrison found in their longitudinal research with 28 participants from a range of subject areas at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University that discipline-specific vocabulary posed by far the largest challenge to students in the first term (a 'lexical deluge', p. 29). Specific suggestions that Evans and Morrison put forward are identifying core disciplinary lexis, deciding the order in which this should be prioritised,

and creating online glossaries, thus allowing EAP tutors to dedicate in-class time to vocabulary-building and learning strategies to support the development of learner autonomy. Their distinction between in-class and out-of-class learning time is a relevant one for this volume. The EAP classroom is the ideal setting for drawing attention to effective learning strategies, provided the strategies put forward have been fine-tuned to account for the wide range of contexts in which these strategies are applied. Outside the EAP classroom—in lectures, seminars, tutorials, practical workshops, on study trips, during individual study time in the library or elsewhere, conversations with peers or random day-to-day occasions—EMI participants will use these strategies to tackle AWL items, subject-specific language linked to subject-specific concepts, colloquial English particular to individual communication styles and any other categories of vocabulary in the academic, professional and personal dialogues in which they engage. Some of the spaces outside the EAP classroom generate language that can be predicted and pre-taught by EAP tutors, though the uses of other language can only be acquired through repeated encounters in authentic contexts.

Charles (2012, 2014) and Flowerdew (2015) provide useful insights into student engagement with corpora for academic language learning purposes, and it is unlikely that this particular strategy would have yielded results for AcLitT participants. Having a higher level of proficiency at the outset (Participant E) helped, and the open-ended design of the assessed work she was required to do enabled her to pursue her own interests, thus increasing her engagement with higher-level vocabulary. A subject lecturer recommended further reading or exhibitions and events; if the lecturer had set aside time to explore Participant E's reaction to that reading, this would have further contributed to meaningful exposure and productive engagement with new language.

Participant A spoke about 'fake' words, i.e. language that was abstract and formal and not part of day-to-day practice-oriented repertoires. A strategy that might be applied in this case would be to use social media as a corpus (e.g. hashtags on Twitter) to explore different contexts of use, and decrease the emotional distance between oneself and the abstract, formal language, then make use of the newly developed knowledge and confidence to tackle the academic literature.

All participants would most likely have benefited from having key language visually highlighted, but in the absence of this being provided for them, they could be encouraged to create their own visual dictionary,

using font type and images creatively to record and remember meanings. Awareness-raising of the limitations of English learner dictionaries in EMI settings and of the fuller range of sources of language meaning available to them (from specialised glossaries in different formats to crowdsourcing platforms) as well as examples of meaning discovery 'journeys' similar to the ones captured in Peters and Fernandez (2013) would most likely be highly beneficial.

Participant F noted she would have benefited from meeting a 'language enthusiast', a highly articulate expert user keen on sharing knowledge about language in informal, out-of-language-class settings. Language enthusiasm, to a certain extent, falls within the remit of any role connected with teaching and learning at university given that university language overlaps partly but not fully with everyday and professional registers. In the absence of this, however, kindling enthusiasm for subjects and making resources available to facilitate the translation of enthusiasm into learning practices offer a necessary basis from which to pursue other avenues for language development.

Research-wise, as Coxhead (2016a, p. 183) states, we currently 'know much more about the nature of academic vocabulary than we did back in 2000' when Coxhead published her flagship piece on the AWL. The depth of this knowledge, however, is not evenly distributed across all subject areas, particularly the creative ones studied by participants in the interviews which underpin this volume. Another aspect which merits further attention are the various layers of vocabulary that students might have difficulty with, based not on frequency but on the importance of the message they help carry across, whether they convey core information or supporting detail that may or may not be left out. Student engagement with new vocabulary in EMI settings, whether face-to-face or in virtual environments, as well as 'little-researched areas of the world' (Coxhead 2016b) is an area ripe for investigation—not the vocabulary they need to acquire but students' learning journeys from noticing new language to making effective use of this for a variety of purposes. Briggs (2015a, p. 301) cautions that

> outside the [language] classroom it is less likely that learners will fully understand a word/phrase because they may not be exposed to comprehensive or accurate definitions, there is unlikely to be any checking of understanding and the opportunity to use the word/phrase may never occur.

Following on from this, Briggs (2015b, p. 130) puts forward questions of particular relevance to studying abroad and EMI. These questions are flagged up at the end of the present chapter not to close the chapter but to prompt further reflection and open up previously uncharted research paths: 'Are some types of language contact [in EMI] more beneficial to vocabulary acquisition than others to engage in? Which are likely to beget meaningful language processing?'

References

Ackermann, K., & Chen, Y.-H. (2013). Developing the Academic Collocation List (ACL): A corpus-driven and expert-judged approach. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12,* 235–247. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2013.08.002.

Ädel, A., & Erman, B. (2012). Recurrent word combinations in academic writing by native and non-native speakers of English: A lexical bundles approach. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*(2), 81–92. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2011.08.004.

Appel, R., & Wood, D. (2016). Recurrent word combinations in EAP test-taker writing: Differences between high- and low-proficiency levels. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 13*(1), 55–71. doi:10.1080/15434303.2015.1126718.

Briggs, J. G. (2015a). A context-specific research tool to probe the out-of-class vocabulary-related strategies of study-abroad learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 25*(3), 291–314. doi:10.1111/ijal.12070.

Briggs, J. G. (2015b). Out-of-class language contact and vocabulary gain in a study abroad context. *System, 53,* 129–140. doi:10.1016/j.system.2015.07.007.

Charles, M. (2012). Proper vocabulary and juicy collocations: EAP students evaluate do-it-yourself corpus-building. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*(2), 93–102. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2011.12.003.

Charles, M. (2014). Getting the corpus habit: EAP students' long-term use of personal corpora. *English for Specific Purposes, 35,* 30–40. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2013.11.004.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly, 34,* 213–238. doi:10.2307/3587951.

Coxhead, A. (2016a). Reflecting on Coxhead (2000), 'A new Academic Word List'. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 181–185. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tesq.287.

Coxhead, A. (2016b). Acquiring academic and disciplinary vocabulary. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 177–190). Abingdon: Routledge.

Coxhead, A., & Walls, R. (2012).TED talks, vocabulary, and listening for EAP. *The TESOLANZ Journal, 20,* 55–67. Retrieved from http://www.tesolanz.org.nz/Site/Publications/TESOLANZ_Journal/default.aspx#H138990-6.

Dang, T. N. Y., & Webb, S. (2014). The lexical profile of academic spoken English. *English for Specific Purposes, 33,* 66–76. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2013.08.001.

Dóczi, B., & Kormos, J. (2016). *Longitudinal developments in vocabulary knowledge and lexical organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2012). Learning and using English at university: Lessons from a longitudinal study in Hong Kong. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(2), 21–47. Retrieved from http://journal.asiatefl.org/.

Flowerdew, L. (2015). Corpus-based research and pedagogy in EAP: From lexis to genre. *Language Teaching, 48*(1), 99–116. doi:10.1017/S0261444813000037.

Folse, K. (2011). Applying L2 lexical research findings in ESL teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(2), 362–369. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.5054/tq.2010.254529/epdf.

Ife, A., Vives Boix, G., & Meara, P. (2000). The impact of study abroad on the vocabulary development of different proficiency groups. *Spanish Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 55–84.

Littlemore, J., Trautman Chen, P., Koester, A., & Barnden, J. (2011). Difficulties in metaphor comprehension faced by international students whose first language is not English. *Applied Linguistics, 32*(4), 408–429. doi:10.1093/applin/amr009.

Lobo, A., & Gurney, L. (2014). What did they expect? Exploring a link between students' expectations, attendance and attrition on English language enhancement courses. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 38*(5), 730–754. doi:10.1080/0309877X.2013.817002.

Murray, N. (2016). *Standards of English in higher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review, 63*(1), 59–82. doi:10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59.

Peters, P., & Fernández, T. (2013). The lexical needs of ESP students in a professional field. *English for Specific Purposes, 32*, 236–247. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2013.05.002.

Sakui, K., & Cowie, N. (2008). To speak English is tedious': Student resistance in Japanese university classrooms. In P. Kalaja, V. Menezes, & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL* (pp. 98–110). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simpson-Vlach, R., & Ellis, N. (2010). An academic formulas list: New methods in phraseology research. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(4), 487–512. doi:10.1093/applin/amp058.

Welker, H. A. (2010). *Dictionary use: A general survey of empirical studies*. Retrieved from http://let.unb.br/hawelker.

CHAPTER 4

Spoken English on the EMI Campus

Abstract The English language learning and use histories that students bring with them on an EMI campus may or may not include authentic, meaningful and purposeful spoken interaction. The network of relationships that underpin life on an EMI campus may or may not offer opportunities for further use and development of spoken English. This chapter puts forward 3LU individual experience snapshots, illustrating aspects that facilitate or pre-empt lively, meaningful and rewarding exchanges. These are followed by outlines, anchored in undergraduate AcLitT data, of contexts and conversations involving extensive use of English. The trajectory of Olivia, the emotional dimensions of her experience and her resourcefulness further ground discussion of language development in EMI. The closing section teases out implications and points to further avenues for research.

Keywords EMI campus · Spoken interaction
Spoken academic discourse · Language use

4.1 Preliminaries

The extent to which English is used on an EMI campus, in public and in private spaces, as the medium for lively, meaningful and rewarding exchanges is effected, among other things, by prior instructed language learning or, alternatively, by language use experience. In traditional

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_4

language classroom contexts, speaking tends to be neglected (e.g. Seferaj 2014), sometimes due to NNSE teachers' lack of confidence in their own ability to use English for this purpose. Communicative teaching methodologies which award oral interaction a central place may also vary in terms of how close they are to the artificial or, conversely, more authentic ends of the continuum. Language textbooks, more often than not, contain dialogues that would be difficult to replicate in real-life settings, and pragmatic competence is less often included in language syllabi. The extent to which participants in EMI bring with them positive experiences of extensive use of English in the language classroom varies.

Participants in EMI with prior out-of-class experience in using English, as this chapter illustrates, are better placed to interact with peers and staff, though even in these cases language proficiency does not automatically equate with the rich dialogue and extensive interaction necessary for further language development. As one participant in Sercombe and Young's (2015) research revealed, in spite of an adequate level of competence in the language, 'she hasn't developed as many friendships with her native speaker colleagues as she would have liked, because: *They're young, they're really nice but we don't, but they're really young. We just don't have a lot in common*.' (p. 48). Different EMI contexts provide opportunities for dialogue and interaction to varying extents. Waters and Leung (2013, p. 614) offer a telling example of the linguistic impact of what they call 'immobile transnationalisms', i.e. how degree courses franchised by universities in English-speaking countries and taught in students' country of origin fail to provide an environment in which these students can develop linguistic competencies comparable to those of their peers travelling to English-speaking countries for study purposes:

> One day I went to meet a client. I introduced myself and this guy said to me: 'Your English should be better [because] you have come back from the UK'. So I needed to explain [that I did my British degree in Hong Kong]. But sometimes I ask myself, do I really need to explain myself? However, I do not want people to feel that I am intentionally misleading them. I am honest and I did not go to the UK. So even now, I am still thinking of how I should deal with this kind of situation. I remember when I had my job interview. In the interview, there were also other applicants from HKU [University of Hong Kong], CUHK [Chinese University of Hong Kong]. We had a group interview. I would say I graduated from X [UK] university. I think it is a matter of how I identify myself. I don't

> want to mention [it] but I also don't want to be misunderstood that I claimed I had been studying in the UK, but kept quiet about it. (David Kwok, aged 24, who graduated with a British university degree in 2009, Hong Kong)

The combined experiences of English language use among participants in EMI settings impact on the amount and meaningfulness of spoken interaction. Both mobile and immobile transnationalisms may fail to provide access to social relationships and situations in which students feel they are perceived as valued partners in linguistic exchanges and which would support them in increasing their confidence and their level of proficiency.

Applied linguistics researchers, language teaching practitioners, academic and professional staff in higher education and language learners would all agree that interaction and opportunities for language practice in authentic situations are essential for language development, yet the extent to which interaction is facilitated or taken up depends on a range of factors. This chapter focuses on the Englishes spoken during the EMI experience and on how the speakers of these Englishes engage in interaction. It teases out the factors which have an impact on interaction as perceived by research participants themselves. The plural use of Englishes in this chapter is indebted to views expressed by Jenkins (2013), Baker (2016) or Björkman (2013) among others and relates partly to local varieties, partly to levels of proficiency and partly to register and purpose of use (e.g. social exchange, more formal interaction with lecturers, peer feedback in learning and teaching events, study group interaction outside formally scheduled classes, or language use in professional contexts by students in part-time employment). Gurney (2016) is one of the most recent voices to draw attention in a discussion piece to the fact that EMI students will go on to work in globalised ELF workplaces and thus be more likely to interact with non-native speakers of English. Relatedly, Hall and Cook (2015) reveal, on the basis of needs analysis research conducted in a number of European countries, participants' awareness that 'increased mobility, migration, and integration, combined with developments in online communication, have led to substantial changes in English language use and practices' (p. 3), which impact on the way English is learnt, taught and experienced. This chapter offers insights into the interaction that takes place during study through the medium

of English and the extent to which EMI campuses and connected spaces live up to their potential as language-rich environments conducive to language development.

Insights from the 3LU project are presented as brief accounts of individual experience, capturing salient aspects identified by research participants themselves. AcLitT data are organised on the basis of contexts and conversations. Olivia's experience is retold as a trajectory narrative of development throughout the exchange year.

4.2 Accounts of Individual Experience from the 3LU Research Project

Experiences recounted by 3LU research participants illustrated the wide range of opportunities to speak English on the EMI campus (as well as offcampus during their academic sojourn in the UK). Lillian stated she was more a language user than learner: 'I want to be a learner but firstly a learner of my course'. She actively pursued opportunities to interact with classmates from different countries (e.g. she was part of a study group with students from Nigeria, Thailand and Vietnam). While some language posed difficulty, for example explaining engineering concepts in presentations when taking questions from the audience, she was undeterred. She confidently said 'Please give me one minute to organise my language' and looked for other words to explain what she meant. Cassandra's circle of friends involved co-nationals who were studying on related courses and Cassandra's conversations with them resulted in learning some useful specialised vocabulary in English, even though English was not used exclusively in these conversations. Vivian had a multi-national network of non-native-speaker friends, whom she had met on the pre-sessional course. When asked whether her language was developing as a result of being part of this network, Vivian replied she was learning 'not language but content from friends'.

Because of the various language levels on her course, Maria, a Malayalam and English speaker from India, felt that she was at a disadvantage because lecturers attempted to simplify their language to support less proficient students. She also noted that at times the lecturers asked her and her co-nationals to explain points to the less proficient students. When delivering presentations, she preferred to speak freely rather than rehearse in advance. Her definition of a confident communicator was 'someone who can convince the clients that their design is good'. Maria's

approach to communication was indeed fairly confident and direct—in her interaction with a lecturer

> I sort of argue with her. She says, I've told you enough, now go and do what you want. I clarify, so this is what you want. She says, it's up to you. Do you want me to show you everything? I'm more used to clarifying and concluding. Here, lecturers won't do this.

If Maria did not feel she had had enough guidance, her strategy was to 'call the others and clarify with them, but if we are not sure we go back to the next class. At least you have done something and she would be happy'.

Although from a country where English was an additional official language, Jahan felt more comfortable speaking on campus than off campus. On campus people were more 'used to international students': 'In class they know me, I don't feel like a visitor'. Having had some professional work experience in between the undergraduate degree he completed in his home country and the postgraduate degree he was enrolled on in the UK, he was able to contribute more substantially than some of his colleagues during in-class peer assessment sessions.

Anna's course had four enrolled students. Fortunately, one module was shared with another course, which increased potential communication opportunities. A native speaker colleague with a similar undergraduate background and career route to Anna's helped with words she was not sure about: 'If appear in drawing it would be easy to understand. I'm very visual. If not I use a dictionary or ask my friend who is British here. She works in a construction firm'. One lecturer on Anna's course spoke quite fast, and Anna found it difficult to follow what he was saying. He asked at the end of the lecture whether the students had any questions, but did not really give them sufficient time to answer, and as the students had not had enough time to process information, no questions were asked. Anna had hoped for a different, more interactive teaching style than traditional lectures then 'go home and do assignment'. Outside term time, Anna volunteered in an Oxfam shop and learnt the British equivalent of some general American words she was more familiar with.

Leila was able to compensate for the lack of sufficient contact time with lecturers by working with a British student on course projects. She expressed the view that 'it depends on how proactive you are to find people to speak with'. When presenting her work to colleagues in

fortnightly group tutorials, Leila felt comfortable about her language but sometimes insecure about her design, which made her feel less proficient in the language and less inclined to speak at length. She was aware that her English was 'lacking something' but hoped that she would be able to use more professional words to talk about design in a future job. In general, Leila preferred one-to-ones because 'you can control the pace of conversations [and can] predict what they are talking about'. A typical day for Leila did not appear to involve substantial interaction; she started the day by chatting with a German housemate over morning coffee, then working alone in her room, sometimes going to university, going to the supermarket in the afternoon, cooking at home and going for a walk in the evening. Her weekends were spent within a larger group including some co-nationals, though Leila admitted preferring to use English at weekends because she was beginning to find the guttural 'h' in her native language a bit painful.

The experience of Xanthe, a participant in the 3LU project, offers a telling example of a language-poor environment. Xanthe's course involved two days a week of class contact, and the rest of the time she had 'nobody to talk to'. Although a studio space was available to students on Xanthe's course, she preferred to work from home to avoid carrying back and forth the resources she needed to work on her project. The projects on her course were individual, and according to Xanthe, her colleagues adopted the same practice. During the two days on campus, Xanthe used English with colleagues from other countries and her conversations were limited to 'general things, food, cooking'. In Xanthe's words, classmates from other countries had a 'different sense of beauty', and Xanthe was reluctant to make comments that would have a negative impact on her relationship with them. Antonia was equally reluctant to comment on others' work. She would usually write the feedback on post-it notes which she attached to the displayed work, 'but only if asked'. In contrast to Xanthe, however, Antonia found that interaction with her peers helped her realise that their English competency level was lower than hers, which increased her confidence about her ability to speak.

Bella's course offered similarly limited opportunities for on-campus interaction, but Bella was part of a social network which used English to communicate, and she also secured a part-time job which relied on partly scripted language. Harry (mother tongue: Gujarati) was also enrolled on a course with little formally scheduled contact time (studio time, workshops once a week, one-to-one sessions every fortnight), but

he actively sought language development opportunities; he asked British colleagues to correct him and, in his words, 'two of my friends are really cooperative'. Fortunately for him, the limited range of opportunities to use English on his course was complemented by the supportive workplace environment to which he had access due to his paid internship. His manager was very supportive and openly encouraged him to share his thoughts, feel comfortable and not worry about language. Harry described himself as 'a keen listener. I capture words, try to memorise them and use them. People have advised me to read but I didn't find that useful. I need to use language. Everywhere I go I speak to people'.

Carla did not use English extensively on campus, partly because her co-nationals formed a substantial proportion of her cohort, and Carla found it 'weird' (her own words) to use English when communicating with them. Carla had completed an undergraduate degree at the same university and her high school education at an international school through the medium of English (albeit in her home country). Off campus, Carla frequently travelled within the UK and used English in her social network built around part-time paid employment. Earlier exposure to a wide variety of native speakers and being able to use the language for professional—not only academic—purposes gave Carla the opportunity to develop her English further. Carla's confidence level varied. She stated: 'My level depends on myself. Sometimes I speak quite fluently but sometimes I just feel stuck'.

The opening section in this chapter flagged up a number of aspects which pre-empted successful interaction and signalled that EMI campuses are not de facto language-rich environments seamlessly leading to language development: lack of shared interests to converse about, withdrawal caused by anxiety at unfamiliar language use scenarios and unevenly distributed opportunities for authentic spoken communication in English. While these were also touched upon in interviews with the 3LU participants, the predominant image projected by the interviews was one of resourcefulness and of drawing on both on-campus and off-campus experiences, explicitly or implicitly, to build oneself up as an effective English language speaker. Two published accounts, each focusing on a postgraduate East Asian student but offering contrasting trajectories, are summarised below to add further depth to the discussion.

Perrin (2015) is an insightful case study which illustrates 'the complexities of a learner's identity(s) and the role that these have in accessing a learner's English language communities, both real and imaginary'

(pp. 279–280). Drawing on Norton (2000), Perrin used the analytical tool of investment to explore and explain the experience of Meredith, a Chinese EFL learner and temporary sojourner in a UK academic setting. Meredith's main goal was to acquire an educated native speaker level pronunciation which would be interpreted as a sign of proficiency on her return to China and open doors to better employment opportunities. However, Meredith's everyday life in London did not involve contact with speakers who fitted Meredith's native speaker construct. As a result, she withdrew from interaction with the local speaking community, who in her view were not in a position to model 'the correct linguistic practices […] important in social mobility and in being able to gain access to more prestigious communities' (p. 294). Paradoxically, Meredith's investment in the target language led to her not benefitting from immersion, because off-campus immersion did not give her access to a variety of English that was valued among the professional community she wished to join on graduation. Meredith's interaction with colleagues on her academic course was outside the scope of the discussion in Perrin (2015), though it is likely that a university course would supply interaction opportunities that more readily met Meredith's needs.

Meredith's experience is rather different from that of Daisy, a participant in Benson et al.'s (2013) research, who travelled to the UK from her native Hong Kong to study for an MA in applied linguistics. Daisy's immediate priority, language-wise, was to improve her listening and speaking skills. The course itself was not particularly demanding from a content point of view, given Daisy's undergraduate background in the same area, but limited contact hours (nine per week) meant that Daisy had fewer opportunities to engage in discussion with her peers, and outside the course, Daisy spent most of her time in her flat, speaking Mandarin Chinese. The 'high point of her time in England' (p. 98), however, was the opportunity to take up some paid work as an interpreter in hospitals and clinics, use English for a wider variety of purposes and gain additional life experience.

The diversity apparent in the 3LU interview data, read alongside case study and narrative accounts of non-native English speakers pursuing higher education abroad (or in their home country) through the medium of English problematizes the nature of EAP provision that could be made formally available to these students. It raises questions about ownership and accountability with regard to personal language development and formal EAP provision. The following section adds

to that discussion by presenting insights from AcLitT data, organised according to specific contexts and conversations available to the first-year undergraduate research participants.

4.3 Contexts and Conversations (AcLitT)

Chapter 3 showed how new language that fitted into naturally occurring interaction was more likely to be noticed and remembered by the AcLitT research participants. Lectures provided input but no opportunities for interaction, however. Seminars accompanying lectures, although designed as opportunities for in-depth discussion and consequently language development, did not appear to fully achieve this aim or help deepen student understanding of concepts further in some cases, as Participant F noted:

> yeah the thing is we don't have classes where we talk about [creative subject] we like we have lectures where they explain different eras […] but we are not asked about our opinion or it's not about an actual piece of […] design it's just about an era or an artist or you know so they are talking more about that time in history more than in depth concepts […] first of all and we don't like we had a very few like three seminars throughout the entire year where we were asked to talk about these things but it was again quite a forced situation and you have ten students seven of which don't feel comfortable talking in front of others and most of them don't know what to say anything they say would be superficial because they don't normally talk about these things so I think the difference would be if you had like a small group of people [interview F.3]

A similar scenario was described by Participant D:

R: do you get a chance to say a lot of things in seminars
D: I think we're supposed to say more than we do um because no one really no one really wants to talk as much I think
R: why
D: I don't know maybe it's out of laziness sometimes it's all just easy questions like you don't want to say anything cause that's just weird and I think it's also for me personally I find it a bit odd because like in school I'm used to like raise my hand and wait for the teacher to say something so I know it's my turn to speak but in seminars we are just supposed to talk and I find that a bit weird like I don't want

> to disrupt anyone it's just that as well it's just inconvenient sort of [interview D.3]

The absence of opportunities to develop her knowledge through discussion was salient for Participant F, and she put forward a scenario she would have liked to experience:

> for my course for me I feel like it would be useful to have you know such a conversation with someone who's not necessarily a teacher because a teacher would be cautious about what you know and what you don't so they might use simpler language for the sake of your understanding but you just have someone from industry […] I think just having conversations […] would probably help a lot just randomly about design not something that not when I have to get my project ready and they're talking about my own project but just generally OK what is my opinion what is your opinion what is her you know other opinion um I think those kind of conversations might teach us more [interview F.3]

In contrast, learning and teaching events centred around practical, hands-on projects facilitated a greater degree of interaction. The studio in particular (especially full-day ones) gave students the opportunity to talk about their projects with the tutors available, without the time constraints imposed on shorter timetabled events. In the studio, conversations developed organically with peers and tutors. Practical workshops achieved a similar effect.

C: it's in the studio so you can pop in there any time and start a conversation with the tutor
R: how does that work are you happy with
C: yeah I'm very happy with because like if you have a question in this moment but after an hour you remember another thing that you want to ask you can go and ask them because we have a full day studio so I'm happy with it
R: and in the studio is it just your group or is it many different people working on different projects?
C: it's only our group but we got like more than a tutor so it's divided into each tutor I think twenty or twenty-five students so it's divided
R: are they all together in the same place
C: yeah yeah in the same place around seventy students

R: does it get very noisy
C: um it is but it's better when it's noisy because it's more like the place there's life in the place you want to work maybe it's for me
R: that's really interesting I think other people would prefer a quiet space
C: yeah but I'm maybe because our degree is more related to creativity cause we design and so when we talk to each other we get more inspiration and ideas [interview C.2]

In his final interview, Participant C contrasted this with individual tutorials, which have time limits and do not allow him to explain his concept at length. Participant F also perceived the studio as a space conducive to learning conversations.

R: what's the best opportunity you've had to talk about something study-related
F: best opportunity I don't know we talk about it all the time whenever so I normally I'm in the studio from 10 to 5 every day and normally it's just like two more students in the studio and otherwise some people show up for like an hour or two but there aren't too many people so I'm just there all day so tutors do come up to me a lot and I have chats with them about study-related stuff but also with other students like everyone is really open and approachable about like if you're stuck with an idea or you don't know how to go and whoever is next to you they're just going to ask what do you think they could do so the studio in general is just a good place to talk about study-related stuff [interview F.2]

The image, conveyed in the AcLitT interviews, of the studio as a space from which students enrolled on courses with a creative component derive a great deal of learning value through conversations with tutors and peers echoed findings from Blair's (2006) research. Blair contrasts the positive atmosphere of the studio as a space of informal interaction to that of the studio as a setting for the 'crit'. In spite of expectations that the crit would be an opportunity for students to articulate the thought processes behind their work and receive constructive feedback, Blair's research led her to identify a series of factors that undermined this: large groups and a lack of space for everyone to listen in on and

contribute to feedback; a tutor-led format which excludes students from the feedback-giving process; unsupportive, unconstructive, confrontational tutor feedback; affective barriers ('students catatonic with tiredness and fear', p. 91, unable to focus on what is being said about their peers' work); or lack of familiarity with crit language or vocabulary. This was not the case for the AcLitT participants whose experiences informed this volume, possibly because crits are differently facilitated in the first year of an undergraduate degree. However, the vignette in the opening chapter and remarks made by participants about some of their peers' low attendance at the studio (and therefore lack of uptake of interaction opportunities within the studio) seem to suggest that there is scope for providing more fine-tuned language development support in this area. One particular aspect on which language development provision could focus is flagged up in a comment from a participant in Blair's research:

> I think there is a certain vocabulary that you need to use as long as you've got that and don't really say 'I don't really know why I did this'... I was always told that if you like it, then you have to explain and be strong in your reasoning why you did it. It may not necessarily be the right reason but if you are confident, then it gives off to everyone else - what this person has put up is 'crap' but they're speaking as if they are an authority on it and they understand and they can explain the reasons they've done certain things. (Blair 2006, p. 88)

Reflection on the learning process is part and parcel of becoming a professional designer and can be facilitated to a certain extent through raising students' awareness of subject-appropriate ways of speaking and of the type of language that conveys reflection.

Group work which involved library research appeared to engage students less, while tasks which had a practical or creative output, shared through presentations both while in progress and as a summative event, seemed more likely to result in more in-depth, personally meaningful learning and speaking, enhancing students' confidence to communicate in English. Participant C admitted he usually prefers to absorb information and to speak only when he is 'definitely sure that [his answer] is right' [interview C.3]. When prompted in the interview, he described the following situation when he had confidently facilitated a group project which involved bringing together creative ideas and theoretical insights contributed by his peers.

C: I can remember the second project this year we had to design a chair and the concept was about the cultural stuff how different cultures sit so I came up with the idea and everyone started designing and drawing the form of the chair so yeah the concept and the idea came from me but everyone else cooperated with it
R: how did you explain the concept to everybody else
C: well it was easy because in that project we had like four or five students I can't remember but the students were from different places so like it was easy for me to explain to the groupmates because I've just like I told them to like research about the history of how people sit and their culture and then we gathered all the information and then started designing
R: so how did you manage to merge all those different
C: it came through the process of the design like the creativity of the design because all of us agreed about the people sat on the floor before the chair so we had that concept of designing a chair that people would sit on not normally like we are sitting now but like sitting on the floor but on a platform so we had that idea but then the creativity of the form and the function was about and through the process of the design
R: ah so in the end you came up with a platform
C: yeah we came up with a platform that has a table next to it and it was a good project I think
R: what made it good
C: the concepts as the tutor reflected on it the concept of it was a strong concept [interview C.3]

Such validation when sharing creative ideas in more or less formal learning and teaching situations was important for AcLitT participants as it gave them additional impetus to participate in conversations. These conversations, more than an opportunity to practise using English to develop their language knowledge, were settings in which AcLitT participants could use their language knowledge to showcase and consolidate emerging professional identities:

> um well I think it was about the group project the trend forecasting everyone did some research about technology so um we had like a lot of pictures and everything and kind of had to choose the key words and the key concept and what we want to say about it for this project we kind of

> creating our own trend and we have to sell it really well because we have to explain why people would start wearing that or wearing the colours we chose or things like that and um I came up with some key words from our images and we had those images and I chose the words addiction and manipulated by technology and be enslaved exposed and there is something more I guess wired wired because it was like a picture of a girl all tied up with USB wires like technology was like kidnapping her something like that and the tutors really liked the words I chose and they thought they kind of express really well the idea of being addicted to technology and everything happens nowadays and that's it [interview E.3]

The keywords that Participant E chose were highly effective because they conveyed the idea of technology addiction and people's relationships with the media in a precise, succinct way.

Group projects functioned as contexts in which constructive interaction took place in preparation for a specified output or outcome. This extended into presentation settings, with spontaneous supportive peer mediation from the wider group helping to lift individual student performance:

> it was about the about my design like I had no interior walls in it so I wanted my design to be an exhibition the building itself as an interior exhibition and the site the landscape and the natural things surrounding it like an exterior exhibition so […] the idea was to blend the interior with the exterior the tutors didn't understand at the beginning but some of the students in the audience understood it and they explained it to them [interview C.3]

Readiness or ability to fully benefit from group work depended on a number of considerations. Participant E openly admitted disliking group projects in high school but changing her views at university, when she experienced group work with colleagues who had a similarly high level of interest in the work. Participant G was a couple of years older than her home student peers on the course and, in comparison with them, had more experience of travelling (as well as working) in a number of European countries. Some of her home student peers had rather different attitudes towards university:

> I noticed in England there's a lot of this idea that going to university means party every night and freedom and you're not at home anymore

> rather than I'm going to study to learn something that I'm passionate about which surprised me a bit I mean I guess I had heard of it on like forums there's this student room basically that but I guess it wasn't this is a bit more than I expected so sometimes I found maybe it's not so easy to not like make friends but socialisation takes place a lot around clubbing and partying which I'm not into so that's a bit it's different in the way we do things back at home and [another country she had experience of] [interview G.1]

Academic assignments helped find further common ground. Coursework for the majority of AcLitT participants consisted of independent research projects completed in groups, which facilitated interaction around academic matters and, as Participant G noted, 'it's natural that you end up talking about not only with your group but maybe with other groups on how are you doing this how are you getting on with that so yeah both it's a big part of the whole experience' [interview G.1].

Quality assurance and enhancement processes offered an additional context for language use. Participant G had volunteered to be a course representative, which gave her the opportunity to experience an interaction style and setting to which she had not been exposed prior to this:

> I'm a pretty outspoken person so I'm also for example presentations I don't really mind and all the students dread presentations and we had our fourth presentation already today and was people like oh my god I can't do presentation and I was oh that's OK I'll do it so even when we were sat we were sitting they were like representatives from the other years and obviously the lecturers and the staff I was the one yesterday was pretty informal getting to know how we do things and the one next Wednesday is going to be minuted and it was good fine it was fairly again informal so we sort of brough the feedback that we had been getting from other course mates and the lecturers were all really friendly so something that I like I guess on one hand I've had it all but like is how informally you address your teachers in England I had it both in sixth form and even here it's very odd to me cause in Italy again I can say for Austria too because of my boyfriend you would never call them by their first name first of all they're not like friends they're you know professor sort of professor surname whatever so it's not like it wasn't scary or daunting to talk […] figure of they're easy to talk and I do speak my mind in seminars and lecturers too if they ask I answer and all other people are scared especially in first year I think they don't want to say anything but yeah I don't mind so I'll say what I'm thinking [interview G.1]

4.4 Olivia

Olivia's experience with spoken English while an undergraduate exchange student in the UK resonated with that of both AcLitT and 3LU participants and helped highlight some key aspects that language proficiency studies overlook: managing the emotional aspects of language use and engaging in reflection about one's development as a language user. At the beginning of her one-year stay, as recounted in Chap. 2, Olivia almost left the room during a social lunch organised to give the students the opportunity to meet their peers and design tutors. During the initial stage, Olivia felt reassured by the presence of a co-national, also an exchange student on the same course, who had prior experience of studying in an English-speaking country (Canada). However, opportunities for interaction with others were limited: 'I don't have many friends here because the first project was in a group of three people so I was with my Brazilian friend and another English friend' [interview O.1]. In more practical encounters, such as when buying art supplies for her project from the university shop, Olivia resourcefully relied on mobile technology: 'if sometimes just by speaking they don't understand me I usually just go to Google and then I search for it maybe the translation or the image so that I can show them' [interview O.1]. Contact with what she called 'real language' (as opposed to input from recordings by trained actors made specifically for language learning materials) offered Olivia reassurance: 'It makes the student feel better when he notices it's not a problem to have an accent.' [Olivia written piece 1]. She aptly noted 'I do not need to have the most perfect English; I just need to make myself understandable.' [Olivia written piece 1].

Olivia's circle of interlocutors gradually increased: in an interview conducted approximately halfway through her exchange programme, she noted that 'now the tutorial groups have changed so I have now I think five different people who I'm speaking with sometimes' [interview O.2]. Olivia felt increasingly more comfortable sharing creative ideas in tutorials, such as using fragments of plates in the shape of vinyl records to visually represent feelings of anger within a fictional character passionate about music. In Olivia's tutorial group, a student showed sketches of a design idea involving a children's product, and Olivia made a constructive suggestion about using round shapes consistently to convey the idea of 'embraceness' (i.e. comforting hugs, feeling safe and protected).

The range of settings in which she used English also became wider: Olivia signed up for a volunteering project, which involved tutoring a non-native speaker high school student English poetry: 'he just asked me with some help with poetry which was like OK because I've never read poems in English and so it was quite a challenge' [interview O.2]. One of the poems Olivia chose was *The Falling Leaves* by Margaret Postgate Cole, the title a metaphor for lives lost in the First World War. Olivia felt that this experience had a positive impact on her design as she was practising 'think[ing] beyond what's written' [interview O.2] and exploring ways in which meaning was communicated figuratively. Olivia also attended Italian classes:

> since I'm learning another language taught in both English and Italian, and I need to talk to the other students in English, it's been a good opportunity to fill some gaps in my daily [English] vocabulary […]. It's good to look for the meaning of a word in its own language, not in yours, because it makes you start thinking in the language you're learning, and it's essential for speaking – it has to be fluid and spontaneous. [Olivia written piece 6]

Fluidity and spontaneity characterised Olivia's experience at a non-academic event organised by her university:

> For instance, something that happened to me this week made me feel proud of my English skills. I went to a well-being session, and there was a point in which I was speaking about something that's making me deeply angry. And I had no problem with speaking anything about it, the words just came to me naturally, even though I was in a state of full anger. [Olivia written piece 7]

Towards the end of the exchange programme, Olivia was confident that her fluency had improved: 'I used to think about a sentence I'd like to say I had to think about it like three times to reorder to see if it would make sense and now I feel more comfortable to just say it like straight away without thinking too much' [interview O.3]. While contact time within her academic schedule had not increased, Olivia was able to offer more examples of contributions she had made in tutorials, feeding back, among other things, on how the typography in her peers' work reflected the abstract concept that underpinned it. Her comments met with appreciation, not only from the peer to whose work the comments

were related but also from the tutor: 'the tutor was quite happy and like because my actual tutor was not there that day and I said can I join this tutorial just today and he said oh that's great you should come here more often' [interview O.3]. This was particularly valuable to Olivia because the tutor whose group she joined on that day was someone with a reputation for having high standards and making honest and straightforward, occasionally 'not very kind' comments.

In addition to work which was summatively assessed on the course, Olivia had the opportunity to participate in live briefs, presenting her designs to an audience drawn from professional agencies in the design field. The live brief involved an interim crit, followed a couple of weeks later by a presentation. One of the criteria for the presentation was 'that you have passion for what you do and that you enjoy the project' [interview O.3] and Olivia successfully conveyed this. While she was explaining the thinking behind her work, Olivia felt self-conscious about the language: every time she 'tripped on some words' [interview O.3], someone in the audience was making notes, and Olivia worried that her accuracy was being evaluated, which made her uncomfortable and meant that her performance was somewhat negatively affected. She described her experience as follows: 'We don't usually write too much text on the boards we prefer to let the image talk for itself so I was like I remember what I had to say but it was more about building up the sentence and like my voice trembling and this factor like being nervous a bit.' [interview O.3]. In the interview, Olivia reflected that language-wise she was perhaps in a comfort zone, using the language she already knew to discuss her work rather than building more formal words such as *exceptionally* and *nevertheless* into her spoken output and actively looking for more complex ways of expressing ideas.

In her end-of-year reflective portfolio, Olivia wrote: 'However, as for my fluency on presentations, I believe that I could have written down some expressions and words British students said when presenting their projects, to enrich my vocabulary.' While she was quite self-critical about her performance in the live brief presentation towards the end of the year, Olivia drew strength from the feedback she was given ('I was told later that I went quite close on being one of the top three students, and just by knowing that and by getting a 5 out of 5 in all of the assessing criteria, it made it worthy' [Olivia reflective portfolio]).

4.5 Reflection: Meaningful Interaction Across the EMI Campus

Research into academic discourse socialisation has predominantly focused on writing, with spoken interaction receiving less attention, possibly due to the link between writing and summative assessment at university. Spoken academic discourse, however, as Duff (2010) points out, 'is normally much more spontaneous and public than written discourse' (p. 177), though less likely to entail 'explicit and appropriate scaffolding, modelling and feedback to support students' performance' (p. 181). Placed alongside reports that study abroad leads to greater fluency than accuracy, Duff's statement underpinned the choice to dedicate, in this volume, a chapter to experiences of speaking rather than writing English on the EMI campus and during EMI journeys.

With reference to parallel-language settings in which tuition takes place both in English and in the local language (though the point is equally applicable to non-native speakers studying in an English-speaking country), Pecorari et al. (2011) note that EMI is a '*potentially* [my emphasis] fertile ground for incidental language acquisition, in that exposure to the second language (L2) arises during authentic communicative events which are likely to promote a relatively high degree of motivation and attention in learners.' (p. 57). Looking holistically at individual students' language development, exposure to language in various print and oral environments and opportunities to notice language need to be complemented by recurring opportunities for purposeful oral interaction. The interviews which underpin this volume help flesh out the range of ways in which *potentially* plays out in practice. Research participants at various stages in an academic journey recounted their experiences with spoken English in an EMI setting.

The projects did not look at spoken experiences quantitatively. They sought to uncover research participants' perceptions of the extent to which their EMI journeys enabled their development as competent speakers of the Englishes that would support them further in their professional careers. They unpacked the aspects which, from the interviewees' point of view, facilitated or enhanced their participation in meaningful conversations. Positive experiences were underpinned by careful course design incorporating activities and resources relying on group work; changing assignment group membership during an academic year; effective seminar

facilitation and lecturers sensitive to ELF speaker needs. Background knowledge on topics studied gave students the confidence to engage in interaction. Persistent and proactive students made effective use of language development brokers within their on-campus and off-campus networks (Blaj-Ward 2017) and deployed strategies to compensate for a lack of opportunities to interact in English. Input and feedback on performance, received not in artificial language instruction contexts but in live, authentic ones helped participants broaden and consolidate their knowledge of English not as an object of but as a medium for learning and meaningful communication.

The vignette in Chap. 1 illustrated a scenario in which uptake of opportunities to engage in spoken interaction in a mobile transnationalism setting was constrained due to factors related to the individual participants in that scenario, to do with affective attitudinal response and lower levels of linguistic competence. Existing literature contains a number of accounts of learners who will avoid settings that are not familiar enough to allow predicting the language required (Kinginger 2009). As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, higher levels of linguistic competence do not necessarily pre-empt silence either. Elliott and Reynolds (2014) draw on their experience of working with international student groups on a postgraduate HRM course and on reflective accounts written by students on that course to shed some useful light on (among other things) group work in such settings. Informed by Griffiths et al. (2005) construct of 'learning shock' as well as by insights from systematic reviews of group work research that neither fully validate nor provide sufficient evidence for removing participative pedagogies from higher education teaching practice, Elliott and Reynolds's article puts forward a particularly telling example of silence in group work, from a student, Lucy, whose English Elliott and Reynolds label as flawless. Lucy found group work problematic. One of her journal entries, Elliott and Reynolds (2014) note 'graphically describes the experience of becoming anxious and marginal within the group activities which she was aware others might superficially interpret as unwillingness to join in' (p. 315):

> I was amazed and shocked with what was expected of us with no content, no structure…. However groupwork was proved to be even more stressful…my silence upset my groupmates, for whom I was helpless, the only thing I could do was quietly prepare what was requested – drawing posters, doing the photocopying, doing my part in the role-play, and pretend that nothing happened. (Elliott and Reynolds 2014, p. 315)

The vignette in Chap. 1 and the example of Lucy in Elliott and Reynolds (2014) are telling reminders of the need to approach language in EMI from a sociocultural point of view rather than a cognitive, proficiency-oriented one.

Commenting on further research needed into language development in study abroad, Kinginger (2009, p. 150) emphasises that

> 'Studies of informal contact with expert speakers in study abroad are of key importance, since it is language development outside the confines of classroom discourse and of institutional constraint in general that study abroad is assumed, above all, to promote'. The formal/informal distinction and the label 'expert speakers' need to be reinterpreted for study abroad or at home through the medium of English as a foreign language. As in EMI, language is the medium rather than object of learning, what counts as informal (i.e. non-instructed) language learning takes place both inside and outside classrooms. Expert speakers do not necessarily have a high proficiency level in English as objectively measured. The level of expertise is evaluated on the basis of ability to speak knowledgeably about a subject and to communicate effectively in ELF settings. To take research into 'contact with expert speakers' forward, a focus on speaker viewpoints could be complemented by closer attention to the actual language used, as in two studies by Basturkmen and Shackleford (2015), and Dippold (2015), respectively.

Basturkmen and Shackleford (2015) explore a telling example of incidental learning (i.e. in teaching and learning events whose focus is on subject matter rather than on language meaning and form). They found—through a small case study of first-year lectures in a New Zealand-based accounting course—that language-related episodes were initiated both by subject lecturers and by students and that these episodes generally addressed lexis which supported students' developing understanding of the knowledge base in the accounting field. Subject lecturers both introduced complex terminology and provided feedback on students' contributions to the discussion, 'modelling and demonstrating conventional articulation of ideas in the register of accounting' (2015, p. 94). Basturkmen and Shackleford worked from transcripts of interaction to identify functions of particular turns and turn clusters. Dippold (2015) combined discussion of reported experience with analysis of interlanguage pragmatics in the internationalised classroom. The strength of these two studies is that discussion of language use is

contextualised within higher education research literature, which adds weight and relevance to conclusions drawn. The present volume argues in favour of further studies along these lines, taking account of Tran and Pham's (2016) view that English is a medium through which more and less expert users relate to each other meaningfully, rather than 'merely a competency that they aspire to acquire' (p. 577).

References

Baker, W. (2016). English as an academic lingua franca and intercultural awareness: Student mobility in the transcultural university. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 16*(3), 437–451. doi:10.1080/14708477.2016.1168053.

Basturkmen, H., & Shackleford, N. (2015). How content lecturers help students with language: An observational study of language-related episodes in interaction in first year accounting classrooms. *English for Specific Purposes, 37,* 87–97. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2014.08.001.

Benson, P., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., & Brown, J. (2013). *Second language identity in narratives of study abroad*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an academic lingua franca*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Blair, B. (2006). At the end of a huge crit in the summer, it was 'crap'—I'd worked really hard but all she said was 'fine' and I was gutted. *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education, 5*(2), 83–95. doi:10.1386/adch.5.2.83/1.

Blaj-Ward, L. (2017). From language learner to language user in English-medium higher education: Language development brokers outside the language classroom. *Journal of Research in International Education, 16*(1), 55–64. doi:10.1177/1475240917694109.

Dippold, D. (2015). *Classroom interaction: The internationalised Anglophone university*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialisation into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30,* 169–192. doi:10.1017/S0267190510000048.

Elliott, C. J., & Reynolds, M. (2014). Participative pedagogies, group work and the international classroom: An account of students' and tutors' experiences. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(2), 307–320. doi:10.1080/03075079.2012.709492.

Griffiths, D. S., Winstanley, D., & Gabriel, Y. (2005). Learning shock: The trauma of return to formal learning. *Management Learning, 36*(3), 275–297. doi:10.1177/1350507605055347.

Gurney, L. (2016). Challenges for developing EAP practice in Anglophone contexts. In I. Liyanage & B. Nima (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary research perspectives in education: Shared experiences from Australia and China* (pp. 7–16). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2015). *The English language needs and priorities of young adults in the European Union: Student and teacher perceptions.* London: British Council. Retrieved from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/F003%20ELTRA%20Hall%20Cook_FINAL_V2_web.pdf.

Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning.* Harlow: Pearson.

Pecorari, D., Shaw, P., Irvine, A., & Malmström, H. (2011). English for academic purposes at Swedish universities: Teachers' objectives and practices. *Ibérica*, *22*, 55–78. Retrieved from http://www.aelfe.org/documents/03_22_Pecorari.pdf.

Perrin, S. (2015). Why does Meredith wish to sound like the queen? An investigation into identity issues surrounding spoken English usage of Chinese ELF speakers in London. In A. H. Fabricius & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Transcultural interaction and linguistic diversity in higher education: The student experience* (pp. 278–299). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seferaj, K. (2014). Coping with new teaching approaches and materials: An East-European EFL teacher's interpretation of communicative teaching activities. In S. Garton & K. Graves (Eds.), *International perspectives on materials in ELT* (pp. 89–103). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sercombe, P., & Young, T. (2015). Student adjustment: Diversity and uniformity of experience. In A. H. Fabricius & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Transcultural interaction and linguistic diversity in higher education: The student experience* (pp. 34–55). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tran, L. T., & Pham, L. (2016). International students in transnational mobility: Intercultural connectedness with domestic and international peers, institutions and the wider community. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 46*(4), 560–581. doi:10.1080/03057925.2015.1057479.

Waters, J. L., & Leung, M. (2013). Immobile transnationalisms? Young people and their in situ experiences of 'international' education in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies, 50*(3), 606–620. doi:10.1177/0042098012468902.

CHAPTER 5

Reading Practices in Academic Settings

Abstract Reading at university underpins work that students submit for assessment and scaffolds language development through exposure to appropriate ways of conceptualising and communicating about practices in the students' chosen fields. This chapter highlights the variety of summatively assessed courseworks, which impacts on the range of readings needed to underpin them. It summarises EAP wisdom on reading and provides accounts of experiences of reading by participants in the AcLitT and 3LU projects. It connects published and primary data to draw out implications for practice and further research: university reading extends beyond standard academic texts, social interactivity needs to be designed more overtly into reading activities, and prior experiences of reading do not necessarily translate into effective reading at university without appropriate guidance.

Keywords Reading at university · Critical EAP pedagogy
EAP textbooks · Evaluating sources · Extensive reading · Multimodality

5.1 Academic Practices and Contexts of Language Use at University

Core elements in standard definitions of EAP are aptly subsumed in the following paragraph from Duff (2010) on academic discourse:

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_5

> Academic discourse (or academic language, academic literacies) refers to forms of oral and written language and communication—genres, registers, graphics, linguistic structures, interactional patterns—that are privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalized, or ritualized, and, therefore, usually evaluated by instructors, institutions, editors, and others in educational and professional contexts. (Professional discourse is subsumed here under the cover term of academic discourse because generally professional socialization has a strong academic component prior to or concurrent with internships and other field experience in the professions and because academia itself is a professional site.) (p. 175)

The academic practices through which students engage with academic discourse have over time developed to approximate more closely practices encountered in global professional contexts outside academia. Different courses and subjects are differently placed on the continuum of academic formality. Against this backdrop, standard definitions of EAP need to be modified, to capture more fully the richness of discourses that converge in EMI. The present chapter focuses on reading as a form of input for language development, from the viewpoint not of discrete lexical items to be accumulated, but of engaging with a range of texts and deriving from these the necessary discursive knowledge that supports effective interaction on and beyond the EMI campus. Discussion of reading is prefaced, in the opening section, by an overview of academic practices and (summatively assessed) contexts of language use into which reading at university is expected to feed.

For the participants in the research projects which underpin this volume, exposure to English language and opportunities to use it on the course took place in and around a variety of formally scheduled learning and teaching events. The students attended lectures and seminars, project briefings carried out by tutors (or 'business meetings' as labelled on some courses), individual and group tutorials. They presented—or were the audience for presentations of—design work-in-progress, both during regular sessions and at project reviews ('crits'). Other teaching and learning events included studio practice, film screenings, guest talks, mini conferences and/or research trips. Formative feedback was foregrounded in course and module guides as an important component of the learning process and was delivered throughout the year.

The learning and teaching processes were punctuated with summative assessment points, more high-stakes contexts of language use. More traditional assessment tools (e.g., academic essays on self-selected or set

questions, dissertation proposals or tests on lecture content) were used on some research participants' courses, but the majority of work that the students were required to produce consisted of professionally laid out text and imagery documenting a research process for and the development of a creative idea, contextualising this both within the relevant industry and more broadly within the cultural, historical and creative landscape. This was often accompanied by the requirement to put forward a strategy for idea implementation in a professional context. Some assessments mirrored closely professional genres in the relevant industry (e.g., client or consumer profiles), others were pedagogical tools helping students reflect on their learning experience (e.g., lecture diary or personal development file). Work was produced in a variety of platforms and all courses used a range of assessment types—oral, written, group, individual, with or without an audience of peers.

Competence in English was assessed alongside competence in visual language. Using words and imagery, students were required to map their learning journeys, document research, provide rationales for choices made, persuasively put forward a case for implementing a design idea, construct an essay-length coherent discussion of a topic, critique work, place work within the relevant industry context as well as giving it a wider cultural, historical and theoretical contextualisation.

More specifically, between them, research participants in the 3LU and AcLitT projects and the case study protagonist, Olivia, were required to complete the following courseworks for the purposes of summative assessment: individual and group projects involving design exploration, research and presentation; short essays of around 1000 words, e-test, blog; portfolio of design work; drawings and diagrams accompanied by a list of changes made during the brief timeline; client profiles; an individual and critical discussion (300–500 words) supported by the introductory lectures and most importantly by the recommended bibliography; Technology Diary of all lectures, seminars and visits (lecture/visit notes); tutor written briefs, live, negotiated and competition briefs in a variety of platforms; personal development file; longer essays and reports on self-selected or set questions; half-year and end-of-year tests on lecture content, practical criticism; seminar presentations, dissertation proposals; projects ranging between one day and several weeks; reports of research conducted for a design project; debate portfolios produced in groups; blogs, reflective journals, brand/retail promotion and visual analysis reports proposing a new trend and contextualising this within

the fashion industry, the wider cultural and artistic context and the report author's development journey; brand promotion plans accompanied by a range of documents mapping the research and development journey; sketchbook; consumer profile, mood board, sketchbook; artefacts accompanying items to be promoted; an analysis of how brands build narratives around one specific item, place the item within a broader creative context, or re-appropriate it and place it into a different promotional context (including text and imagery); sources of inspiration, rationales; visual product.

5.2 EAP Perspectives on Reading

To offer a backdrop against which conclusions can be drawn about how scaffolding reading in EMI can be effectively achieved to facilitate integration of insights from a very broad range of reading which challenges traditional academic classifications into the range of assignments highlighted in the previous section, it is useful to look at existing EAP wisdom as reflected in published pedagogic guidance and large circulation textbooks as well as research insights into how reading competencies are developed.

The complexity of reading from an EAP viewpoint is aptly highlighted in Alexander, Argent and Spencer (2008). Combining a focused survey of literature on reading development with practitioner insight, Alexander et al. draw attention to the impact that reading speed (not always dealt with appropriately in an EFL setting) has on students' ability to tackle academic material, its overtly signalled intertextuality and 'situated[ness] within the social practices and power hierarchy of the academic and professional community' (p. 122). As students gradually progress through the various stages of an academic course, they are exposed to broader ranges of textual genres and deploy a wider range of approaches with decreasing levels of guidance. They become astute at evaluating writer purpose while at the same time clearly establishing their own purpose as readers and having the confidence to read a text in a non-linear way. They command an 'inner voice for the rhythms and divisions of English sentences' (p. 142) which helps them negotiate textual meaning. While in a general EFL context, students would skim a text for the topic, in an academic study context skimming is reserved for establishing the relevance of a text to a task, where background knowledge is already accessible to a student. As locating appropriate material is increasingly facilitated by more and more comprehensive online databases with

sophisticated search functions, source credibility has already been established and evidence to construct a particular line of argument is more readily available.

A detailed list of specific competencies required for academic reading at postgraduate level is available in Brewer et al.'s (2013) *Can Do Framework*. The framework covers four key areas, namely academic context (to do with the specific nature of academic reading practices as opposed to reading for a variety of other purposes), academic discourse (the language features and discursive organisation of academic texts), discipline-related skills (to do with knowledge-making practices in specific subject areas) and practical skills for reading that students are expected to mobilise on a postgraduate degree. The *academic context* category subsumes ability to navigate reading lists in terms of relevance and text type, the necessity to align text type with reading purpose and reading approach, and in-depth, below-the-surface processing of textual information and meaning, linking this to prior knowledge and selecting ideas in preparation for linked course assignments. The *academic discourse* category relates to capitalising on knowledge about the textual organisation and on linguistic resources to tease out the threads of meaning contained within or prompted by texts. The competencies also mention disciplinary specificity and managing reading load, respectively. The latter reflects the greater emphasis posed at postgraduate level on independent sourcing of appropriate reading material. The framework is a useful point of departure for syllabus design. What it does not purport to do is to provide a detailed breakdown of strategies that students should be able to deploy; the wording of the competencies is necessarily quite general. Tasks that support the development of competencies are however included. A complementary framework, Pearson Education's (2016) *Global Scale of English*, maps reading-related 'Can Do' statements onto a scale aimed at 'provid[ing] a detailed picture of language performance at different levels of proficiency and for individual skills' (p. 5), to enable EAP practitioners, assessors and course developers to respond supportively to students' needs. Actual examples of syllabi aimed at developing reading competencies are available in the public domain in a small number of commercial EAP textbooks. The reading skills strand in two integrated skills EAP textbooks are reviewed below.

Unlike a general English language textbook, *EAP now!* (Cox and Hill 2011) ends with a list of references and an index, similar to a standard

academic text. The material is drawn from a number of sources that students would encounter on campus, both within and outside formally scheduled learning and teaching events: a policy document about preventing discrimination and harassment on campus; a module overview; undergraduate textbook excerpts; slightly adapted 'authentic' university essays (accompanied or not by essay question and references); newspaper articles; lecture scripts; as well as a small number of decontextualized (i.e., stripped of source information or critical apparatus) pieces of text supporting, for example, activities focused on distinguishing between fact and opinion. The activities built around the source texts ask students to engage with these texts separately, as discrete entities. There is no requirement to compare texts, read around the topic or synthesise ideas from various sources, to build a knowledge base, as would be the case outside a language classroom. Due to inherent limitations of a commercial (EAP) textbook, the combination of skills and strategies that are highlighted and practised help students tackle texts not longer than two to three pages on average. Students look at texts globally and familiarise themselves with the sequencing of stages in the material they are likely to encounter in connection with an academic course, the purposes of different text types, but also the surface features that distinguish academic sources from non-academic ones. They practise reading with the grain (skimming for topic, gist and main ideas, scanning for specific information, distinguishing whether a set of given claims are true or false, looking for language clues); reading against the grain by approaching a text from different points of view; and using texts (e.g., policy documents) to make and support judgements related to taking practical action.

While placing emphasis on the same skills and strategies as *EAP now!*, Hewings and McCarthy (2012) base some of their activities on a combination of paragraphs from different academic sources (university textbooks, book-length studies, journal articles), inviting students to select relevant information and make notes in preparation for other tasks. The source for the excerpts is clearly indicated and most excerpts (though not all) have in-text references. There appears to be more emphasis on raising awareness of language clues than on using sections and stages in texts to locate relevant information. In contrast to *EAP now!* , Hewings and McCarthy's textbook does not include readings about policy and procedure or course documents in addition to academic content ones. While both textbooks would provide appropriate exposure to academic register, as Miller (2011) notes is not necessarily the case for other

commercially available textbooks, they scaffold students' engagement with reading on university courses to a certain point beyond which further bridging is required to help students progress from individually tackling texts to socially reading their way into their chosen globally oriented professions.

The extent to which the pedagogic know-how translates into pedagogic practice and a positive student experience inevitably varies. Undertaking university study is sometimes phrased as 'reading for a degree'—an apt description which clearly highlights a central aspect of that experience, and one that reportedly a sizeable proportion of students who speak English as a foreign language are likely to find difficult when transitioning from EFL to EMI because of lack of adequate preparation. Pre-sessional and other preparatory courses that help students transition into English-medium higher education go some way towards addressing this. However, these are not available or accessible to all EMI entrants, and awareness of the prior experience of reading in English helps further contextualise the 'Can Do' statements with a view to offering all students appropriate support. In the context of a piece of research focusing on activity systems theory, Liu (2015) draws attention to the prior shared experience, among Chinese students studying for a postgraduate degree in the UK, of reading in English primarily to prepare for university language tests in their home country. This experience is shaped by the university language test (CET-4) construct, which projects a view of reading as the means to find correct answers in a text. Students are exposed to short texts which have been pedagogically processed and are accompanied by set comprehension questions, often in a multiple-choice format. Practising reading in preparation for a test often involves learning shortcuts and strategies to identify answers, without necessarily achieving full-text comprehension. By contrast, studying a university subject through the medium of English, especially but not only at postgraduate level, places emphasis on students formulating their own questions for texts, building on prior knowledge of the subject, looking not only for information but also for viewpoints and ways of supporting, nuancing or refuting arguments, and reading feeds into writing or other forms of communicating ideas either immediately or in the longer term. A UK university lecturer interviewed for Liu's research helpfully acknowledged that course design should pay explicit attention to students' need to develop a wider range of reading strategies than those they may be accustomed to from English language classes.

An insightful overview of the kinds of texts that students from mainland China, who make up a substantial proportion of international students in English-speaking countries, have experience of reading in English is available in Renandya et al. (2015). Within a policy context which singles out reading as the only compulsory course for undergraduate students across the Chinese higher education sector, the authors surveyed sample units from eight extensive reading [ER] coursebooks. Publisher or editor status were a key factor in selecting coursebooks for analysis because 'such coursebooks are likely to have a larger market share and, consequently, may exert a greater influence on how ER is implemented in Chinese universities' (p. 258). Principled analysis carried out on sample units revealed that the readability of a substantial proportion of texts in these textbooks was set 'at the students' frustration level' (p. 262) due to their syntactic complexity and low-frequency vocabulary and that the texts contained many low-frequency lexical items unlikely to be known to students at that level, considerably slowing down their journey throughout the text. They found that the activities accompanying these texts most frequently focused on detail and on retrieving (factual) information in response to multiple-choice comprehension questions rather than aiming to 'engage students to meaningfully explore the contents of the reading passages' (p. 265), especially at the post-reading stage, thus depriving them of the kind of deliberate attention that facilitates skills acquisition.

Kuzborska's (2015) description of her research participants as

> 'coming to the graduate programme with a strong background in writing and reading which valued accuracy, correct answers and personal opinions rather than evidence-based arguments, thoughtful interpretation, and reasoned exploration' (2015, p. 152) points not only to the tension between EFL and EAP reading discussed above but also to the tendency of some EAP courses to take skills and strategies out of context and to remain at the surface level of the text rather than facilitate readers' growing participation in academic and professional debates within their chosen subject area. Kuzborska's key contribution to research into EMI readers' experiences is her emphasis on reading as a situated and social interactive activity, something that EAP practice needs to build a greater understanding of.

The following section explores actual experiences of reading in EMI settings reported by participants in the research which underpins this volume, in order to help ground EAP approaches to reading

development into needs analyses that place the student at the centre, complementing those that have a text and target situation focus. Two main aspects are unpacked through juxtaposing research participants' views. Firstly, undergraduate students' conceptualisation of 'academic' texts, indicative of the (in)congruence between EAP textbook views on academic reading and actual reading practices on university courses with a creative or professional orientation, and the extent to which the same students' recounted reading experiences reveal a 'social interaction' orientation towards reading, integrating it into participation in communities of practice. Secondly, the range of experiences of prior reading in English brought to bear on student participation in postgraduate EMI courses, to highlight the importance of appropriate scaffolding.

5.3 Experiences of Reading in EMI

5.3.1 What Is an Academic Text? (AcLitT)

University courses delivered through the medium of English may expose students to types of text and ways of reading they may not be familiar with or may not have had enough opportunity to practise. Understanding the nature of a text is crucial to selecting the right approach to reading it and thus being able to use the material in relevant, meaningful ways. Selecting appropriate sources as a first step in assessing the reliability of information is vital for independent research valued at undergraduate and postgraduate levels and EAP provision includes elaborate criteria to help students judge the suitability of a text. For the first-year students participating in the AcLitT research which underpins this volume, however, knowledge of these criteria was neither fully developed nor necessarily a priority. Participant A noted that the main difference between her academic reading and her everyday reading was that texts in the former category were 'more specialised in a certain area' and had 'a lot of words which apply to that area only', 'honestly I'm not too sure about that' [interview A.2]. Participant B, coming via a foundation course route to university study, also equated academic reading to the recommended reading list on the course.

R: if people say to you academic texts what comes to your mind instantly
A: published books

R: what's the difference between a normal published book and an academic published book
A: I don't really know I think it depends cause they already categorise it in the bookshop so actually you can tell so you can actually go ask the staff like where can I get this book and stuff and the other thing is we've got a list recommended book list just get that book and check it and most of books in the library I can [interview B.2]

He articulated the features that distinguish academic texts from non-academic ones as follows:

R: so if the book wasn't in the library or on your reading listReading list /required reading would you know it's academic
B: I think fashion if for myself fashion course so it's quite hard to tell still but I mean like some of them you can still tell because they the way not advertise but the way they illustrate the book the words they use and some of them don't really have the index don't have the references and stuff at the back of the book so those kind of books like texts not academic ones so yeah I think that's it I'm not sure about the others actually because why I just normally read books from library [interview B.2]

Participant D, on a different course geared towards professional rather than creative practice, noted that in her case 'it's not as much books anymore actually it's mostly academic papers', which she locates through direct links in her course online learning rooms or through searching the recommended online databases. These examples are typical of comments made by other interviewees and signal that knowledge about the specialised conventions and expectations of academic discourse may need to be facilitated differently in the first year of an undergraduate academic degree with a strong practice orientation than is proposed in commercially available EAP textbooks.

When choosing material to read for his course, Participant B's reasoning was as follows: 'it depends on how useful that is to me instead of if they are academic or not' [interview B.2]. Participant E's interpretation of the difference between academic and non-academic was based on content: in the context of reading she had to do for her course, the former are texts which help her 'understand things and develop ideas' [interview

E.2] whereas the latter, also important on her course, are 'a good source of information to do things' [interview E.2].

On Participant G's course, broader reading was encouraged than just standard academic texts, which arguably accounted for her readiness to engage with reading. Her degree was closely linked to a professional field. She noted earlier in the project that she had chosen to study in the UK particularly because of the professional orientation of the degree (reputable university courses in her country align with more traditional academic disciplines). The professional orientation of the course meant that lecturers encouraged students to immerse themselves in the most current professional debates rather than in a body of discipline-specific wisdom accumulated over time. While Participant G did receive a 'pretty extended [recommended] reading list', the list did not include traditional types of the textbook, by which she meant ones that had been written specifically for university students, rather than 'books that like really anybody would want to read they weren't published for us'. What differentiates academic books from general everyday books according to Participant G are the 'highly specific' content, extensive bibliography and author credentials.

Participants did not fully and explicitly articulate the different reading strategies they were using or the differences in register or textual organisation between the reading they were expected to do for the university degree, the reading they had experienced in English language classrooms and the reading they had themselves chosen to do for a variety of purposes related or not to the course. Participant F offered a candid account of her reading habits, which revealed much about her preferences and pointed towards the lack of effectiveness of course reading lists as pedagogic tools when not integrated into a social interactive approach scaffolding students' engagement with texts and helping them explore the texts' meaning and relevance.

F: I'm ashamed to say I don't read too much but I when I do I read mainly articles online that I find either in like news articles or if my social network shares something on facebook or linked in or something um so I normally read on my phone and in the morning um but for school we don't have to read too much I tried to read one of the books on the essential reading list it was almost impossible

R: why

F: so boring and it was trying to sum up what design is in a trillion sections each section was relatively short but didn't say anything and I read like the first half of it and I just gave up because I doesn't say anything new it was just very boring
R: what would have made it more interesting
F: well I bought this other book a few weeks ago about urban sketching do you know what urban sketching is
R: not really
F: if you just go sit on the [pavement] and draw a building in front of you or draw whatever you see in the city more or less and so you go with a sketchbook and just a pen or sometimes some colours and I like to do that and I bought this book that has like a bunch of tips on how to draw buildings better and it just had a lot of examples that was just a tiny bit analysed so it always pointed out just one thing about that example and it had very short to the point very useful tips and it had a lot of it it was like a relatively long book not a long book but there was enough to read but it was just very efficient I would say I like efficient reading
R: what would have made those boring books better
F: if they would have made it more to the point and less like … but nothing just make more sentences for the sake of having more sentences
R: is that how you would define academic books
F: not all obviously but many and I feel like where we have to make essays a certain size it's for the sake of making it that size and often you can actually arrive to the point in half the size but you just have to say more and I like when people actually do more research to have to say more if you don't have more to say you should not write longer because it drives me crazy
R: so how would you define an academic book
F: I'm I do design I don't do academic books I have no idea like I don't know [interview F.2]

Set academic texts were seen by Participant A as a source of ideas to contextualise her own creative ideas in summative assessments which involved independent research:

> 'often with academic like books I try to find things I can make sense of with my own like with my […] presentation I go through books and I find

ideas that rather like similar to my ideas is and trying to make sense of them organise them rather than going through everything' [interview A.2]. The nature of the coursework, the workload entailed and Participant A's day-to-day reading experience meant that she did not attempt a holistic, in-depth understanding of the academic material she read; in her reading, she did not (need to) follow the grain of scholarly arguments and debates.

Participant C, on the other hand, viewed reading as a way of building up his knowledge base. On his course, reading was carefully scaffolded. Specific course briefs introduced in lectures were accompanied by set reading which was, according to Participant C, 'not very difficult because you get used to it in the lectures when the tutors explain the words and most of the words so you understand it when you read it' [interview C.2].

Participant F was not of the opinion that academic texts should invite a different reading approach. Faced with a rather opaque text, Participant F, together with a group of English native speaker classmates, booked an appointment with a student mentor in the library who advised them to go through the text sentence by sentence and write down the main point in each. Participant F felt they 'overanalysed the whole thing to just try to find meaning in it but normally I would just read and then think about it I don't use pencils to highlight things' [interview F.2].

As the project progressed, it became apparent that for courses oriented towards professional and creative practice, traditional understandings of 'academic texts' and 'reading for academic purposes' would need to be reframed by paying attention to the wider range of texts from which students can derive relevant knowledge for the course. Reading social media updates on the professional fashion world, pattern-cutting books to help students improve their technical skills or guidance written by professional associations about environmental design to build up one's knowledge base require different approaches to processing information than might be expected on a traditional EAP course. The university courses on which participants in the research which underpins this volume were enrolled capitalise to a much larger extent on students' everyday reading practices and prior, non-academic reading experience.

5.3.2 Prior Experiences of Reading, and Their Bearing on Postgraduate EMI Reading Practices (3LU)

A number of 3LU interviewees had prior experience of academic reading in English. Carla had studied a different but related subject at the

undergraduate level in the UK. Jahan had completed his undergraduate degree through the medium of English in a country where English was one of the several official languages, but felt there were no apparent differences between his undergraduate reading and the compulsory or recommended material on the postgraduate course. Harry had been a TNE student in his home country, studying for a degree delivered offshore by a UK university. Textbooks were in English but teaching at undergraduate level was both through English and through the local language (with English used exclusively on the postgraduate degree). Use of two languages was also mentioned by another student from a non-English-speaking country: her undergraduate course made use of textbooks in English, but she summarised the knowledge acquired from those texts in her own language.

In contrast, other research participants had experienced reading in English in a general EFL context, not connected to their subject course. For Xanthe, reading formed a substantial proportion of her in-class English language learning experience both at school and at university in China. As regards out-of-class reading in English, this was dependent on access to material in English and on research participants' motivation. At university, there was no external motivation for students to put effort into studying for language classes, and as a result, Xanthe did not make substantial progress with her English during her undergraduate degree. To prepare for a postgraduate degree in the UK, Vivian took the IELTS exam and then enrolled on a pre-sessional course where she was taught reading skills which she was required to apply to texts outside her subject area.

A staple of developing reading skills in a general EFL context is the activation of schemata and access to schemata is less readily available in an EAP context. For instance, Audrey had an undergraduate degree in Business which had given her the necessary background knowledge to help with text comprehension, on the one hand. On the other, her lack of familiarity with the industry to which she had to apply her business knowledge posed problems. Postgraduate degrees differ in the extent to which they scaffold the creation of students' knowledge base through guided reading or expect students to gradually build their own reading lists through individual research.

The choice of whether, how much, what and how to read in English on the postgraduate courses on which 3LU participants were enrolled was underpinned by a range of beliefs and attitudes. Even among some

of the more proficient students, interviewees commented that their research was mainly visual and they were not required to read (though this view ran counter to the course documentation, assessment did not involve extensive writing and therefore the visual took precedence over the verbal even in the blogs that students were required to produce). Vivian was not particularly keen on reading, however, on her course, the research dissertation was the most important form of summative assessment and reading was therefore a necessity. Cassandra openly admitted avoiding books because it took her too long to read and she felt that reading was not productive for her. At the other end of the continuum, Jahan was academically minded (he planned to pursue a doctorate) and the positive experiences he had had as a peer mentor had opened him up towards the possibility of an academic career, of which reading was seen as a natural part. Martha was passionate about her project and although not a systematic reader (she tended to pick up specialised knowledge from the technicians who supported her project) she still readily negotiated texts which had layers of specialised knowledge with primarily a referential meaning. Anita's reading practice went one step further: she drew on the work of a philosopher in her creative practice and read this both in her own language and in English. Translation of what she read took place not only from one language to another but also from one medium to another.

5.4 Implications for Research and Practice in EAP Reading Pedagogy

Chapter 3 showed that students found it easier to engage with concrete vocabulary that could be visually explained then reinforced through repeated use in interactive contexts. It also showed that more abstract, conceptual vocabulary posed difficulty when students did not have the background knowledge to help them articulate connections between ideas. Students were exposed to the more abstract, conceptual vocabulary in receptive contexts (i.e., lectures in which there was limited scope to contribute, or reading done individually) and were required to use this vocabulary mainly in written courseworks that were, again, individually produced. A similar situation applied in the case of reading. Information from texts focusing on concrete, visual processes was more likely to be drawn on in the spontaneous, day-to-day interaction taking place in the various learning and teaching spaces on the courses on

which students were enrolled. The more abstract, conceptual texts that help students develop their ideas and add depth to their work were processed by the students, with a greater or lesser degree of success, into summative written courseworks rather than being integrated into extensive, ongoing conversations about creative or professional practice. Nation (2015) offers an in-depth discussion of how extensive reading can result in substantial vocabulary learning. Extensive reading supplies the necessary number and quality of 'meetings' with new language that is glossed or easy to look up in an electronic environment in order to confirm meaning guessed from contextual clues and access a wider range of word knowledge. Extensive reading, however, particularly at lower levels of proficiency, appears to achieve its full potential when learners have access to simplified and graded texts rather than authentic ones with high vocabulary burden, Nation emphasises. Extensive reading within EAP courses is very rarely implemented, due to teacher attitudes and the high-stakes nature of these courses (Macalister 2008, 2010). The use of graded readers in authentic EMI settings is not an option; neither is Nation's suggestion of re-reading, given the heavy reading load on university courses. Narrow reading, i.e., 'reading within a very limited topic area' (Nation 2015, p. 143), is likely to halve the amount of new language encountered. The extent to which this is a feasible and productive alternative is worth exploring further, as is access to glossaries that help unpack discipline-specific concepts and idiosyncratic combinations outside the remit of advanced learners' dictionaries. It is not entirely clear to what extent positive attitudes towards extensive reading for language development translate into similarly positive attitudes towards reading for academic purposes, and these relationships are well worth exploring further. It is likely, however, that higher language levels empower students to engage with academic texts and feel better integrated into the print culture, as well as respond more readily to inspirational teachers who spark their curiosity towards academic subjects. Thus, extensive reading which is appropriately managed from a pedagogic viewpoint could only have positive consequences.

From an SLA perspective, lack of interaction around material that is read is likely to limit the amount of language development that can take place. From a higher education pedagogy and research perspective, the interaction could be enhanced by looking in more depth into the reading practices that students engage in around their courseworks and by designing learning and teaching events or staging summative

assessments in ways that maximise opportunities to discuss and receive feedback on the use of conceptual and theoretical material. Evans and Morrison (2012) offer a telling example of how assignment design could be used to scaffold students' experience of reading and build an interactive dimension into this. One participant in their longitudinal research with undergraduate students at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University recounted the experience of a group project which entailed 'breaking the project down into several stages, each involving the completion of a specific and required task that would build towards the assignment outcome, such as the production of an annotated bibliography, a critique of a key source, a detailed plan and an initial draft' (2012, p. 37). Another example of interaction is provided by Grey (2009). In a course that nurtured the development of a critical EAP community and could serve as an excellent example of Chun's (2015) point that EAP is becoming increasingly multimodal, participants were asked to read a poster displaying the poster authors' visual representation of difference (a hybrid face comprised of features borrowed from the mixed-gender author group). The following excerpt from the ensuing discussion around the image could easily have taken place among some of the AcLitT interviewees:

> Kei suggests: *I think the left side is female because it's softer*
>
> *…and the right, male.*
>
> There has been considerable discussion amongst the students about Japanese cultural practices in relation to gendered bodies and appearance. Kei told us that both men and women use products for skin care and make up so I wonder what cultural norms of femininity and masculinity she is drawing upon in order to make some form of recognition.
>
> Novi interrupts, *I think both are men*
>
> Her response shows the struggle that is going on for the class as they engage with different discourses of gender difference. I doubt if they expected this rupture during an academic seminar presentation.
>
> (Grey 2009, p. 129)

The shared nature of the meaning-making process within (as illustrated above) or outside the EAP classroom enables EMI participants to

develop levels of critical literacy that empower them as readers. It also enables EMI participants to make creative and confident use of their Englishes in ways that add depth to their identities as effective communicators in a globalised world.

There has been a 'steady focus on reading for writing in EAP scholarship since the mid1980s', Hirvela (2016) writes, which is 'hardly surprising, given that much of what students are asked to do in academic settings in order to both acquire and display knowledge revolves around some type of writing' (p. 127). While the relationship between reading and writing is an important one to explore, there is nevertheless scope for research into the wider range of reading practices on university courses, to understand in what way and to what extent reading experiences can and should be scaffolded. Economies of scale mean that EAP provision is often of a more generic type and reading skills are taught in a partly decontextualised way. Not being subject experts, EAP tutors cannot fully facilitate students' engagement in discipline-specific communities of practice.

To integrate reading competencies into a syllabus for either a pre-sessional or an in-sessional EAP course, it is necessary to merge consideration of target needs, which underpins the frameworks mentioned in 5.2, with some understanding of students' prior experience of reading in English within a language learning context, or developing relevant academic and other background knowledge through the medium of English. EAP provision should not only present students with tasks that mirror practices within the target academic discipline but also effectively scaffold students' transition from previous reading experiences to academically sanctioned ways of reading.

Wilson (2016) calls for 'delicate scaffolding' (p. 257) through pedagogic tasks and spontaneous interaction into a 'culture of critical thinking […] which is characterised by a great diversity of disciplinary, institutional, local and even personal cultures and discourses' (p. 257). She takes as a point of departure Davies and Barnett's (2015) three-part framework for understanding critical thinking, which brings together the skills perspective, the criticality perspective which views reading as dialogue which leads to

> an openness to new ideas, the will to be well-informed and to use credible sources and observations, being prepared to listen and consider other points of view, the ability to take a position and defend it, but also to withhold judgement when appropriate and to change positions if the evidence and reasons indicate this (p. 258)

and the critical pedagogy perspective, which enables readers to develop the 'awareness required to act responsibly and ethically' (p. 258) in a world where power is unevenly distributed. The research she conducted into the classroom practices of three different EAP practitioners teaching reading revealed student resistance to strategies such as organising notes in separate columns to illustrate contrasting viewpoints, a struggle to construct meaning from texts without tutor help in the absence of cultural capital and lack of affective engagement with reading material, a clash between tutor aspirations related to critical reading and pragmatic orientation towards passing a course. It also revealed, however, that reader identities were gradually being developed, control of concepts gained and text language appropriated through teacher commitment and dedication to raising students' metacognitive awareness of skills, rich dialogue 'punctuated with laughter and permeated with a positive orientation to learning' (p. 261), and context-sensitive approaches that ensure 'students remain secure in this dangerous space between educational worlds' (p. 264). The experiences of AcLitT and 3LU interviewees shared in the research which underpins this volume adds further evidence in favour of the relevance of delicate scaffolding, to empower EMI participants to construct meanings out of texts that are personally and politically relevant.

References

Alexander, O., Argent, S., & Spencer, J. (2008). *EAP essentials: A teacher's guide to principles and practice*. Reading: Garnet Publishing.

Brewer, S., Calderwood, M., Roche, C., Schmitt, D., Slaght, J., & Williams, A. (2013). *Can do framework: Competency statements for international students (Master's level)*. Retrieved from https://www.baleap.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Can_Do_Framework__with_sample_activities_April_2013.pdf.

Chun, C. (2015). *Power and meaning making in an EAP classroom: Engaging with the everyday*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cox, K., & Hill, D. (2011). *EAP now!* (2nd ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education.

Davies, M., & Barnett, R. (2015). Introduction. In M. Davies & R. Barnett (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education* (pp. 1–26). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialisation into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30,* 169–192. doi:10.1017/S0267190510000048.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2012). Learning and using English at university: Lessons from a longitudinal study in Hong Kong. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(2), 21–47. Retrieved from http://journal.asiatefl.org/.

Grey, M. (2009). Ethnographers of difference in a critical EAP community—becoming. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(2), 121–133. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2008.09.006.

Hewings, M., & McCarthy, M. (2012). *Cambridge academic English: An integrated skills course for EAP. Upper-intermediate student's book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hirvela, A. (2016). Academic reading into writing. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 127–138). Abingdon: Routledge.

Kuzborska, I. (2015). Perspective taking in second language academic reading: A longitudinal study of international students' reading practices. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20,* 149–161. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2015.09.004.

Liu, J. (2015). Reading transition in international students: Through the lens of activity system theory. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 17,* 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2014.11.004.

Macalister, J. (2008). Implementing extensive reading in an EAP programme. *ELT Journal, 62*(3), 248–256. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm021.

Macalister, J. (2010). Investigating teacher attitudes to extensive reading practices in higher education: Why isn't everyone doing it? *RELC Journal, 41*(1), 59–75. doi:10.1177/0033688210362609.

Miller, D. (2011). ESL reading textbooks vs. university textbooks: Are we giving our students the input they may need? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(1), 32–46. doi:10.1016/.j.jeap.2010.12.002.

Nation, P. (2015). Principles guiding vocabulary learning through extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 27*(1), 136–145. http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2015/discussion/nation.pdf.

Pearson Education. (2016). *Global scale of English learning objectives for academic English*. Retrieved from https://www.english.com/gse.

Renandya, W., Hu, G., & Xiang, Y. (2015). Extensive reading coursebooks in China. *RELC Journal, 46*(3), 255–273. doi:10.1177/0033688215609216.

Wilson, K. (2016). Critical reading, critical thinking: Delicate scaffolding in English for Academic Purposes (EAP). *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 22,* 256–265. doi:10.1016/j.tsc.2016.10.002.

CHAPTER 6

Parameters of English Language Development Provision in EMI

Abstract Published accounts of formal EAP provision show a range of ways in which this can contribute to English language development in EMI journeys, while tracking studies have explored the effectiveness of this contribution. Building on published work which emphasizes the importance of embedding instructed EAP into the subject course, discipline and university context, this chapter argues in favour of context-sensitive measures of quality in EAP provision, which give the student an active part in designing this provision rather than merely a recipient role, and reflect the principle that language proficiency development is 'everyone's business'. It acknowledges the 'cultural scripts' that participants in EMI bring with them with regard to quality assurance and enhancement, and seeks to capitalise on the complementarities of resources which facilitate development.

Keywords Quality assurance · Quality enhancement
Context-sensitivity · Student voice · Cultural scripts

6.1 Formal Language Support Provision: An Overview

Student voices have led the discussion in previous chapters, whereas the present chapter, while still mindful of research participants' views of language support, balances these with a stronger focus on formal arrangements put in place at a local, institution or sector-wide level. Chapters 3–5

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_6

in this volume have considered how a number of students who were enrolled on courses with a creative, visual or built environment component drew on their English language resources as they went about their everyday life on an English-medium instruction (EMI) campus. Recounted experiences were presented alongside findings from recently published research into English language development within higher education settings. Language use and language development outside a formal language classroom context were the focus of these chapters. By contrast, Chap. 6 zooms in on formal initiatives set up at institution level to provide non-native speakers of English with language support. The present section provides an overview of these arrangements followed by a review, in Sect. 6.2, of projects usually labelled *tracking studies* in EAP. These look at how students' English develops at university, either in response to or separate from formal language support. Section 6.3 presents insights from AcLitT interviews on what would constitute effective formal support. Section 6.4 follows this up with measures currently in place to assure and enhance quality in the EAP sector and contextualises these measures within wider debates on quality assurance in EMI and TNE. The closing section considers good practice principles in EAP and their applicability across EMI contexts.

The discourse around language support provision in universities is underpinned by valid concerns about students' ability to function as competent language users but often materialises into formal tuition imparting either generic principles (EGAP) or the key language and conventions typical of a discipline (ESAP), based on target situation needs analysis. The other end of the continuum would be provision which takes careful account of individual learning journeys and scaffolds students' knowledge development. However, resource availability (time within students' busy course schedules; staffing; finance), or lack thereof, is one reason why the latter is not always achievable. Professional know-how is another. EAP practitioners and course developers who transition into EAP from general language teaching may focus their efforts on making sense of unfamiliar disciplinary territories. Practitioners and course developers who approach EAP without a general language teaching background may feel confident unpacking disciplinary conventions but may be less knowledgeable of second language acquisition theory which might have guided them in setting up individual or larger-scale learning-centred support. Higher or lower degrees of ability to deploy an appropriate range of needs analysis approaches (see Bocanegra-Valle

2016) in disciplinary contexts which are not sufficiently familiar to EAP practitioners and course developers could also potentially have a negative impact on the effectiveness of EAP provision, while learner views and wants (Brown 2009) add a further layer of complexity to this.

In an overview of existing research into students' language development in English-medium universities, Arkoudis (2014) cites Dunworth (2013) and Rochecouste et al. (2010) in support of the view that 'students do not develop their communication skills through osmosis' (p. 10). Hers is one of the key voices who argue in favour of making English language proficiency 'everyone's business' (p. 17), through developing institution-wide strategic plans and policies and adequately resourcing policy implementation through a range of practical measures. A number of studies synthesised below discuss courses designed to meet this aim. These courses are constructed around the principle of embeddedness.

Embeddedness is a recurrent theme in accounts of provision in English-speaking countries, particularly the UK, Australia and New Zealand, with EAP practice reportedly attending closely to disciplinary and course specificity. Murray and Nallaya (2014) provide an account of embedded support within a faculty of education, arts and social sciences, where language specialists facilitated reflection by subject academics on the literacy practices underpinning a number of taught undergraduate courses and, once learning outcomes had been mapped onto assessment tasks, designed resources on how to deliver academic literacy support as well as working directly with the students, offering follow-on guidance. Murray and Nallaya reflect that

> while the volume of research critiquing existing literacy practices in academia is copious, there is a relative paucity that considers, in procedural terms, how to furnish all students with the disciplinary literacies they need and some of the challenges associated with doing so (p. 4)

and their article goes some way towards redressing this imbalance. Noteworthy about Murray and Nallaya's account are the degree and nature of the cooperation between language tutors and subject academics. Other accounts of embeddedness (e.g. Sloan and Porter's CEM model 2010; Sloan et al. 2013; Frohman 2012) position the language tutor as an ethnographer of academic disciplines and place support delivery firmly within the EAP classroom rather than as learning spaces opened up within the subject learning and teaching events. Sloan and

Porter (2010) is an account of cooperation between a language tutor and a subject specialist to design resources and deliver weekly workshops mapped onto the natural life cycle of a UK-based postgraduate management degree. Frohman (2012), writing from the point of view of an academic language and learning practitioner, elaborates on procedures which led to successfully setting up collaboration with a Faculty of Health at an Australian university at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. The provision in Frohman's account consisted of workshops oriented towards generic writing skills complementing ones targeting specific assessments; one-to-one consultations; self-directed study; role-play and workshops aimed at developing professional communication skills for the practical curriculum components.

The tension between seeing language proficiency as falling solely within the remit of language specialists or, conversely, as being 'everyone's business' (Arkoudis 2014, p. 17) is one that in practice requires careful negotiation. Murray and Nallaya (2014) offer a pithy summing up of what this entails:

> It requires more than a good idea that is theoretically well informed; it also requires leadership (even charisma), good networking skills, an understanding of the local political climate, astuteness, the active support of senior management, a clear roll-out strategy, good channels of communication, clearly articulated consequences for failure to comply and a good deal of perseverance on the part of those driving change. (p. 11)

The degree of embeddedness impacts not only on the focus and content of the support but also on students' readiness to participate in the provision made formally available at university. Arkoudis and Doughney (2014) note that 'a non-compulsory model that exists outside of the curriculum does not target the right students, given that students who have less significant English language development needs are more likely to attend […] workshops [which focus on literacy development]' (p. 12), while those who would more readily benefit from support are less likely to engage with it. Lack of engagement on the part of less proficient students in formal language support has been highlighted in a number of recent studies (e.g. Arkoudis et al. 2012; Lobo and Gurney 2014).

Accounts of English language development in EMI provision outside Anglophone contexts reveal similar concerns with language proficiency but prioritise somewhat different aspects, and the extent to

which language development is seen as everyone's business or as the sole responsibility of language specialists differs from context to context. Across Europe, the contributors to a 'state of play' report (Wächter and Maiworm 2014) which sought the views of EMI programme directors note that the availability of English language support varies substantially from institution to institution and country to country. The discourse around English language proficiency in mainland Europe EMI programmes reflects an altogether more positive outlook. Particularly at postgraduate level, students' language level is generally perceived as appropriate for the programme of study on which they are enrolled. While 'the warnings that the quality of teaching and learning in [English-taught programmes] will necessarily be lower than that in the native language due to an insufficient command of English of all parties have not fully disappeared' (Wächter 2014, p. 132), in the more established EMI programmes which attract greater interest from better prepared candidates, language is not a barrier to learning. However, where programmes are 'new, income-driven and less selective in admissions' (Lam and Maiworm 2014, p. 101), particularly at the undergraduate level, English language levels may as a result be lower. Lower English language levels could perhaps more readily be compensated for in settings in which EMI programmes recruit students who speak the same first language only, while programmes delivered to student cohorts with greater levels of linguistic diversity carry higher risk in terms of quality.

Against this background, it is perhaps not surprising that a larger number of EMI undergraduate programmes in Europe (compared to postgraduate ones) offered English language training (Lam and Maiworm 2014). Lam and Maiworm (2014) also found substantial variation across countries in terms of the extent to which English language training was made available to students. The structure, content, pedagogic principles and indeed the policy contexts of language training for EMI students were outside the scope of Lam and Maiworm's research, which offers only a bird's eye view. The contribution that their project makes towards discussion about language training is to raise awareness of current diversity and facilitate the choice of dimensions alongside which providers of English language support in EMI settings could organise sharing of experience and good practice across national and institutional boundaries, to add to the published body of knowledge about EMI in English-speaking settings.

The following section offers a synthesis of studies into English language development.

6.2 Tracking the Impact of Language and of Language Development Initiatives on Academic Success

For reasons to do with the necessity to set appropriate language criteria for university entry that give students a suitable base on which to build relevant knowledge, or the desire to evidence how the quality of learning journeys is or could be enhanced at university, or rather pragmatic concerns with financial accountability, studies have been conducted which track the impact of language and of language development initiatives on academic success. Published accounts of tracking studies are predominantly from the Australian context, and the selection reviewed in this section demonstrates the range of approaches that have been taken to tease out the relationship between language and academic achievement and draws attention to these approaches' relevance and limitations.

A study which reveals noteworthy information about the relationship between proof of language proficiency for university entry and academic success (the latter measured as grade point average) was carried out by Oliver, Vanderford and Grote (2012) at an Australian university. Using data from 5094 students of non-English-speaking backgrounds, they found evidence that students admitted on the basis of having completed a foundation programme were less likely to succeed on the target university course, while IELTS scores at and above minimum entry requirements were more likely to lead to academic success. While not intended for this purpose, Oliver, Vanderford and Grote's research raises questions about the extent to which foundation curricula which offer preparation for university provide sufficient opportunities for students to develop their language to a level that allows them to take key elements of academic literacy from the foundation curricula forward into their university degree. To answer these questions in a satisfactory way, however, complex and comprehensive research projects should be designed, combining qualitative and quantitative instruments and taking account of the full range of factors impacting on language development. Steps towards providing answers are suggested in the studies summarised below.

Humphreys et al. (2012) focused specifically on IELTS scores in the context of a tracking study conducted over the first semester of academic study (also at the undergraduate level) at an Australian university,

to explore proficiency gains rather than predictive validity of language level at entry. Fifty-one candidates' scores on the IELTS academic test at the start and at the end of the semester were compared to reveal that the main gain in proficiency occurred in relation to speaking. The correlation between IELTS scores and GPA was strongest in the areas of listening and reading, the two receptive macroskills. A wide range of subject areas was represented in the group of participants, and 55% of the participants were of Chinese origin. Humphreys et al. (2012) acknowledge that 'the relationship between general academic proficiency and discipline-specific proficiency is a complex one' (p. 34) and caution that evidence of improvement in English language proficiency over the duration of a university degree should 'be interpreted as reflecting a complex tapestry of multiple intersecting conceptualisations of proficiency and multiple underlying variables' (p. 36). Variables that other studies have attempted to address are motivation/agency, language socialisation, language support and contact with others speaking English, sociocultural factors, cultural adjustment, intercultural skills, language background, age, and other cognitive and affective factors. Language support may indeed have had a notable contribution in the case of Humphreys et al.'s research participants, as these were drawn from students who were required to participate in their university's English Language Enhancement Course, available to those with less than 7.0 in IELTS or entering university via a non-test pathway.

Language development 'in the course of regular university studies' (not through explicit instruction) was also explored by Storch and Hill (2008). Participants in Storch and Hill's project (thirty-nine international students mainly from Southeast Asia) were tested at the beginning and end of a semester on their listening, reading and writing skills, using an in-house test. The same version of reading and writing sections was administered on both occasions. Prior to the end-of-semester test, participants completed a questionnaire, and complementary qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews with slightly over one-third of participants in the project. Data analysis revealed that students with lower writing scores at the beginning of the semester showed the greatest improvement in this skill, whereas a higher initial score in reading led to greater improvement in this area. Across all three skills, improvement did not occur consistently, with some participants reflecting, in interviews, that 'their writing deteriorated over the semester' (p. 04.9). Participants linked this to assessment requirements on the

course which involved group reports ('I haven't written a lot since I come here'. p. 04.9) and to lack of opportunities to receive feedback on language in the written work they produce. Some but not all participants had accessed formal language support during the semester, though Storch and Hill carefully avoid suggesting a direct link between formal support and language gains, emphasising instead that 'researchers need to look at factors in the broader educational context to explain students' progress, or lack thereof' (p. 04.12). They also caution that scores and measures used to quantify progress may not be sufficiently fine-tuned to account for degrees of progress that may not be substantial enough (depending on where the threshold is set) and may not have statistical significance but that may be personally significant for the research participants, with regard to specific situations in which they were required to complete some reading, listening or writing that made a difference to how they experienced an EMI course.

Knoch et al. (2015) explored the extent to which students' written academic English developed by the end of a three-year university degree in a large higher education institution in Australia. They used a range of global and discourse measures to compare the writing of thirty-one undergraduate students at the beginning and end of the degree course. Analysis of the set written piece (an argument essay on corporate advertising, the same on both occasions) was complemented by semi-structured interviews conducted with a small number of participants in relation to the second piece of writing. The semi-structured interviews covered the 'writing requirements of the subjects they undertook throughout their three years, the type of assessment tasks, and about the nature of feedback they received on their written assignments' (p. 44), as well as participants' subjective assessment of their development as writers in an academic setting. The two methods combined revealed that the lack of significant development in grammatical accuracy and lexical complexity could possibly have been due to the lack of feedback addressing specifically language (as opposed to content). In the words of one participant,

> Every written assignment we only get feedback on how the assignment is good or bad, but- general, but the lecturer don't tell you this word is not right or this sentence is not right, or your or your… structure is not right, they don't talk about that, they only talk about you should write this, you should write that, you don't write this, you don't write that… yes just

> focus on the question, you answer the question, no matter how you write, you get marks. (p. 48)

In contrast, fluency, where improvement was immediately evident in terms of word count, may have been due to a combination of writing practice in English both within and outside formal course settings (e.g. social media in the case of the latter). Knoch et al. note that the general topic chosen for the research (corporate advertising) may have pre-empted participants from displaying more fully their ability to showcase lexical complexity in a discipline-related task, whereas the type of writing (argument essay) may also have impacted on their findings to a certain extent.

Two studies which track performance in the context of formal language support provision are Kennelly et al. (2010) and Stappenbelt and Barrett-Lennard (2008). Kennelly et al. (2010) draw confident conclusions about the effectiveness of an embedded academic literacy course for first-year students in a faculty of business and government, deriving their evidence from summative assessment outcomes, attendance data, student evaluations of the course, as well as reflective comments from peer tutors. Stappenbelt and Barrett-Lennard (2008) offer a similar example, from the field of engineering. The embedded support discussed in Stappenbelt and Barrett-Lennard's study resulted in improved pass rates for international students, as well as greater levels of student satisfaction and engagement as documented by formal surveys within the institution. The communication focus stream attached to the Introduction to Professional Engineering unit was also commended by the professional body which accredits engineering degrees.

6.3 Student Views of Effective Language Support

The tracking studies reviewed in Sect. 6.2 rely on quantitative measures of progress and explore development at the level of cohorts. While recognising the relevance of quantitative, standardised assessment, the present volume is nevertheless mindful of the difficulty in setting up a language test that adequately captures qualitative improvement in EMI participants' ability to make meaningful contributions across a range of communicative scenarios; in Kinginger's (2009) words, existing tests cannot 'capture the subtle changes occurring as language learners abroad enlarge their communicative repertoires' (p. 68). It is also mindful of

reports that engagement in formal language provision, to which tracking studies are generally linked, is less than optimal across many higher education contexts. The AcLitT project which underpins this volume sought to explore the tension between needs as framed in formal language development provision on the one hand and 'wants' or student views on what might constitute relevant language support if formally organised by the institution in which they are enrolled. It explored participants' own perceptions of how their language developed and gains they had made alongside views on how formal provision could be fine-tuned to meet their needs.

None of the participants in the AcLitT research which underpins this volume received regular, systematic, formal language tuition during the academic year. They drew on varied resources for language development. Participant C, for example, was part of an academically minded peer group working on common projects and practised using already familiar and new language. Opportunities for interaction led him to feel more confident, and he noticed that tutors asked fewer questions as the year progressed when he was presenting work in the process of being developed: 'as I'm improving my design I'm improving my English' [interview C.3], although he was aware that the visual might be compensating for the verbal to a certain extent when he was putting his ideas across, given that his ability to convey ideas through detailed, complex drawings increased. Also at the end of the academic year, Participant E noted that she had reached a stage where she was 'thinking in English' rather than in her native language and also mentioned confidence:

> before I was afraid to talk so I was pretty quiet when other people were talking around me and they used to think that I don't like them or things like that or I think that I don't want to talk or but now because I'm like more confident I can participate and understand what they say and give them ideas and explain that it's much better I feel much better because of this. [interview E.3]

Participant F, on the other hand, started her course with an already high level of English. The main change in her case was the accent—'some of it is turning British which is weird because it's not all' [interview F.3]. The same hybridity occurred in her choice of language as well; she had begun to use the British English equivalents of some words she knew already in relation to everyday life.

In the three examples above, the interactive context supplied language that students could potentially assimilate, as well as situations in which students could evaluate the English they were speaking, either by comparison with other students or by reactions to what they said or wrote. None of the participants in the project felt that formal language classes of the kind they had experienced prior to starting their academic degree would support them alongside the subject modules they were attending. Being in the first year of a three-year undergraduate degree course, they felt perhaps that the length of time they would spend immersed in the language, combined with a busy academic schedule, made formal language classes less attractive.

In response to the question 'If attendance at language classes was required on your course, what would these classes be like ideally? What would happen in them?', asked in the third and final AcLitT interview, participants put forward different versions of language support, all involving strong connections with the focus of the course they were enrolled on. Participants A and B would prefer to be a in a group with students who have similar levels of linguistic competence. Preference was also expressed for either practice or input from a language tutor in relation to key words on the main course, in effect an extension of the subject-focused teaching and learning events:

> maybe learn to understand more like the word surrealism to understand words better like that cause I don't think we have that much of a chance in seminars to talk about just one word to understand the word it pass by really quickly and it mainly to talk about the general theme rather than the language itself so in language class we got to talk about the language more because I think it's helpful with international students it's just like is really new language and is also difficult language so we have the chance to understand the words like the words in our course is better yeah it does help us to write better I think I don't have to constantly google it anymore. [interview A.3]

Participant C would like to receive definitions of technical words and examples of more formal language that could be used in written work. On Participant D's course, a workshop about essay writing was led by one of the subject lecturers and was aimed at both home and international students ('all the native students said that that was really helpful' [interview D.3]). She felt that such a workshop, in which someone with

knowledge of the genre could unpack the coursework brief and give students the opportunity to understand the requirements more fully, would be ideal:

> we first had just lectures like about the structure and everything and then we had seminars and in the seminars we had just one example and we were just asked to sort of just try out things we had different tasks that we were supposed to do and then we would talk through them and then we would get like the final answer though obviously the final answer isn't the only answer possible. [interview D.3]

AcLitT student interviews confirm the relevance of embedded language support, though seem to indicate that language should preferably be foregrounded within the subject teaching and learning events rather than in the type of separate academic English classroom which underpins the CEM model. It is also possible that access to academic language development brokers who facilitate the performance of learners of English in academic contexts (see Blaj-Ward 2017, for further detail) would enhance student journeys from language learner to language user, over and above formally taught provision. Hence the need to not only think of language development as everyone's business within an institution, but also create opportunities for awareness-raising and reflection on how encounters with language development brokers outside the language classroom can be capitalised on.

6.4 Developing Context-Sensitive Measures of Quality in Formal Language Support

Tracking studies offer objective measures of language development outcomes, and, combined with student views on language support, they paint a richer, more complex picture of formal language provision and of aspects which can increase its effectiveness. Systematic input from a wide range of stakeholders, however, is required, for assuring and enhancing formal language provision quality.

In the context of a discussion of how quality management can be applied in general language education, Heyworth (2013) argues in favour of creating a culture of quality, through developing among stakeholders a shared understanding of the criteria used to define quality in language education and of the standards against which quality is

evaluated. He also recommends deploying appropriate methodologies, resources and instruments which facilitate arriving at the standards. He puts forward the view that accreditation processes (i.e. requests for evidencing principles and practices) should enrich rather than create unproductive and unconstructive pressures for the day-to-day life of an institution. Formal quality assurance with a specific EAP focus is not yet supported by a quality assurance body with an international reach similar to that of EAQUALS or the British Council. BALEAP, a UK-based organisation that has assured the quality of pre-sessional provision in the UK for several decades, has recently widened its focus to cover in-sessional EAP and is exploring ways of reaching out to an international audience. In the meantime, however, EAP providers have the opportunity to develop what Pyvis (2011) labels 'context-sensitive measures of quality' (p. 743). Pyvis' statement is made in the context of transnational higher education, not specifically EAP, but the experience he describes delivering comparable quality while teaching an Australian Bachelor of Business Administration on a Chinese campus resonates with EAP contexts where participants in EAP provision encounter educational content and practices to which they are not accustomed.

The published accounts referred to in previous sections offer examples of different EAP providers' attempts at measuring and evaluating the quality of language development formally provided to students. In the context of in-sessional language and academic skills support, the instrument of choice for collecting student feedback appears to be the questionnaire survey administered at the end of a course (e.g. Stappenbelt and Barrett-Lennard 2008; Kennelly et al. 2010; Sedgley 2011), although questionnaires vary with regard to the extent to which they include open-ended items or items which respondents are required to score. The view they project is one of the students as recipients of provision rather than as co-producers or decision-makers and as a collective body rather than as individuals with distinct voices to reflect the complexity of higher education learning trajectories. Surveys or, alternatively, focus groups or semi-structured interviews (e.g. Lobo and Gurney 2014; Sloan et al. 2013) mentioned in published accounts of in-sessional provision are not accompanied by sufficient detail about the process and procedures for feedback collection; these accounts focus instead on analysing the content of the feedback provided. Lobo and Gurney (2014) are an example of a study which highlights the limitations of surveys when administered in a language that participants may speak less fluently

and in relation to an educational experience that may not conform to expectations based on participants' prior experiences. Commentary on how respondents' participation was secured, specific questions asked, or procedures for analysing feedback are not included in Frohman (2012) either; Frohman, however, provides a more in-depth discussion of how, over a period of two years, she combined a wider range of methods to generate insight into the relevance of in-sessional provision, enhance its quality and secure the support of decision-making stakeholders within her institution (paper and online end-of-session and follow-up surveys; focus group discussion; other formal and informal evaluation data; unsolicited anecdotal emails from students; formal and informal feedback). Frohman's account could be read as a clear illustration of a grassroots attempt to create the culture of quality that Heyworth (2013) would support.

Alternative approaches to exploring student views are illustrated in Sovič (2013) and Shreeve (2011), two studies which could inform the design of context-sensitive measures of quality. Sovič's findings are derived from analysis of interviews, conducted by international postgraduate students with international undergraduate and postgraduate students. Shreeve (2011) explored similar subject areas but collected (home) undergraduate student evaluations of teaching and learning experiences in alternative formats (e.g. sketchbooks, artefacts, artworks, illustrated stories, recorded interviews, animations and music), focusing on positive aspects conducive to learning for each individual student who participated in the project. As a result of sharing the outcomes of their project with colleagues at her institution, Shreeve concluded that the audience were able to connect with the artefacts more successfully than they would have done with a standard report and that allowing students the freedom to choose the focus and format of their accounts (originally planned as an essay, with the option of a video interview or video diary for dyslexic students) led to more insightful outcomes.

The importance of capturing the student voice for course quality enhancement processes has recently been emphasised in a number of publications focusing on the UK higher education context (e.g. Kandiko and Mawer 2013; McClaran and Brown 2013; van der Velden et al. 2013) and is likely to have similar relevance in other EMI contexts. Students who travel to a foreign country to undertake a taught postgraduate degree bring with them 'cultural scripts' (Welikala 2013) not

only in relation to teaching and learning but also in relation to their role in higher education quality assurance and enhancement. These cultural scripts 'do not neatly reflect the nationalities of the learners. Instead, they reflect different perspectives of learners who have shared beliefs from different cultures of learning and teaching' (Welikala 2013, p. 27). As such, the scripts will have a bearing on the extent to which students engage successfully in teaching and learning and participate actively in shaping the teaching and learning provision available to them at university. To ensure that scripts are aligned with course design principles, the latter need to be laid bare to ensure ownership of the course not only by expert developers but also by course participants.

Accounts of quality assurance and enhancement in the countries of origin of international students who travel to pursue a taught postgraduate degree in English (although student mobility does not necessarily occur in transnational education) show variations in processes and procedures (e.g. Lee 2009; Liu 2013) and foreground the inherent variety of cultural scripts that participants in EMI and TNE bring with them. Variation and potential lack of student familiarity with, and consequently lack of engagement in, these processes and procedures can also be gleaned from studies of internationalisation at the level of systems and curricula (e.g. Fitch 2013; Geddie 2012; Leask 2013), academics' perceptions of educational quality in the context of internationalisation (e.g. Pyvis 2011), commentary papers on the impacts of English-medium instruction in universities not based in English-speaking countries (e.g. Manh 2012), or research into 'how learners who embark on learning sojourns in different cultural contexts make meaning of and respond to the new culture of learning they encounter in their host university' (Welikala 2013, p. 27).

With specific reference to taught postgraduate courses in the UK, Cheng (2011) cautions that quality in teaching and learning is being interpreted in a variety of ways and that what may be perceived as good quality teaching by some does not necessarily automatically engender good quality learning. Similarly, a study which focused on art and design in UK higher education (Yorke and Vaughan 2012) and included a number of non-British students concluded, with reference to first-year undergraduate students, that 'there is no single "student experience"' (p. 54) and 'there is no magic paint that can be brushed over curriculum design and implementation to guarantee students' delight in their experience' (p. 54). While published insights can be used to sensitise academics

and course developers to international student expectations, academics and course developers need to engage in context-specific data collection and to process and operationalise findings in ways that acknowledge the uniqueness of each individual student's learning journey. They need to understand not only students' expectations about high-quality teaching and learning but also how students perceive and engage with the quality assurance and enhancement processes. Good practice in quality assurance and enhancement requires that students receive guidance on how to engage with the process of feeding back on their higher education experience and there is scope for studies to include a greater degree of transparency about the processes and procedures employed to arrive at conclusions about course quality.

6.5 Reflecting on Good Practice Principles in EAP for EMI

The study abroad research reviewed in Chap. 2 highlighted substantial heterogeneity and unevenness in language development and the importance of exploring learning backgrounds, contextual features and individual differences in responding to settings in order to scaffold development in appropriate ways. The tracking studies summarised in Sect. 6.2 mapped performance in English-medium higher education against formal language provision goals or independently of such initiatives and reached similar conclusions about variation. Both sets of research (study abroad and tracking) have a quantitative slant and contain reference to the need for more fine-grained approaches that capture more fully the fluid and dynamic, contextualised and identity-enhancing experiences of transition from language learning to language use in EMI and of EMI participants 'accommodating and traversing any differences between their own variety of English and cultural frame of reference, and that of their interlocutor' (Murray 2016, p. 80).

Formal EAP provision prior to the start of an undergraduate or postgraduate course aims to offer a solid basis on which to build further knowledge through exposure to practice in academically sanctioned registers. In-course support (further) unpacks discipline-specific practices and conventions, either in continuation of or as a way of compensating for lack of access to pre-sessional support. Drawing on findings from a longitudinal piece of research with undergraduate students at the Hong

Kong Polytechnic University, Evans and Morrison (2012, p. 31) note that

> It is perhaps not surprising that their essentially generic EAP course was barely able to meet their immediate needs, although it must be doubted whether a discipline-specific course could have achieved much more in practical terms. In fact, the evidence suggests that a raft of regular discipline-specific courses would have scarcely scratched the surface of their manifold and evolving needs; and only the most munificent university management would be prepared to sanction such a programme.

Interestingly, Evans and Morrison's research revealed that teachers' ability to inspire students had a greater impact on the students' learning than the immediate relevance of the content. Research participants 'recognised the importance of English classes (and other forms of provision) in enhancing their interest and confidence in the language' (p. 39). Evans and Morrison's findings point to the importance of accessing a wider set of resources than formal provision and also usefully complement the key success factors that Dunworth et al. (2014) identified in relation to the latter: senior leadership with 'continued involvement in driving policy, promoting consultation and engaging appropriate stakeholders' (p. 529); language and discipline expertise; realistic time resources; collaboration based on mutual recognition of expertise; adequate resources; evidence-informed decisions and sustainability.

The context from which Dunworth et al. (2014) draw their conclusions is a higher education system in an English-speaking country. The extent of EMI provision in other settings will determine how formal language development opportunities are quality assured. A degree course with only one component taught in English in a non-Anglophone country to a monolingual group of students may orient towards integrated support in the form of team teaching between language and subject specialists or simply supplying self-study resources for students to access prior to each session. The quality assurance procedures around the English-medium aspect could be localised to that component only and informally agreed at the course level. In settings where provision in English is more substantial, and English is associated with higher stakes assessment, quality governance needs to be formalised, closely aligned with institutional procedures for quality assurance, and linked to mechanisms for accessing financial and other resources. National regulation of

pre- and post-enrolment English language standards, gradually introduced over the past decade or so in Australia, is an excellent point of reference for discussion about quality assurance in EMI. Official policy documents in that country (see Murray 2016 for a critical overview) stipulate standards that institutions are required to implement 'through curricula and assessment revision and design where English language proficiency is an integral component of programme learning outcomes, and is aligned to discipline-specific standards' (Murray 2016, p. 64). Institutional compliance with the standards is then assessed by an external quality assurance body that looks, among other things, at how students are made aware of their responsibility to further develop their English while at university and at ways in which post-entry language development is evaluated through tracking and performance measures and other means. In non-English-speaking countries, in cases where EMI provision is the outcome of a TNE-type relationship, a language policy may be developed at the level of the institution. Perrin (2017) provides an example of a draft policy to guide programme delivery, assessment, student recruitment, research and administration as well as acknowledging social/daily life language. While in its early stages, the policy that Perrin discusses is nevertheless a 'step in the right direction in recognising language use and position within an increasingly complex HE world' (p. 170).

This chapter has argued that to be successful, formal provision needs to articulate with EMI participants' prior and future experiences, to empower EMI participants to capitalise on (formal and informal) resources available, and to engage them in the decision-making processes around institutional resource deployment. Additionally, formal provision needs to be embedded within a culture of quality that favours contextual sensitivity. In Murray's (2016) words, 'what may be a reasonable and effective response in one context may not necessarily be so in another' (p. 4). Context-sensitive quality assurance measures are proportionate. They fit the natural rhythm of the institutions in which they are deployed and take account of the stage each institution is at in the quality assurance journey. Quality assurance that is context-sensitive takes guidance from external policies but is interwoven into the fabric of the provision rather than seen as an external intervention. Importantly, it establishes the value of the provision in relation to EMI participants' overall academic experience and their readiness to join a globalised professional community, rather than simply in relation to the class of the degree obtained.

References

Arkoudis, S. (2014). *Integrating English language communication skills into disciplinary curricula: Options and strategies*. Sydney: Office for Learning and Teaching. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/research/teaching/docs/Arkoudis_S_NST_report_2014.pdf.

Arkoudis, S., Baik, C., & Richardson, S. (2012). *English language standards in higher education*. Camberwell, Victoria: ACER.

Arkoudis, S., & Doughney, L. (2014). *Good practice report: English language proficiency*. Sydney: Office for Learning and Teaching.

Blaj-Ward, L. (2017). From language learner to language user in English-medium higher education: Language development brokers outside the language classroom. *Journal of Research in International Education*. doi:10.1177/1475240917694109.

Bocanegra-Valle, A. (2016). Needs analysis for curriculum design. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 560–576). London: Routledge.

Brown, J. D. (2009). Foreign and second language needs analysis. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *Handbook of language teaching* (pp. 269–293). Oxford: Wiley.

Cheng, M. (2011). 'Transforming the learner' versus 'passing the exam': Understanding the gap between academic and student definitions of quality. *Quality in Higher Education, 17*(1), 3–17. doi:10.1080/13538322.2011.554634.

Dunworth, K. (2013). *Degrees of proficiency: Building a strategic approach to university students' English language assessment and development*. Office for Learning and Teaching Report. Retrieved from http://www.olt.gov.au/project-degrees-proficiency-building-strategic-approach-university-studentsapos-english-language-ass.

Dunworth, K., Drury, H., Kralik, C., & Moore, T. (2014). Rhetoric and realities: On the development of university-wide strategies to promote student English language growth. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36*(5), 520–532. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2014.936088.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2012). Learning and using English at university: Lessons from a longitudinal study in Hong Kong. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(2), 21–47. Retrieved from http://journal.asiatefl.org/.

Fitch, K. (2013). A disciplinary perspective: The internationalisation of Australian public relations education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 136–147. doi:10.1177/1028315312474898.

Frohman, R. (2012). Collaborative efforts work! Reflections on a two-year relationship between Faculty of Health and International Student Services—Language and Learning Unit. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning,*

6(3), A47–A58. Retrieved from http://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/185/154.

Geddie, K. (2012). Constructing transnational higher education spaces: International branch campus developments in the United Arab Emirates. In R. Brooks, A. Fuller, & J. Waters (Eds.), *Changing spaces of education: New perspectives on the nature of learning* (pp. 39–58). Abingdon: Routledge.

Heyworth, F. (2013). Applications of quality management in language education. *Language Teaching, 46*(3), 281–315. doi:10.1017/S0261444813000025.

Humphreys, P., Haugh, M., Fenton-Smith, B., Lobo, A., Michael, R., & Walkinshaw, I. (2012). Tracking international students' English proficiency over the first semester of undergraduate study. *IELTS Research Reports Online Series, 1,* 1–41. Retrieved from https://www.ielts.org/teaching-and-research/research-reports/online-series-2012-1.

Kandiko, C. B., & Mawer, M. (2013). *Student expectations and perceptions of higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.kcl.ac.uk/study/learningteaching/kli/research/student-experience/student-expectations-perceptions-HE.aspx.

Kennelly, R., Maldoni, A., & Davies, D. (2010). A case study: Do discipline-based programmes improve student learning outcomes? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 6*(1), 61–73. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/view/671/501.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Knoch, U., Rouhshad, A., Oon, S. P., & Storch, N. (2015). What happens to ESL students' writing after three years of study at an English medium university? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 28*(1), 39–52. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2015.02.005.

Lam, Q. K. H., & Maiworm, F. (2014). English in the classroom and beyond. In B. Wächter & F. Maiworm (Eds.), *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014* (pp. 98–118). Bonn: Lemmens. Retrieved from http://www.aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/images/members/ACA-2015_English_Taught_01.pdf.

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalising the curriculum in the disciplines: Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 103–118. doi:10.1177/1028315312475090.

Lee, K. (2009). The future directions of higher education quality assurance in Korea. In T. W. Bigalke & D. E. Neubauer (Eds.), *Higher education in Asia Pacific: Quality and the public good* (pp. 181–199). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Liu, S. (2013). The student experience in China. In C. B. Kandiko & M. Weyers (Eds.), *The global student experience: An international comparative analysis* (pp. 192–211). Abingdon: Routledge.

Lobo, A., & Gurney, L. (2014). What did they expect? Exploring a link between students' expectations, attendance and attrition on English language enhancement courses. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 38*(5), 730–754. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2013.817002.

Manh, L. D. (2012). English as a medium of instruction in Asian universities: The case of Vietnam. *Language Education in Asia, 3*(2), 263–267. doi:10.5746/LEiA/12/V3/I2/A14/Manh.

McClaran, A., & Brown, R. (2013). *HEPI occasional report (6). New arrangements for quality assurance in higher education.* Retrieved from http://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/HEPI-Occasional-Report-6-Quality-Assurance-in-Higher-Education-full-report.pdf.

Murray, N. (2016). *Standards of English in higher education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, N., & Nallaya, S. (2014). Embedding academic literacies in university programme curricula: A case study. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(7), 1296–1312. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.981150.

Oliver, R., Vanderford, S., & Grote, E. (2012). Evidence of English language proficiency and academic achievement of non-English speaking background students. *Higher Education Research and Development, 31*(4), 541–555. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07294360.2011.653958.

Pyvis, D. (2011). The need for context-sensitive measures of educational quality in transnational higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*(6), 733–744. doi:10.1080/13562517.2011.570436.

Rochecouste, J., Oliver, R., Mulligan, D., & Davies, M. (2010). *Addressing the ongoing English language growth of international students.* Sydney: ALTC.

Sedgley, M. (2011). The assignment success programme. In P. Hartley, J. Hilsdon, C. Keenan, S. Sinfield, & M. Verity (Eds.), *Learning development in higher education* (pp. 102–113). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shreeve, A. (2011). 'Tell us about it!' Evaluating what helps students from diverse backgrounds to succeed at the University of the Arts London. In M. Saunders, P. Trowler, & V. Bamber (Eds.), *Reconceptualising evaluation in higher education: The practice turn* (pp. 181–185). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Sloan, D., & Porter, E. (2010). Changing international student and business staff perceptions of in-sessional EAP: Using the CEM model. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(3), 198–210. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2010.03.001.

Sloan, D., Porter, E., & Alexander, O. (2013). Yes, you can teach an old dog new tricks. Contextualisation, embedding and mapping: The CEM model, a new way to engage staff and students in the delivery of an English language and study skills support programme: A case study of Heriot-Watt

and Northumbria University. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 50*(3), 284–296. doi:10.1080/14703297.2012.760779.

Sovič, S. (2013). Classroom encounters: International students' perceptions of tutors in the creative arts. In S. Sovič & M. Blythman (Eds.), *International students negotiating higher education* (pp. 87–103). Abingdon: Routledge.

Stappenbelt, B., & Barrett-Lennard, S. (2008). Teaching smarter to improve the English communication proficiency of international engineering students - Collaborations between content and language specialists at the University of Western Australia. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, 14*(2), 115–124. Retrieved from http://www.engineersmedia.com.au/journals/aaee/pdf/AJEE_14_2_Stappenbelt.pdf.

Storch, N., & Hill, K. (2008). What happens to international students' English after one semester at university? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*(1), 04.1–04.17. doi:10.2104/aral0804.

van der Velden, G. M., Naidoo, R., Lowe, J. A., Pimentel Bótas, P. C., & Pool, A. D. (2013). *Student engagement in learning and teaching quality management: A study of UK practices.* Retrieved from http://www.bath.ac.uk/learningandteaching/student-engagement/qaa-student-engagement-project-2012-13.html.

Wächter, B. (2014). Postscript. In B. Wächter & F. Maiworm (Eds.), *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014* (pp. 131–132). Bonn: Lemmens. Retrieved from http://www.aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/images/members/ACA-2015_English_Taught_01.pdf.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (Eds.). (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014.* Bonn: Lemmens. Retrieved from http://www.aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/images/members/ACA-2015_English_Taught_01.pdf.

Welikala, T. (2013). Beyond 'enculturation': Culture, learning and international contexts of higher education. In C. B. Kandiko & M. Weyers (Eds.), *The global student experience: An international and comparative analysis* (pp. 27–45). Abingdon: Routledge.

Yorke, M., & Vaughan, D. (2012). *Deal or no deal? Expectations and experiences of first-year students in art and design.* Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/deal_or_no_deal.pdf.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

Abstract Higher education through the medium of English opens up opportunities for identity transformation that are closely inter-related with learning and using increasingly more complex varieties of English that have personal relevance and that align with or depart from generally accepted norms. This chapter reflects back on the contribution this volume is making to the discussion of Englishes in EMI and maps out paths for further enquiry as well as components of honest pedagogies to support personal, academic and future professional growth. Through vignettes, it illustrates trajectories that complicate decision-makers' search for neat solutions and offers one possible example of intervening, in a pedagogically honest way, to scaffold lively, developmental discussion within the space of a learning and teaching event.

Keywords Honest pedagogies · Englishes/ELF
Language learning strategies · Research questions

7.1 Reflecting Back on *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*

Undertaking higher education through the medium of a foreign language (English in the context of this volume) opens up opportunities for personal growth and development that may not be available in contexts which do not entail crossing language boundaries, yet growth

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1_7

and development are unlikely to happen below a level of linguistic proficiency that facilitates meaningful dialogue. Minimum entry levels are set by official bodies at national and supra-national levels and can be evidenced in a variety of officially approved means (e.g. an educational qualification from an English-speaking country, a score in an internationally available language proficiency test or a locally validated test, or a positive outcome of attending a preparatory academic language and skills course most often at the same institution where the degree course will be pursued). Yet proficiency levels at entry do not necessarily guarantee academic success, language learning in EMI does not necessarily take a linear growth trajectory, and concerns have been aired in academic publications and the press about language standards both at the point of entry and on graduation. Against this backdrop, the present volume has explored, from the vantage point of an EAP tutor and higher education researcher, the viewpoints of a number of international students about language development through quality input and purposeful language use during university study abroad. The research which underpins the volume has sought to understand what may help or hinder EMI participants' growth into competent and confident communicators. It has not sought to establish causality but to raise awareness of some of the ways in which meaningful dialogue in the context of studying for a higher education degree may be nurtured or pre-empted. It has questioned traditional, restricted views of EAP to help EAP providers tease out nuances and specificities in their contexts, identify the most appropriate strategies they can deploy to support students in preparation for university study or throughout the duration of their higher education journey and construct persuasive, evidence-informed arguments for language development to become everyone's business in a sector that places great value on communication. The volume responds to a need to understand more about the way in which English language development plays out in individual EMI participants' lives, so that policies underpinning national regulatory frameworks can be more effectively contextualised and meso-level stakeholders do not implement EMI uncritically, without paying sufficient attention to language.

The Englishes through which academic practices are enacted and supported on an EMI campus are manifold and the extent to which they are purposefully and meaningfully used depends on a multitude of qualities and circumstances. Participants in the 3LU and AcLitT research, as well as Olivia, the protagonist of the exchange case study, provided

insights into how they made English their own along (yet unfinished) journeys of growing into confident language users and rounded professionals in fields that transgress national boundaries yet are fully sensitive to local contexts. The Englishes allow students to project mobile, globalised identities (Gurney 2016), which are co-created daily rather than carried in an essentialised form, and attitudes towards these Englishes will become more nuanced in the process of use (de Costa 2012; Jenkins 2013).

The research has focused on EMI participants (more specifically, students), and in their accounts of personal journeys, there has been little or no reference to EAP practitioners. This does not negate EAP practitioners' value. Rather, it reveals how learning takes place outside formal language classroom settings, to help inform and refine the design of EAP provision, further emphasise the importance of working with a conceptualisation of EAP that goes beyond a focus on target situation needs analysis, and generate guidance that helps ensure learning and teaching spaces outside the EAP classroom are language-rich environment with new language made salient to facilitate noticing and with interaction opportunities provided for language to be rehearsed and creatively used. It has also focused on a selection of language areas and skills (vocabulary, speaking and reading) deployed through academic practices for reasons highlighted in the respective chapters.

The research which underpins the volume did not set out to evaluate the language development strategies used by the 3LU and AcLitT participants or by Olivia. Similar to the tracking studies reviewed in 6.2, such an evaluation may fail to recognise the dynamic, nonlinear nature of the language development journeys. The experiences recounted in this volume are mainly but not exclusively positive ones. They provide a true-to-life account of learning journeys in progress. Inevitably, journeys will have rewarding moments as well as times when more resources need to be mobilised to avoid going off course.

An aspect that the research has not touched on is where the research participants were positioned on the academic grading scale. While some participants volunteered the grades they had received on specific coursework assignments, the research design did not entail comparing and contrasting personal accounts of progress with objective measurement of outcomes. The focus on language and on students' viewpoints meant that subject lecturer views fell outside the scope of the research. Research focusing specifically on how subject lecturers implement marking criteria

in EMI is needed, in line with Kinginger's (2009) endorsement of projects that have ecological validity to avoid the risk of distorting research participants' views of their progress and claiming relationships of causality without sufficient evidence to underpin such claims.

Another aspect that the research has not overtly engaged with is whether 'EMI in higher education is a good or bad thing' (Walkinshaw et al. 2017, p. 16). Opinion on this matter is divided. The present volume stands with Walkinshaw, Fenton-Smith and Humphreys in that

> those judgements rightly belong to local actors in the first instance, and this volume delivers no definitive 'party line' one way or the other. What we do know is that EMI is a phenomenon that necessarily occurs in situ in response to particular pedagogical, political, economic and social forces. On a practical level at least, it is the manner in which EMI is implemented, and the policy communications and processes underlying that implementation, which determine the success or otherwise of the eventual outcome (conceding, however, that 'success' is an ideologically loaded term). (p. 16)

The following vignette, a composite of insights from the AcLitT, 3LU and Olivia projects, as well as from published accounts of EMI experiences and post-EMI trajectories in various Asian and European countries (e.g. Costa and Coleman 2013, Doiz et al. 2013, Hu et al. 2014, Kym and Kym 2014, Priegnitz 2015), illustrates the range of conditions that need to be placed in balance before a value judgement can be made about language learning and use:

> Lucy travelled to an English-speaking country for her undergraduate degree. Lucinda is completing hers in her home town, through the medium of English. Lucy is surrounded by English, Lucinda speaks her own language with the academic-related staff on campus and with everyone else outside the campus gates. Lecturers at Lucy's university are not all native speakers; lecturers on Lucinda's programme are from a range of countries including English-speaking ones. The libraries at both Lucy's and Lucinda's universities are well-stocked. Off campus Lucy can more easily visit the working spaces of practitioners in her field and use English to converse and learn about their practice. Lucinda's course content, however, is fine-tuned to give her a more confident grasp of localised practices. Lucy's peers speak a wider range of first languages than Lucinda's, though Lucy does have access to a strong network of peers from her home country. The type and amount of assessed work that Lucy and Lucinda are

> required to do is comparable. Neither Lucy nor Lucinda have immediate experience of the practitioner world they wish to join after graduation and while in Lucy's case the finer points of cross-cultural pragmatics mean that her live research projects do not always run as smoothly as she would wish them to, Lucinda is not in a more privileged position when she negotiates the more rigid hierarchies in her home country. The Englishes that Lucy is exposed to and with which she interacts include a wider range of (native) regional accents; there is a range in Lucinda's case as well, though this is mainly linked to English as a lingua franca varieties, fully comprehensible to those within Lucinda's region. At the end of her course, Lucinda will more likely have a greater network of connections within the professional community located in her home country. Lucy's command of English may or may not be higher than Lucinda's, as might her preparedness for employment in roles with more global dimensions. As regards personal growth, the higher education journeys of Lucy and Lucinda will no doubt effect this at the rate and following a trajectory that reflect – to borrow Humphreys et al.'s (2012, p. 36) phrase – the 'complex tapestry of multiple intersecting conceptualisations of self, other and language'.

Language development specialists (i.e. EAP practitioners, course developers and researchers) and language development brokers all have a part to play in this process. The Lucy and Lucinda scenarios could potentially occur in any number of settings, and while the specifics will differ, the key threads in this volume speak to a large number of EMI providers and participants. Interestingly, and usefully in terms of giving a broader perspective on EMI, Priegnitz (2015) notes that English-medium higher education is available in non-English-speaking countries partly as a way to build relationships of an academic, economic and diplomatic nature within international students' country of origin on these students' return and partly to attract, to local labour markets, skilled migrants who might otherwise not have considered that country due to not having a suitable level of proficiency in that country's language. Priegnitz surveyed transnational alumni from English-medium programmes in Germany and Denmark and found that, in contrast to previous studies, these alumni were not using EMI programmes as one stop on their migration paths to Anglophone countries, but choosing to learn local languages, build local networks and seek employment in the country of origin of their EMI degree. Thus, socialisation into the academic discourse norms prevalent in English-speaking countries is not a priority for these participants in transnational education, though language which reflects the articulation

of degree course with professional accreditation bodies might be. This serves to further emphasise that the degree of overlap between the 'E' in EMI and the 'E' in EAP is fluid, dynamic and context-specific, and an (ELF-informed) awareness of what constitutes 'English language' in EMI needs to be shared among key stakeholders.

7.2 Honest Pedagogies

With specific reference to Japan, although this is true of EMI in a number of different countries, Hino (2017) notes that EMI provision could be categorised according to whether it is adopted at the level of a whole university, a department, a programme of study, a selection of curricula within programmes, individual professors delivering their material through the medium of English (e.g. academic staff recruited from Anglophone countries) or 'voluntary classes' where the decision to teach in English is made by the academic member of staff delivering that class. This inevitably has different implications in terms of how language use and development occur and are supported. Students participating in EMI provision are grouped by Hino (2017) on the basis of whether they originate from inner, outer or expanding circle countries, and different group make-ups lead to varied opportunities for language interaction and the need for localised understanding of development needs.

The second standard listed in the *English Language Standards for Higher Education* (ELSHE) document, albeit linked to an official policy drawn up in an English-speaking country and the object of some controversy with regard to implementation (Read 2016, p. 221), resonates with EMI provision in a wide variety of settings: 'The provider ensures that prospective and current students are informed about their responsibilities for further developing their English language proficiency during their higher education studies.' (retrieved from http://www.aall.org.au/sites/default/files/FinalEnglishLanguageStandardsMay2012.pdf). The expectations associated with this standard are that institutional resourcing and individual EMI participant agency need to meet in the middle. While policy implementation for macro- and meso-level qualities monitoring may need further consideration before it takes place, the ELSHE document is nevertheless a valuable resource to guide quality enhancement within institutions that adopt EMI on a variety of scales. This volume recognises the diversity in EMI and offers not solutions but tools to arrive at solutions in ways that make sense in particular contexts and that recognise the

futility of trying to establish a 'neat relationship between outcome gains and individual experience' (Magnan and Lafford 2012, p. 536).

Against this background, Canagarajah's (2014) call for pedagogically honest practices in relation to English language teaching gains particular relevance for EMI. These practices develop procedural rather than propositional knowledge of language, by fostering awareness that helps multilingual speakers 'intuit' (p. 772) the grammar of their interlocutor, borrow and reconstruct this, to 'find a middle ground between the divergent grammars of both parties in a communicative interaction' (p. 772). Language awareness combines with rhetorical sensitivity, 'awareness of genres, conventions and contexts' (p. 773), seen not as normative and prescribed but as resources to engage with. Negotiation strategies, the third component of procedural knowledge, help users engage with resources in ways that 'achieve communicative success and intelligibility' (p. 773). The first step towards honest pedagogy would be for course designers, deliverers and participants to openly acknowledge that due to temporal and other constraints no preparatory course will ever cover all eventualities and all types of social encounters that non-native speakers are likely to find themselves in during their academic sojourn in an English-speaking country. Formal EAP provision aims to add value to academic sojourns, and its effectiveness is likely to increase when complemented by learners consciously attending to their own development outside formal language classrooms. Binaries such as in-class/out-of-class or informal acquisition/instructed learning are unhelpful in that they gloss over or pre-empt discussion about facilitating the development of effective strategies in language learners. Not enough is known about the transition from intermediate to advanced to fully competent user of English in a higher education context, about milestones in learner journeys and contextual factors which speed up or slow down the learning process. While choice over enrolling on a preparatory language for university course is to a large extent not a choice, as it is dictated by institutional gatekeepers, student agency in relation to language development at university is not subject to the same constraints. Students have the freedom to develop a wide repertoire of strategies, though to a certain extent their experience in the formal language classroom prior to entering university may impact positively or negatively on the effectiveness and range of the repertoire.

Language learning strategies are explored in a touchstone study by Rochecouste et al. (Rochecouste et al. 2012). Rochecouste et al.

poignantly indicate that language learning experiences prior to enrolling on an EMI degree course may have equipped EMI participants with 'language learning strategies which can hinder their acquisition of course content' (p. 7). Indeed, Rochecouste et al. found only very limited significant correlation between language learning strategies and academic achievement, the latter measured through GPA. Risk-taking (i.e. willingness to inference, experiment with less familiar language and to engage in interaction) was found to impact positively on GPA, whereas vocabulary learning strategies characteristic of the language classroom were much less likely to serve students appropriately in EMI. Rochecouste et al.'s findings point to the need to 'not only teach academic learning strategies, but also higher level language learning strategies' (p. 7), although what constitutes the latter may still need to be established through more fine-grained research.

A number of strategies which have been reported to impact positively on language development in study abroad are synthesised by Magnan and Lafford (2012) from the research they reviewed for their contribution to *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Among these, some pre-existing knowledge of the language and culture, familiarity with pragmatic conventions, a longer stay in the target context, the use of social media to establish networks pre-arrival, access to and participation in an interactive environment in which the target language is used (homestay, service learning, internships), limited contact with co-nationals during the study abroad period. Magnan and Lafford (2012) are writing about study abroad for the purpose of language learning, though these strategies are equally applicable to EMI. While they are phrased at a higher level of generality than the more specific language learning strategies discussed in Rochecouste et al. (2012), they are a useful reminder of the need to scale strategies in terms of the resources that strategy users would be expected to invest.

Yet another set of strategies, namely the communicative and spontaneous interactional strategies used in low stakes, informal ELF environments to achieve constructive, highly cooperative interaction, are highlighted by Kirkpatrick (2010). Focus group participants in Kirkpatrick's research conducted in an ASEAN setting anticipated lexical items that their interlocutors were preparing to use or even supplied the appropriate item in some cases. They made suggestions to help other participants develop their turns, or provided corrections to help meaning being put across. They went to considerable length to unpack—patiently and

supportively—interlocutor contributions which caused some initial confusion by encouraging repetition, spelling out and clarification and by 'letting pass' (p. 130) idiosyncratic pronunciation which did not negatively impact understanding. They 'listened to the message' (p. 131) rather than worry about accuracy. Speaker paraphrase, participant prompting and participant paraphrase were used to help repair or pre-empt potential breakdown. Topic changes were signalled explicitly so that speakers and participants would have a smooth conversation journey and avoidance of local and idiomatic terms led Kirkpatrick to conclude that 'these ELF speakers [were] consciously aware of the need to edit out any terms or idioms that might cause misunderstanding in ELF communication' (p. 137). Kirkpatrick reflects that localised usage of English carries a level of idiosyncrasy that might hinder successful communication. He notes that awareness of variation from a common understandable core and familiarity with cooperative strategies would help participants in lingua franca settings achieve their communicative goals. A contrasting experience, which serves to confirm the complex and heavily situated nature of communicative expertise rather than invalidate Kirkpatrick's findings, is described by de Costa (2012) in his account of Daphne, a 'designer immigrant' (Daphne was an Indonesian student benefiting from an ASEAN scholarship in Singapore). In the high stakes context of performing literate talk in English in an education setting, she incorporated Singlish into her linguistic repertoire to communicate effectively with peers, even though she had previously stated that Singlish did not equate with good English, thus demonstrating further that 'ELF speakers are indeed capable of linguistic sophistication and sensitivity' (p. 220).

In higher education settings, there is evidence to indicate that messages from less confident users of English are patiently and supportively listened to and read, but the tight scheduling of academic events, academic staff workloads, the imbalance between low and high stakes language use combine to reduce opportunities to create the 'high level of mutual understanding and cooperation' (p. 127) that Kirkpatrick found in his research. There is also the possibility that information about available support is not presented in a way that encourages EMI participants to see its relevance, (re)frame their perceptions of accessing it in culturally appropriate ways and thus fully benefit from it (Roberts et al. 2017).

The opening chapter in this volume put forward a scenario in which three EMI participants positioned themselves very much on the margin

of a learning and teaching event which should ideally have resulted in lively discussion leading to personal and professional growth:

> In a spacious and well-lit studio with less than perfect acoustics in an Anglophone context, two tutors and a group of first-year students are sitting or standing in a fairly tidy semicircle, facing a display of design work-in-progress. Behind the semi-circle, rectangular tables arranged in a block. Behind the block of tables, three East Asian students.

One possible continuation of this scenario in the spirit of honest, contextually sensitive pedagogy could be as follows:

> The tutors notice that the semi-circle does not include everyone. They look knowingly at each other and discreetly reposition themselves. They check if everyone has their work-in-progress to hand, ready to share, what aspect they would like guidance on and in what order students will display their work. They speak in an authoritative yet friendly tone and between them they address each student to ensure everyone feels included in the event. They reassure the students about the informal, supportive nature of the event and they run through some constructive ways of phrasing questions and comments. For a few minutes before the event starts, in pairs, the students share one aspect they feel they need to consider in more depth before they can move forward with their projects. This is to give them a dry run before they speak in front of the whole group and to lower anxiety.

The same scenario could perhaps be preceded by the following:

> The course recruits a large number of international students and language is explicitly foregrounded to ensure that students' growth in their professional fields is appropriately supported. The south-oriented inside wall of the studio is peppered with relevant keywords in different lettering, and students can scan QR codes next to each keyword to listen to podcasts by speakers with a range of values, interests and language repertoires that offer definitions and contextualisations. The corridor that leads to the studio is lined with past student projects (these are carefully selected every year) – the QR codes next to the projects lead to more podcasts, to written reflective notes by the project author as well as peer and tutor reviews. The course leader, not a native speaker herself, has a wealth of stories to share about her language learning experience in the design field. Professional design staff supporting the course engage in regular staff development

about clear and careful communication. The course has access to a specialist writing tutor who is regularly consulted when assessment briefs and guidelines are drawn up. Writing and language tutorials and workshops are available and regularly attended. Employability-related incentives are built into the course – the undergraduate student magazine has built a strong reputation in the field and students sign up for live projects which reward textual and visual work in equal measure.

For EMI providers to be in a position to guide EMI participants through their language development journeys in pedagogically honest ways, more research needs to be carried out into the nature of these journeys. The research could productively build on the conceptual work, methodological recommendations and findings of studies reviewed throughout this volume, heeding the three key threads mentioned in Chap. 1: broadly defined needs analysis, ability to navigate the tension between and complementarity of immersion and instruction, and sensitivity towards what counts as a good language learner and competent language user in EMI. The interview projects conducted specifically for this volume have added to the empirical research base by scoping participation in academic practices in EMI with a view to understanding, from EMI participants' viewpoint, ways in which participation experiences equate with meaningful language learning and development, some aspects which have a bearing on the degree of success, as well as points of convergence with (or divergence from) formal language teaching. They have generated emic and ethically, rather than etically, elicited insights into how the Englishes ('E') in EMI are learnt, used, developed, lived.

7.3 Not an End but a New Beginning…

Participants' learning journeys continue beyond the research and beyond the writing of this volume. It is hoped that this volume will sensitise the full range of institutional stakeholders, from the top of the academic and managerial hierarchies, through subject academic teams to EAP practitioners to ways in which these and other participants' journeys can be nurtured.

Research is designed with a view to answering questions but in the process of arriving at an answer, which is inevitably partial and provisional, more questions are generated. Some of these lead to further research in a variety of overlapping fields. Others can be answered

through a close examination of current practice. Yet others have personal significance for the researcher who developed the initial project. The readers of *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education* are invited to consider the following three questions:

> How do successful EMI participants mobilize available resources to develop confidence in expertly contributing to dialogue in their chosen fields?
>
> Which aspect of EAP course design should be highlighted and made more transparent and is most likely to impact on EMI participants' willingness to engage with formal EAP provision?
>
> What do EAP practitioners need to unlearn from their prior professional development in order to conduct and apply insights from needs analysis that are sufficiently fine-tuned to EMI participants' transition from language learner to language user?

The first question would be more appropriately addressed through academic research. The second could be answered through a practitioner lens. All three are personally significant to the author of this volume and readers are invited to develop theirs while reading *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education* with or against the grain.

References

Canagarajah, S. (2014). In search of a new paradigm for teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Journal, 5*(4), 767–785. doi:10.1002/tesj.166.

Costa, F., & Coleman, J. A. (2013). A survey of English-medium instruction in Italian higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(1), 3–19. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.676621.

de Costa, P. I. (2012). Constructing SLA differently: The value of ELF and language ideology in an ASEAN case study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 22*(2), 205–224. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2012.00309.x.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2013). Globalisation, internationalisation, multilingualism and linguistic strains in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(9), 1407–1421. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.642349.

Gurney, L. (2016). Challenges for developing EAP practice in Anglophone contexts. In I. Liyanage & B. Nima (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary research perspectives in education: Shared experiences from Australia and China* (pp. 7–16). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Hino, N. (2017). The significance of EMI for the learning of EIL in higher education: Four cases from Japan. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific* (pp. 115–131). Cham: Springer.

Hu, G., Li, L., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction at a Chinese University: Rhetoric and reality. *Language Policy, 13*(1), 21–40. doi:10.1007/s10993-013-9298-3.

Humphreys, P., Haugh, M., Fenton-Smith, B., Lobo, A., Michael, R., & Walkinshaw, I. (2012). Tracking international students' English proficiency over the first semester of undergraduate study. *IELTS Research Reports Online Series, 1*, 1–41. Retrieved from https://www.ielts.org/teaching-and-research/research-reports/online-series-2012-1.

Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kym, I., & Kym, M.H. (2014). Students' perceptions of EMI in higher education in Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 11*(2), 35–61. Retrieved from http://journal.asiatefl.org/.

Magnan, S. S., & Lafford, B. A. (2012). Learning through immersion during study abroad. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 525–540). Abingdon: Routledge.

Priegnitz, F. (2015). Language policies in English-medium programmes in Germany and Denmark and their long-term effects on graduates' bond with the host country. In A. H. Fabricius & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Transcultural interaction and linguistic diversity in higher education: The student experience* (pp. 300–325). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Read, J. (2016). Reflecting on the contribution of post-admission assessments. In J. Read (Ed.), *Post-admission language assessment of university students* (pp. 219–236). Cham: Springer.

Roberts, P. A., Dunworth, K., & Boldy, D. (2017). Towards a reframing of student support: A case study approach. *Higher Education*. doi:10.1007/s10734-017-0127-z.

Rochecouste, J., Oliver, R., & Mulligan, D. (2012). English language growth after university entry. *International Journal of Educational Research, 53*, 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2011.11.005.

Walkinshaw, I., Fenton-Smith, B., & Humphreys, P. (2017). EMI issues and challenges in Asia-Pacific higher education: An introduction. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific* (pp. 1–18). Cham: Springer.

Appendix
Notes on the Research Process

Note 1: The 3LU project ('From language learner to language user in English-medium HE contexts: Identities, strategies, trajectories')

Excerpt from the 3LU project summary:

> Non-native speakers of English (NNSE) who pursue higher education in an English-speaking country bring with them a variety of language learning experiences, which impact on the extent to which they are able to perform successfully during their course of study as well as in their professional field after graduation. This small-scale project has a social constructivist underpinning and focuses on the strategies that NNSE students use to develop their academic and professional English language knowledge and skills and the transformative role these strategies play in helping them negotiate the trajectory from language learner to (fully competent) language user. It aligns itself with a recent research trend in second language acquisition, which emphasises the importance of looking at how learning a language changes the learner as a person rather

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1

> than simply broadening their repertoire of knowledge and skills. […] Purposive selection of participants [in semi-structured interviews] will ensure that there is as much variety as possible among participants in terms of prior experience of language learning and professional background or career aspirations.

The 3LU interviews with twenty-one postgraduate students were conducted in May and June 2015, at the end of the taught component of the master's courses on which they were enrolled, when students were about to begin their dissertation projects. Each interview was approximately sixty minutes long. The following list of core prompts was used for each interview:

a. What does the English language mean to you?
b. Tell me about your experience of learning English before you came to [university name].
c. What methods are you using this year to develop your English?
d. Describe a situation related to your course at [university name] in which you were able to use your English language skills successfully. Compare this to a situation in which you felt you would have benefited from more language-related preparation.
e. What would you like to be able to do using the English language when you finish your course at [university name]?

Questions (a) and (e) sought attitudes towards English and instrumental aims, to use these as a frame of reference when interpreting what students did to ensure their English was fit for purpose on the course. Question (b) elicited students' experience of English language learning prior to the postgraduate course and led into question (c) to establish in what way strategies developed in formal and out-of-class learning prior to the start of their postgraduate course were carried over into their UK language immersion experience, and compare these to the new strategies that students decided to adopt in study abroad settings, in other words, how past experience informed their present practice. Question (d) asked for two specific examples of language use on the course, one successful, another less so. This was in order to understand how these learners viewed effective communication in an academic setting and the extent to which they felt their performance was a reflection of that view.

The timing of the interviews was chosen because at that stage in their academic journey they had sufficient experience of being a postgraduate student to provide lengthy, informed answers about their experience of language learning and use. Transcripts were created immediately after each interview so that preliminary analytical insights could feed into subsequent interviews and generate rich data that confirmed, reframed and added depth to these insights.

Note 2: The AcLitT project ('Academic literacy trajectories')

The project was set up to explore key English language development and use experiences in first-year international undergraduate student journeys. It built on the 3LU experience, looking at trajectories longitudinally through interviews conducted at three points during the academic year. Data collection and analysis were closely interrelated, as in the 3LU project. The first of three sets of individual interviews took place in November 2015, about a month into the start of the academic year, within the space of two weeks. The second set took place in March 2016, and the third in the second half of May and first week of June. Insights from each interview informed the additional prompts in subsequent stages, to capture any changes in perception as the year progressed. The choice of first-year undergraduates as research participants was made to provide a counterpoint to the accounts of postgraduates who had already accumulated experience as an undergraduate university student, albeit not necessarily in an EMI context, and were also more likely to have used English in a wider range of settings for employment or social purposes. None of the participants in the AcLitT or 3LU projects were studying linguistics or language teaching courses.

Core prompts used in the AcLitT interviews are included below.

Initial interviews [I*n*]

[I1] Why did you decide to study in an English-speaking country?
[I2] What language study did you do to prepare to come to university here?
[I3] Based on your experience so far, what situations and activities do you associate with learning English? What is the first thing that comes to mind if I say 'learning English'?
[I4] How do you feel about your English at the moment?

[I5] What are you currently doing to learn more English?
[I6] Give me an example of something new you have learnt about English language since you started your undergraduate course.
[I7] Things you find useful when learning English.

Mid-year interviews [M*n*]

[M1] Your language level at the moment (using CEFR map as a prompt)
[M2] One conversation you have had with a tutor or a colleague face-to-face about something study related
[M3] Your reading environment and what and how you read
[M4] Your preferred writing tools/medium
[M5] Some subject feedback you have received on your work; how it was given; how you made sense of it.

End-of-year interviews [E*n*]

[E1] How do you feel about your English now? Has anything changed since we last spoke? In which situations do you feel most comfortable using English? Which situations do you still find challenging? Why do you think that is?
[E2] How does your English compare to that of other international students you met at [university name]?
[E3] Pick one coursework/project from this year you learnt the most from. Explain brief/actual work/feedback. What made it special, why did you choose to talk about this project in particular, what guidance did you receive while you were working on it, was there any specific language that you learnt while doing the work.
[E4] Pick five new words you have learnt on your course this year that you are likely to remember and use in the future.
[E5] Something you said in class or in a course-related meeting to which people reacted well.
[E6] A situation in which you would have wanted to say something/more but could not or did not have the opportunity to.
[E7] If attendance at language classes was required on your course, what would these classes be like ideally? What would happen in them?

Initial interviews lasted approximately half an hour; mid-year and end-of-year interviews around 45 minutes.

Note 3: Olivia

As an exchange student who was simultaneously enrolled on a similar degree course in her home country, Olivia was in an excellent position to compare her experiences in the two settings. Olivia participated in three interviews staged similarly to the AcLitT project and using the same core questions. She wrote ten reflective pieces throughout the academic year, in response to a list of pre-agreed frames:

1. First impressions: your language level at the moment and what materials you associate with language learning and teaching
2. One conversation you have had with a tutor or a colleague face-to-face about something study related
3. Your reading environment and what and how you read
4. Your preferred writing tools/medium
5. Some subject feedback you have received on your work; how it was given; how you made sense of it
6. A source of help with language
7. Self-evaluation of your communication in English so far and some plans you have to develop your language in the future
8. An email message you have had to write and what the response to it was
9. One really special thing that you discovered about your subject
10. The most difficult coursework you have been asked to do or you are being asked to do.

The insights from the written pieces were then explored further in the mid-year and end-of-year interviews. Olivia also shared a fifteen-page summary report which she completed at the end of the academic year and the feedback she received on various pieces of work she produced for assessment purposes on the main module she attended.

Note 4: Informed consent and managing the interview situation

The protocol described in the excerpt below, from the ethical approval application form for the AcLitT project, was followed in all three research projects which underpin this volume.

> Participants will be informed that they can withdraw from the research within the three-week period between the interview and the point at which formal data analysis begins, and if they choose to do so, their data will be removed from the research database. Only the researcher will have access to the unanonymised information, and the data will be stored securely in a password-protected environment. At the start of the research, participants will be informed that any confidential information they give during the course of the research will be treated as such and that they are fully entitled to ask the researcher to stop recording the interview if at any stage they choose to disclose sensitive information or feel uncomfortable about the direction of the conversation.
> As participants may not have experience of being interviewed for research purposes, key points about the nature, aim and scope of the interviews will be included in the initial information letter. The core questions for the semi-structured interviews will be sent to participants in advance, to help them make an informed decision about whether to participate in the research.

The core questions were not necessarily asked in the order in which they were listed in previous notes, if the information shared by the interviewees meant that it was more appropriate to prioritise some questions over others or to revisit points at various stages in the interview. The 3LU interviews took place in various teaching rooms on campus booked once a day and time had been agreed with the interviewees. The AcLitT and Olivia interviews, however, took place in a constant location to add to the sense of continuity. In these interviews, the core questions were displayed on a computer screen for the benefit of those interviewees who perhaps felt less comfortable responding spontaneously and needed more time to reflect. All interviews were recorded via the AudioNote app for iPad (http://luminantsoftware.com/iphone/audionote.html). The iPad was placed within reach of the interviewees, who were shown the record /pause/stop button as additional reassurance that they could stop the recording at any point should they wish to do so.

Index

L. Blaj-Ward, *Language Learning and Use in English-Medium Higher Education*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63239-1