

論文

Local Students' Views of English-Medium Courses in a Japanese Context¹⁾

YUKAWA Emiko / HORIE Miki

Abstract

The Japanese government encourages universities to internationalize, and one means to that end is to offer courses with English as the medium of instruction (EMI). This is a small-scale study of the EMI practice conducted in a private university located in the western region of Japan. The study investigated the local (i.e., Japanese) students' views of the EMI courses they were taking. The participants consist of 147 undergraduate students (70 small-group seminar course students and 77 lecture course students). A questionnaire survey was conducted in January and June of 2016. The questions asked their background, degree of comprehension of the course, and other views regarding the course. The results show that their overall perception of the EMI courses was favorable, and there was a difference between the two course types (seminars versus lectures). Their degree of EMI preference was related not only to their comprehension but also other psychological states such as confidence and motivation for learning more English. The results imply that we should further explore the benefits related to the seminar type of courses in EMI and how to take care of students' psychological states. More studies, both quantitative and qualitative, including not only local but also foreign students and their professors are needed.

Keywords

English-medium instruction, internationalization, Japanese higher education, L1 use

1 Introduction

English-medium instruction (EMI) is being widely practiced all over the world (Chang 2010, Cho 2012, Dimova, Hultgre, & Jensen 2015, Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra 2013, Hu, Li, & Lei 2014, Huang 2012, Kim 2015, Vila & Bretxa 2015).

EMI is defined here as instruction of non-English language courses with English as the official medium of instruction²⁾ in a social context where English is not used as the local language. So far EMI

has been discussed at the tertiary education level, although EMI is not necessarily limited to it.

Each country/area has different goals for and varied views of EMI, depending on its contextual situation, such as the degree of multilingualism of the community, English use/proficiency level, scale of EMI practice, etc. (Brown & Iyobe 2014, Cho 2012, Kim 2015, Vila & Bretxa 2015, Vu & Burns 2014). Therefore, this paper focuses on one type of EMI implementation commonly found in the Japanese context. More specifically, it focuses on the practice of EMI characterized by the fact that EMI courses do not yet form a full-fledged degree program operated only in English and thus are often accompanied by a few other traits. We feel that shedding light on this type of educational practices in discussing EMI has a great relevance to the needs of many universities which are at the exploratory stage of implementing EMI.

This study is to find local Japanese-speaking students' views of the transitional type of EMI in Japan. It investigates a sample of undergraduate students in one private university located in the western region of Japan. Through this exploration we hope to find relevant research and pedagogical foci in thinking about the potential of EMI in Japan.

2 Literature Review

2.1 EMI and Its Diverse Environmental Contexts

EMI is a fairly recent educational innovation. The post-colonial countries, in which English has been used intra-nationally by citizens whose first language differs from English, have operated at least part of their education using EMI for a long time. However, even those countries which have a strong local language and have no problem using that language in the academic domain have recently started to use English as a medium of education, especially at the tertiary level.

Despite such a short history, a large number of studies on EMI have been published recently. These studies describe the general characteristics of EMI practice in one region or country; detect its merits (e.g., motivation to conduct academic work in English, cross-cultural interaction); identify its challenges (e.g., a lack of English proficiency among students and professors, a lack of active participation in class, a decrease in the quantity of course content, a lack of content comprehension, an increase in work load and stress); suggest solutions to the problems (e.g., use of the local language, use of on-line materials to study before and/or after class); analyze sociolinguistic issues such as the relationship between EMI and the local language; and report faculty development activities to make better EMI instructors. Due to limitations of space it is not possible to do full justice to all the previous work nor the issues mentioned above in this review.³⁾ This section therefore will review previous studies focusing on the variability of EMI practice in relation to the environmental context of each region/country, so that the EMI situation in Japan can be understood in a larger picture.

First of all, in small or medium-sized European countries, EMI seems to be relatively easily accepted out of necessity.⁴⁾ In these countries, in addition to most of the issues mentioned above, loss of the academic domain of local languages is feared more than in larger countries. To cope with the

shrinkage of the functions/domains of the local language(s), Parallel Language Use policies, i.e., one program in English and the other in the local language(s) to teach the same content, are reported to be taking place in Scandinavian countries (Pulcini and Campagna 2015: 84).

Hultgren, Jensen and Dimova (2015) point out in their overview of EMI in Europe that disciplines and education levels show some differential preference for EMI and the local language. The fields of business and economics, engineering and technology, social sciences, humanities and arts seem to prefer EMI in this order, and EMI is used more at the master's level than at the undergraduate level (pp.3-4), which implies that other fields and levels prefer the local language.

East Asian countries have a much shorter history of EMI practices, but some have recently launched new EMI schemes of different scales. Kim (2015) and Cho (2012) report on the current situation of the mandatory EMI practices in two prestigious schools of science and technology. Based on their questionnaire survey and interview data, both authors claim that the programs suffer from the insufficient English proficiency levels of both students and faculty. Cho (2012) says that during the time of previous EMI practice, in which EMI was optional and thus both professors and students were able to make more autonomous decisions, participants' satisfaction levels were higher (p.140, p.158). At the time of mandatory EMI in 2010, both students and professors viewed EMI as being less effective for content learning than instruction in Korean. The students who participated in Cho's study expressed the view that the implementation of EMI was mostly for securing "a high rank in university rankings" or "to promote the brand name of the school" rather than "to improve delivery of course content" (Cho 2012: 158).

A campus-wide EMI program was launched in 2005 in a private Taiwanese university, and Huang (2012) reports the views of administrators, professors, and students of this university. Strict implementation of EMI (by even inspecting the use of English in class) was viewed negatively by professors because it restricts instructors' flexibility in using pedagogical strategies, such as code switching (pp.24-26). (Code switching refers to the use of more than one language within an utterance, or between utterances, in discourse.) Decreasing the amount of instructional content (p.30) and lower year students' lack of class participation (p.31) are among other problems. In summary, Huang (2012) says students' satisfaction was strongest with the "sociocultural learning", followed by "enhanced English abilities", but "academic abilities" came only third (p.38).

A smaller-scale and prudently paced EMI practice results in more favorable reflections from stakeholders. Inbar-Lourie and Donitsa-Schemidt (2013) report that the Israeli teacher candidates took two elective EMI courses voluntarily and showed no particular difficulty in understanding the content and viewed them very positively (p.186). Margić and Vodopija-Krstanović (2015) asked professors' opinions regarding the Englishization of courses in their Croatian university via an online survey. The opinions of 73 respondents (out of 250) in the survey were that "EMI could and should be introduced" but on the condition that certain prerequisites have been met (i.e., language assistance, financial support, reduced work load, synchronization of the programs with other European institutions, etc., pp.54-55). Manakul (2007) reports how the EMI graduate programs in the university in Japan in which

he works gradually expanded. Manakul (2007) says that the implementation of EMI enabled a number of positive changes, such as an increase in the diversity of the student bodies, an increase in the students' and the teachers' international mobility, and more publications in English.

2.2 EMI in the Japanese context

EMI has only recently started to be implemented in the modern Japanese higher education system, with a strong initiative from the government.⁵⁾ In 2009 the Japanese government initiated a project to promote the internationalization of higher education called "Global 30", which recruited universities which were willing to create full-fledged EMI programs (i.e., all the courses needed for obtaining a degree in such programs were to be offered in English) for the internationalization of higher education in Japan. Thirteen universities were selected and awarded a substantial fund for five years, and within this term (i.e., by 2014), these universities created 33 undergraduate and 124 graduate courses (the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology, MEXT hereafter, n.d.). To the best of our knowledge based on online sites for prospective foreign students, at least 12 other universities have full-fledged undergraduate programs in the academic year of 2016, which is a rapid increase from only five in 2006 (MEXT 2008).

Since then, MEXT has continued launching a series of policy initiatives to further promote the internationalization of higher education systems, such as (1) the Re-Inventing Japan Project (*Sekai Tenkai Ryoku Kyooka Jigyoo*) and (2) the Top Global University Project (*Suupaa Groobaru Daigaku Jigyoo*) and to develop university students' foreign language and communication abilities by (3) Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development (*Groobaru Jinzai Ikusei Suishin Jigyoo*). (See a summary of these projects in Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS hereafter, 2013). These three projects, among others, are especially intended to encourage each designated university to establish and operate EMI courses which target both international and local students. The rationales for promoting EMI in these contexts were as follows: to provide non-Japanese speaking students with easier access to Japanese higher education, to encourage non-English speaking students with practical opportunities to use English in academic settings, and to promote intercultural learning among students of various cultural backgrounds (Horie 2015, 2017).

In addition to the programs mentioned above, many EMI courses are offered to form only a part or no part of the curriculum of each student's specialized field (i.e., additional or optional courses). When these EMI courses are taken into consideration as part of EMI practice, the number of universities which implement EMI looks quite large; Shima et al. (2014) says in year 2012, 241 undergraduate universities (approximately 32%) and 187 graduate schools (approximately 31%) offered some EMI courses. There are 780 universities in Japan as of 2017 (eStat n.d.); thus, approximately one-third of all universities implement EMI in one manner or another.

Obviously EMI in a full degree program and EMI offered as a portion of the curriculum are different in their goals, operational sizes, student bodies, and outcome. Brown and Iyobe (2014) tackle this issue and disentangle the complexity by categorizing undergraduate EMI into six patterns: "1. Ad

hoc", "2. Semi-structured", "3. Integrated", "4. +αProgram", "5. English-taught Program", and "6. Campus-wide" (See Brown and Iyobe 2014: 13). EMI for full degree programs are included in Categories 5 and 6 above. Category 4 refers to a "(p)ossibly formalized program" "(o)ften run parallel to program for incoming exchange students" (p.13). The others, namely Categories 1, 2, and 3, can be differentiated depending on the degree of integration of these courses with the curriculum content of each specialized degree program. According to the analysis of Brown and Iyobe (2014), the majority of the participants in EMI courses in Japan consist of Japanese students except for Categories 4 and full degree-programs (p.16). This analysis provides us with a useful tool when we think of relevant pedagogical strategies and necessary adjustment for operating various types of EMI in Japanese higher education.

2.3 EMI in K University

K University is a large-scale private university located in the western region of Japan. It has about 35,000 students in 13 colleges. As of November 2017, it has three full-fledged undergraduate EMI programs (one major within each of three different colleges) and six graduate schools have EMI programs (based on admission information in < <http://en.ritsumei.ac.jp/admissions/>>). Moreover, it has a group of EMI courses called International Liberal Arts courses which offer extra English/CLIL courses as well as EMI content courses open to all students on campus regardless of their majors. Furthermore, each college offers EMI courses, but the number changes each year and the details are not accessible.

Assuming that EMI practices in other Japanese universities would have optional courses similar to the ones described above, this study focuses on these "transitional EMI" courses. We loosely define transitional EMI as a type of EMI characterized by one or more of the following features: those not forming a full EMI degree program, those consisting of only or mostly local students, and those in which professors are trying to make some linguistic and content adjustment (including possible use of non-English language(s) because of their students' insufficient English abilities). We exclude language courses and content-language integrated courses from our categorization of transitional EMI in the sense that English improvement is not a part of the assessment targets of EMI courses.

Through this literature review, we hope to have clarified the state of Japanese EMI practice within a larger context of EMI in the world. The focused courses in the present study differ from the ones that are held in the most advanced type of EMI settings. However, this type comprises the majority of the EMI practices in the Japanese context. In addition, this can be viewed as a small but significant step of bilingual and multilingual education at the tertiary education level in Japan. Furthermore, because of the language problem and the participation of foreign students (in some classes at least), EMI courses have become a meeting place in which a more effective pedagogical practice is sought at multiple levels, too. For all these reasons we decided to conduct this study.

In the investigation of the current states of EMI, analysis of multiple perspectives should be taken into consideration. Such analyses should include Japanese students' views, foreign students'

perceptions, professors' opinions, students' grades, analysis of classroom atmosphere, students' class participation, etc. and various combinations of these perspectives. However, the current study is an initial step and first focuses on the Japanese students' views as the starting point of the investigation of these transitional EMI practices.

2.4 Research questions

The present study addresses the following research questions. Each research question has one additional subsidiary question. The term, "seminar (*enshuu* in Japanese)" used below means a small-sized, interactive, and student-centered course.

Research Question 1: What are the students' views of the EMI courses they take?

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between their self-perceived content comprehension on one hand and their English proficiency, degree to which they do their homework, and first language use related attitudes on the other?

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between their preference for EMI courses and the other attitudinal and linguistic factors related to EMI?

For each of the questions above, the following subsidiary question was also asked:

Is there any difference depending on the type of course (i.e., seminar courses versus lecture courses)?

3 Method

3.1 Data

The data of the present study consist of one questionnaire survey conducted in January (2 courses from the 2015 Fall semester courses) and June of 2016 (4 courses from the 2016 Spring semester courses). The courses were chosen based on the availability of transitional EMI on campus. The authors directly asked professors who they found to be teaching EMI courses, for their cooperation. These professors gave the questionnaire to their students immediately after lessons for four of the classes. In two of the classes the first author of this paper went to distribute the questionnaire to the students after their lessons. In both cases, the responses were written down and returned to the professor or the author in the classroom. Participation in these questionnaires was voluntary, and the data collection was conducted based on the students' informed consent. In order for professors to gain valuable information on specific students' views, the questionnaire asked the students' identities and the results were shared with the professors. The questions asked in the questionnaire were the following (original in Japanese; the original questionnaire is available upon request):

1. Name
2. Student Number
3. Major
4. Year
5. Current English proficiency (Circle the number of the item which applies to your case)
 - ① Can understand basic information regarding myself, family, and daily matters

- (Roughly around the level of STEP Pre-Second Grade)
- ② Can understand the daily topics we encounter at work, school, and leisure
(Roughly around the level of STEP Second Grade)
- ③ Can understand the main points of complicated sentences regarding abstract or concrete topics
(Roughly around the level of STEP Pre-First Grade)
- ④ Can understand long sentences and their implicature in various types of text with advanced content (Roughly around the level of STEP First Grade)
6. Write your most recent score in TOEIC (or TOEFL).
7. Is this course obligatory?
8. Do you have study abroad experience in an English-speaking country for 6 months or longer?

Q9~Q17 provided a 6-point Likert scale (6 being the most positive) as below, and the respondents were supposed to circle the appropriate number:

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6

9. Did you study as you were recommended by the professor (e.g., preview, review, study for tests) every time?
10. To what degree can you understand the class content?
11. Do you think your English is improving through this course?
12. Do you think your motivation to learn English is getting stronger through this course?
13. Do you think your confidence in taking English-medium courses is increasing through this course?
14. Do you find your professor's use of Japanese (e.g., in talking, in handouts and/or power point slides) helps your understanding of the class content?
15. Do you think if your professor uses Japanese (e.g., in talking, in handouts and/or power point slides) that would be preferable to using English only?
16. Did you use Japanese in class to check what was going on in class with your neighbor, looking up in a dictionary, or for other purposes?
17. Would you prefer this English-medium course to a corresponding Japanese-medium course to learn the same content?

3.2 Participants

Table 1 shows the background information of the participants and the courses they took: the course type, course content, instructors' first language and the number of participants in each course.

Table 1 Background Information on the participants (N=147, 70 in Seminars and 77 in Lectures)

Course	Type	Number of Participated Ss (Number of Enrolled Japanese Ss)	% of Survey Participation	Instructor's L1 ^a	Course Content
1	Seminar	30 (30)	100.0	Japanese	Intercultural Communication
2	Seminar	13 (13)	100.0	Japanese	Psychology
3	Lecture	61 (87)	70.1	Japanese	Bilingualism
4	Seminar	26 (29)	89.7	Japanese	English Education
5	Seminar	8 (10)	80.0	Japanese	English Education
6	Lecture	9 (25)	36.0	English	Ecology
	Total	147 (194)	75.8		

^aL1 means the first language

Only the Japanese students taking these courses were asked to complete the questionnaire, since courses 3,4,5 consisted of only Japanese students, which would cause an imbalance in the number of Japanese and foreign participants. After all the main focus of this study was the local students' views. The present data include the responses of the students from four seminars (77 students) and two lecture courses (70 students), in total 147, which forms 75.8 % of all the enrolled Japanese students. The students who were enrolled on the course but did not participate in the study were either absent on the day or were present but decided not to complete the survey. Table 2 shows the distribution of the years of the participants. In Japanese universities, students tend to take most of the required courses in the initial three years; hence, the number of seniors is small in the data. Table 3 shows the majors of the participants. Their majors are mostly social sciences and humanities.

Table 2 Participants' Years in University

Type	Number of Ss
Freshman	53
Sophomore	41
Junior	40
Senior	10
Master's 1st	1
Unknown	2
Total	147

Table 3 Participants' Majors

Major	<i>n</i>	%
Unspecified ^a (Communication)	45	30.6
International Studies and English communication	45	30.6
International Management	19	12.9
International Relations	8	5.4
Unspecified as yet (International Cultures)	8	5.4
Asian Studies	3	2.0
Others	10	6.8
Unknown	9	6.1
Total	147	100

^a In the system of this college, the freshmen have not specified their majors yet. They belong to a larger, more general division for a year from which they choose one as their major at the end of the first year. This particular division of the students will choose either "Language Communication" or "International Studies and English Communication".

As for the experience of studying abroad, 30 out of the 147 students said they had such an experience for six months or longer. Seventy-eight said that the course was obligatory for them. The

idea of an “obligatory” course turned out to be rather vague in the participants' minds. In this college, absolute obligatory courses are very limited. Most courses are not obligatory in the absolute sense, but they seemed necessary to the students as far as they were part of the credits these students planned to obtain in order to graduate. The obligatory courses reported here, therefore, should be interpreted as the courses that the participants thought that they wanted to successfully pass.

Table 4 shows the participants' TOEIC scores in each course⁶.

Table 4 Mean TOEIC Scores of the Participants in Each Course

Course	Type	<i>n</i>	<i>Minimum Score</i>	<i>Maximum Score</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Seminar	19	330	910	713.42	129.22
2	Seminar	8	450	870	677.50	153.66
3	Lecture	42	450	935	663.31	110.49
4	Seminar	20	500	945	734.50	137.72
5	Seminar	7	560	850	691.43	114.99
6	Lecture	8	550	855	673.13	103.54
	total	104	330	945	689.89	123.25

4 Results

4.1 Research Question (RQ) 1

RQ 1 asked: What are the students' views of the EMI courses they take? Its subsidiary question was: Is there any difference depending on the type of course (i.e., seminar courses versus lecture courses)? Table 5 shows the results of the first question. The questionnaire used a 6-point Likert scale, 6 being the most positive. Therefore 3.5 is the middle; i.e., the neutral point. As Table 5 shows, the answers of these participants are mostly on the positive side.

The participants' views indicated by each variable can be summarized as follows. Around half of them do not think they did their homework on the regular basis (*Mean*=3.57, *SD*=1.27). Their comprehension is moderately good (*Mean*=4.22, *SD*=.82). They feel modest improvement in English (*Mean*=3.92, *SD*=1.08), but they feel considerably motivated to improve their English owing to this EMI experience (*Mean*=4.90, *SD*=1.12). Their confidence in taking EMI courses is moderate (*Mean*=3.98, *SD*=1.23). They appreciate their professors' L1 use very much when they do use it (*Mean*=5.06, *SD*=1.11), and they evaluate L1 use in class positively (*Mean*=4.40, *SD*=1.47). They actually use L1 themselves (*Mean*=4.79, *SD*=1.11). They would prefer to take the course they were taking as an EMI course rather than a course conducted in their L1, the local language (*Mean*=4.62, *SD*=1.36).

Table 5 Participants' Views of EMI

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. How much <u>homework</u> the participants do	146	1	6	3.57	1.27
2. How much they <u>understand</u> the class	147	2	6	4.22	.82
3. Whether <u>English has improved</u> owing to this EMI course	147	1	6	3.92	1.08
4. Whether they became <u>motivated to improve English</u> owing to this EMI course	147	1	6	4.90	1.12
5. Whether they feel <u>confidence</u> in taking EMI courses	147	1	6	3.98	1.23
6. Whether the <u>professor's L1 use in class was helpful</u> or not	126	1	6	5.06	1.11
7. How they <u>evaluate L1 use</u> in EMI	135	1	6	4.40	1.47
8. Whether <u>they use L1</u> on their own	146	2	6	4.79	1.11
9. Whether they prefer to <u>take</u> the course they are taking as an <u>EMI course</u> or a regular L1 medium course	144	1	6	4.62	1.36

Table 6 shows the difference in their views between the seminar course students and the lecture course students. Because Sapiro-Wilk Tests demonstrated that none of the data listed in Table 6 showed normal distributions, further analyses were conducted using non-parametric tests. In Table 6 the variables which showed a statistical difference (U-test, two-tailed, alpha= .05) and the ones which showed a middle volume of effect size ($r > .03$) are marked with a shadow. Therefore, the results show that there were statistically significant and middle-sized differences between the two types of the courses in the participants' comprehension, confidence, and EMI preference. In all these variables, the seminar course students showed more positive responses than the lecture course students.

Table 6 Participants' Views of EMI in the Seminars Courses and Lectures Courses (Mann-Whitney's U-test)

Variable	Course Type	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
1. Homework	Seminar	76	3.78	1.20	2.21	.03	.18
	Lecture	70	3.34	1.31			
2. Comprehension	Seminar	77	4.56	.73	5.39	.00	.45
	Lecture	70	3.84	.75			
3. Self-perceived English improvement	Seminar	77	4.21	1.05	3.37	.00	.28
	Lecture	70	3.60	1.02			
4. Motivation to improve English	Seminar	77	5.09	.97	1.84	.07	.15
	Lecture	70	4.70	1.24			
5. Confidence	Seminar	77	4.32	1.17	3.73	.00	.31
	Lecture	70	3.60	1.19			
6. Professor's L1 use helpful	Seminar	66	4.91	1.11	1.75	.08	.16
	Lecture	60	5.23	1.04			
7. L1 use Evaluation	Seminar	66	4.26	1.43	1.35	.18	.12
	Lecture	69	4.54	1.50			
8. Own L1 use	Seminar	77	4.79	1.15	.52	.24	.02
	Lecture	69	4.78	1.08			
9. Preference for EMI	Seminar	75	5.16	1.07	5.10	.00	.42
	Lecture	69	4.03	1.40			

Notes: two-tailed, alpha= .05,

4.2 Research Question 2

RQ 2 asked: What is the relationship between their self-perceived content comprehension on one hand and their English proficiency, degree to which they do their homework, and first language use related views on the other? Is there any difference depending on the type of course (i.e., seminar courses versus lecture courses)?

Table 7 shows the correlation coefficients (Spearman's ρ) between the participants' comprehension levels and the possibly contributing variables, namely, TOEIC scores, the degree to which they think they did their homework for the course on the regular basis, and the three L1 related variables (to what degree they felt their professor's L1 use helpful, how they evaluate L1 use in the classroom, and to what extent they used L1 Japanese on their own in class). The results showed that the first two variables correlated with comprehension ($\rho = .35 \sim .48$) when analyzed as the whole, as the seminar course takers only, and as the lecture course takers only. However, the strength of the correlation was stronger with homework ($\rho = .48$) among the seminar course takers than with TOEIC ($\rho = .37$), and it was stronger with TOEIC ($\rho = .43$) among lecture course takers than with homework ($\rho = .35$).

Table 7 Correlation Between Course Comprehension and the Three Possible Contributing Variables

		Comprehension All ($N=147$)	Comprehension Seminar ($n=77$)	Comprehension Lecture ($n=70$)
TOEIC	Spearman's ρ	.48	.37	.43
	P (two-tailed)	.00	.01	.00
	N	104	54	50
Homework	Spearman's ρ	.45	.48	.35
	P (two-tailed)	.00	.00	.00
	N	146	76	70
L1 support	Spearman's ρ	.00	.12	.04
	P (two-tailed)	1.00	.35	.74
	N	126	66	60
L1 evaluation	Spearman's ρ	-.11	-.13	-.06
	P (two-tailed)	.20	.32	.64
	N	135	66	69
Own L1 use	Spearman's ρ	-.07	-.08	-.04
	P (two-tailed)	.42	.48	.72
	N	146	77	69

Notes: Alpha = .05

4.3 Research Question 3

RQ 3 asked: What is the relationship between their preference for EMI courses and the other attitudinal and linguistic factors related to EMI? Is there any difference depending on the course type (i.e., seminar courses versus lecture courses)? Table 8 shows the correlation between EMI preference

and other possibly related variables.

When all of the participants were analyzed (Table 8, Spearman's ρ), preference for EMI over Japanese-medium instruction (JMI, hereafter) courses showed a statistically significant, medium-size correlation ($r > .40$) with content comprehension ($\rho = .46, p = .00$). Five other weak correlations were found between preference for EMI and homework ($\rho = .19, p = .01$), self-perceived English improvement ($\rho = .28, p = .00$), motivation for English improvement ($\rho = .21, p = .01$), confidence in taking EMI courses ($\rho = .36, p = .00$), and TOEIC scores ($\rho = .34, p = .00$).

When the participants of the two course types were separately analyzed, seminar course takers showed a weak correlation only with comprehension ($\rho = .26, p = .03$) but not with any other variable. This is mostly due to the high EMI preference of the seminar takers (mean = 5.16, $SD = 1.07$, see Table 6). The lecture course takers showed a statistically significant, medium-size correlation between the EMI preference and comprehension ($\rho = .41, p = .00$) as well as TOEIC scores ($\rho = .48, p = .00$). They showed a weak correlation between EMI preference and confidence ($\rho = .39, p = .00$) as well as self-perceived English improvement ($\rho = .29, p = .02$).

All the variables mentioned above are darkened in Table 8.

Table 8 Relationship Between Preference for EMI Courses and the Other Attitudinal Factors (Spearman's ρ)

	Preference for EMI All ($N = 147$)			Preference for EMI Seminar ($n = 77$)			Preference for EMI Lecture ($n = 70$)		
	ρ	N	p	ρ	n	p	ρ	n	p
1. Homework	.19	143	.03	-.03	74	.82	.23	69	.06
2. Comprehension	.46	144	.00	.26	75	.03	.41	69	.00
3. Self-perceived English improvement	.28	144	.00	.10	75	.39	.29	69	.02
4. Motivation to improve English	.21	144	.01	.16	75	.19	.17	69	.15
5. Confidence	.36	144	.00	.21	75	.07	.39	69	.00
6. Professor's L1 use helpful	-.13	124	.14	-.05	64	.68	-.11	60	.41
7. L1 Use Evaluation	-.04	133	.67	-.10	64	.44	-.04	69	.75
8. Own L1 Use	-.05	144	.53	-.11	75	.36	-.02	69	.90
9. TOEIC Scores	.34	103	.00	.02	53	.91	.48	50	.00

Notes: Alpha = .05

5 Discussion

In this section, the important points of the findings of the present study will be discussed referring to the previous studies on EMI when relevant. Further studies will be suggested based on the findings as well as the limitations of the present study.

First, the results of the present study show that the general tendency of the course takers' views of EMI (RQ 1) was positive, which was in accordance with the studies cited in the last part of Section 2.2 of this paper (Inbar-Lourie and Donitsa-Schemidt 2013, Margić and Vodopija-Krstanović 2015,

Manakul, 2007). The participants regarded EMI as more preferable than the hypothetical mirror course to be taught with Japanese as the medium of instruction. The present participants also said that their motivation for learning more English increased, although their English itself did not improve as much (Chang 2010, Kang and Park 2005). The participants' appreciation of the professors' L1 use (where it existed) is shared with the participants in Lee's study, too (Lee 2010).

Second, one interesting phenomenon that the present exploratory survey found is the difference between the two types of courses; that is, the seminar course takers showed significantly more positive views than the lecture course takers in five of the nine questions. Since the number of the courses surveyed this time is limited, it is too early to make any definite claim. Possible reasons for this observation, however, include the following: (1) Small class size (up to 30 students); (2) More opportunities for multiple levels of interaction with peer students and/or instructors for students to check their understanding of course contents in a safer and easier small group setting; (3) More systematic encouragement for students to complete their homework, which help their learning and interactions in the classrooms in turn, and (4) the tendency that the seminar type courses are offered in higher level courses and are thus taken by more advanced and mature students.

Third, the results of RQ2 indicated that not only English proficiency but also much homework they think they did on the regular basis was related to course content comprehension. This result is plausible because both students and professors try to bring into class the students' previous knowledge, their learning before and after class through whatever language they gained/will gain. Assigning homework and incorporating it skillfully (as hinted in the result of the seminar type courses) has the potential to facilitate the success of EMI courses.

Fourth, it was suggestive to find in these data that EMI preference was (statistically) related, not only to comprehension, TOEIC scores, and homework but also to psychological variables such as confidence, self-perceived improvement of their English, and motivation for learning more English due to the current EMI experience. This suggests that taking care of those psychological factors is important when we teach EMI courses. Even though correlation does not show causal relationship, at least those factors are related. The English proficiency levels cannot be changed within one semester, but the students' motivational state might be changed, for example, by skillful educational interventions such as acknowledging their fear, bringing in former course takers and letting them share their learning strategies for the course, introducing some learning materials written not only in English and in the students' L1 so that the students could use those materials outside the class, etc.

Fifth, it was interesting to observe that the students did not necessarily view the use of L1 as positive ($M= 4.40$, $SD= 1.47$) as they felt grateful for their professors' L1 use ($M= 5.06$, $SD= 1.11$), when they are asked if that is a desirable strategy for class. The result showed a gap of .66 and a slight difference in variability. It seems that using or not using L1 in class was viewed with a wide variety of opinions by the students at least at the time when this survey was conducted. We need to investigate qualitatively how the ideas differ and why.

Generally speaking, it is worth exploring how to incorporate multiple language resources (i.e.,

translanguaging) in any bi- and multilingual learning contexts (García & Wei, 2014). The possibility has been suggested in previous literature on EMI (Toth & Paulsrud, 2016). One study is reported on translanguaging and EMI (Yukawa, 2016). Many constraints are expected, but in the modern age of multilingualism, especially in the context of transitional EMI, there should be some room for skillful and beneficial translanguaging.

Lastly, the limitations of the present study need to be stressed, and further studies based on such limitations are needed. One of the limitations is the study's sample size. Even though the number of EMI courses itself is still small, the sample size of the present study was modest, which requires caution in interpreting the results. Another limitation is the fact that the survey this time did not collect the voice of foreign students or professors. The last limitation was that the survey is in its nature a quantitative study, and has limitations in uncovering complications of the phenomena. As was observed already, one such limitation was felt in interpreting the students' rather contradictory views of L1 use in class. Many of them appreciated when their professors used L1 to aid their comprehension and yet they did not evaluate it as highly when they were asked to evaluate translanguaging in class as a pedagogical policy. Surveys do not uncover what complications lie underneath this gap. We need qualitative investigation of the details.

6 Conclusion

The present study focused on EMI in a Japanese context, motivated by the fact that EMI practices differ depending on the context in which they take place. It is undeniable that the English proficiency of Japanese students is still limited, which suggests that many EMI courses offered, especially as optional courses outside of full-fledged English-medium curricula, may have traits typically found in EMI at the transitional stage. Specifically focusing on such transitional EMI courses, the present study conducted a survey on EMI course takers' views of EMI.

The findings of the general picture endorsed what previous studies elsewhere presented. In addition, the study implied the existence of different views among students due to the different course types, i.e., seminar and lecture courses. It also hinted that students' EMI comprehension is not necessarily all due to their English levels; their active learning for the course seems to have an influence. Furthermore, the study pointed out the importance of the students' psychological state in determining their preference for EMI. Since all courses and all learning opportunities should be formative and linked to further learning, it is important to take care of their feeling of confidence and other psychological states, which in turn motivate them for their future learning.

Being well aware of the limitations of this exploratory small scale study, further research on foreign students' and professors' views on top of Japanese students' views were suggested. Further studies are needed using quantitative methods which have sufficiently large data sizes for disentangling relevant variables through statistical analysis. Further research should also be conducted using qualitative studies which reveal task or context specific details of course takers' behaviors and feelings.

Notes

- 1) This study is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Kiban (C) Project No.16K02863 The current use and possible practice of translanguaging in college English-Medium courses and a Campus Asia program.
- 2) In some institutions, the use of English only is strictly implemented and even inspection takes place whether instructors are abiding by this rule or not (Huang, 2012, p.24), but in others, a mixture of the use of English and the local language seems to be accepted (Lee, 2010).
- 3) The readers are advised to refer to the following book form of compilations of studies: Dimova, Hultgren, & Jensen 2015, Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra 2013, Vila & Bretxa 2015.
- 4) As for the heterogeneity within Europe, Pulcini and Campagna (2015) claim that north-south differences exist; the countries in northern Europe tend to have longer EMI tradition and higher English abilities (p.64).
- 5) There are at least two universities which were established prior to 2009 with a full EMI in their programs: Asia Pacific University from 2000 and Akita International University from 2004.
- 6) Self-perceived English proficiency was asked in addition to TOEIC scores just in case when many participants did not have or remember their TOEIC scores. Luckily however, two-thirds of the participants (104 out of 147) had one, and so only the TOEIC scores were used in the analysis.

References

- Brown, H., & Iyobe, B. "The growth of English-medium instruction in Japan." In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), *JALT 2013 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT, 2014, pp. 9-19
- Chang, Y-Y. English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reflections from Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Taiwan International ESP Journal*, 2, (1), 2010, pp. 55-84.
- Cho, D. W. "English-medium Instruction in the university context of Korea: Tradeoff between teaching outcomes and media-initiated university ranking." *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(4), 2012, pp. 135-163.
- Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Declaration, B. The European higher education area. *Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education*, 19. 1999. Retrieved from <https://www.eurash.eu/library/bologna_1999_bologna-declaration-pdf/> on August 16, 2017.
- Dimova, S., Hultgren, A. K., & Jensen, C. (eds.). *English-medium Instruction in European Higher Education: English in Europe* (Vol. 3). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (eds.). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristle, U.K.: Multilingual matters, 2012.
- eStat. "Gakkoo kihon choosa nenji tookei. [Annual Statistics of Basic School Data]." n.d. Retrieved from <<http://www.e-stat.go.jp/SG1/estat/List.do?bid=000001093058&cycode=0>> on August 16, 2017.
- García, O., & Wei. L. *Translanguaging: Implications for language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Pivot, 2014.
- Horie, M. "17 Japan". In H. De Wit, F. Hunter, L. Howard, & E. Egron-Polak. (eds.), *Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Brussels : European Parliament, 2015. pp.229-240
- Horie, M. "Faculty Training for Non-Speakers of English at Japanese Universities: Effective EMI Teaching for a Culturally Diversified Student Population". In A. Bradford & H. Brown (eds.) *English-Medium Instruction in Japanese Higher Education: Policy, Challenges and Outcomes*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2017, pp.207-221.
- Hu, G., Li, L., & Lei, J. "English-medium instruction at a Chinese University: rhetoric and reality". *Language*

- Policy*, 13(1), 2014, pp.21-40.
- Huang, Y., P. "Design and implementation of English-medium courses in higher education in Taiwan: A qualitative study." *English Teaching & Learning*, 36, 1, 2012, pp.1-51.
- Im, J. H., & Kim, J. X. "Use of Blended Learning for Effective Implementation of English-Medium Instruction in a Non-English Higher Education Context." *International Education Studies*, 8(11), 2012, pp.1-15.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. & Donitsa-Schemidt, S. "Englishization in an Israeli teacher education college: Taking the first steps." In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2013, pp. 151-173
- JSPS. "Mirai e hiyakusuru guroobaru jinnzai no ikusei. [A presentation slide made by Japan Society for Promotion of Science]." 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.jps.go.jp/j-tenkairyoku/data/renrakukai/h25/06_h26gaisan.pdf> on Augst 16, 2017.
- Kang, S., & Park, H. (2005). "English as the medium of instruction in Korean engineering education." *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 155-174.
- Kim, J-Y. "Nonnative English-speaking Professors' Experiences of English-medium Instruction and their Perceived Roles of the Local Language." Asia TEFL Conference Nanjing, China, November 7-9, 2015.
- Lee, B. "A study on the teaching method for an efficient EMI education of engineering major students." *Studies on Engineering Education*, 13(6), 2010. pp.188-194.
- Manakul, W. "Role of English in internationalization of higher education: The case of the Graduate School of Engineering, Hokkaido University." *Higher Education and Lifelong Learning*, 15, 2007, pp.155-162.
- Margić, B., D., & Vodopija-Krstanović, I. "English as threat or opportunity in European higher education." In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015, pp.19-42.
- MEXT. "*Daigaku ni okeru kyooiku kaikaku no naiyoo nado no kaikaku jyookyoo ni tsuite*. [About the reform progress of university education and others]." 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/20/06/08061617.htm> on Augst 16, 2017.
- MEXT. "Global 30 Project-Establishing University Network for Internationalization-." n.d. Retrieved from <<http://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/highered/title02/detail02/sdetail02/1373894.htm>> on March 1, 2018.
- Pulcini, V., & Campagna, S. "Introducing EMI at a Croatian university: can we bridge the gap between global emerging trends and local challenges?" In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015, pp.43-64.
- Shima et al. "*Daigaku kyooiku kaikaku no jittai no haaku oyobi bunnseki ni kannsuru choosa kenkyuu. Jigyoo hookusho*. [A research study on the understanding and analysis of the state of university education reform: The project report]." 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/itaku/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2015/01/22/1347633_01_1.pdf> on Augst 16, 2017.
- Toth, J. & Paulsrud, B. "Translanguaging practices and perspectives: Case studies from English-medium instruction in Swedish schools." Paper presented at American Association for Applied Linguistics 2016 Annual Conference, April 9-12, Hilton Orlando, Orlando, Florida, U.S.A., 2016.
- Vila, F. X., & Bretxa, V. *Language policy in higher education: The case of medium-sized languages* (Vol. 158). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2014.
- Vu, N. T., & Burns, A. "English as a medium of instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese tertiary lecturers." *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(3), 2014, pp. 1-31.
- Yukawa, E. "Use of the first language in an undergraduate English-medium seminar course: An EMI case in a Japanese context." *Studies in Mother Tongue, Heritage Language, and Bilingual Education*, 12, 2016. pp.40-76.

日本の大学における英語開講科目に対する現地学生の見方

YUKAWA Emiko (Professor, College of Letters, Ritsumeikan University)

HORIE Miki (Professor, International Education, Ritsumeikan University)

要 旨

日本の大学では、政府主導の国際化政策の一環として、英語での科目開講（EMI）を推進している。本稿は関西の私立大学での EMI 実践に関する小規模な研究である。本研究は EMI 科目を履修している地元（日本人）学生の、EMI の見方について調べた。147 名の学部生（70 名の小集団演習クラスの履修者と 77 名の講義クラスの履修者）が参加した。2016 年の 1 月と 6 月に行った質問紙調査では、学生の背景情報の他、授業の理解度など受講に関する学生自身の見方について尋ねた。分析の結果、学生の EMI 科目についての見方はおおむね好意的で、クラス形態（演習と講義）によって差があることが分かった。EMI 科目を履修したいという気持ちは科目の理解だけでなく、自信やさらに英語学習をしたいという動機などの心理的要因の状況と関係があることも分かった。こうした結果から、小集団演習クラスという形態で英語開講科目を提供することの利点や、どのように学生の心理的要因に配慮すべきかを今後さらに検討することが示唆される。また、今後、現地在住学生のみでなく、外国人学生、その教員を含む、さらなる量的質的研究が必要である。

キーワード

英語科目開講、国際化、日本の高等教育、L1 使用、

