



CLIL-ised EMI in practice: issues arising

Balbina Moncada-Comas and David Block

Departament d'Anglès i Lingüística, Universitat de Lleida, Lleida, Catalonia, Spain

ABSTRACT

In the shift to English-medium instruction (EMI) in European higher education, policy often runs ahead of research and curricular decisions are taken independent of evidence regarding their suitability for achieving broader educational goals, which may range from internationalisation as a general strategy to English language learning as a more specific one. Where English language learning is a goal, EMI may be said to have been *CLILised*, that is, it is adopted not only for content delivery, but also as a means through which students may improve their English language knowledge and skills. Drawing on interviews and classroom observations, and employing a Membership Categorization Analysis methodology, this paper examines how a lecturer in Agronomic engineering at a Catalan university, experiences *CLILised* EMI. It documents how the lecturer positions himself as a content lecturer and how categories are produced and negotiated in interviews and classroom practices. Among other things, the paper shows that while the lecturer refuses to inhabit an English language teacher identity, he nonetheless acts in this capacity when he focusses on vocabulary learning through the provision of glossaries and translation. These and other findings point to a more general disjuncture between policy and practice, which, it is argued, needs to be addressed by university administrators and EMI lecturers.

KEYWORDS

EMI (English-medium instruction); HE (higher education); multilingualism; teaching practice; policy issues

Q1

Introduction

Over the past two decades Catalan universities have followed a general trend in Spanish and European higher education, whereby an increasing number of university courses are taught using English as the medium of instruction (Dimova et al. 2015). This shift to English-medium instruction (EMI) may be seen as problematic for many reasons, not least because it forms part of more general internationalisation policies adopted by universities in order to make them more effective competitors for students in the worldwide higher education market. In this paper we will not focus on this aspect of EMI, important though it is (see Block 2018, for some thoughts on neoliberalism and its impact on education), as we direct our attention to the policy-to-practice issue of how EMI unfolds on the ground. In short, we are interested in how in many contexts, policy runs far ahead of research and curricular decisions are taken by university administrators before there is any evidence regarding the suitability of EMI in the context in which it is implemented, or independently of evidence showing that it actually works to achieve broader higher education goals such as internationalisation. This paper is a modest move towards remedying this policy-research disjuncture. It examines, in an exploratory manner, how Jaime (a pseudonym), a lecturer in Agronomic engineering at a Catalan university, experiences EMI. This examination is based on two types of data: (1) two interviews with the lecturer about his experiences of teaching content in English and (2) two classroom observations, which allowed researchers to analyse his actual EMI practices. The analysis of the interview data

and classroom observation notes and session transcriptions follows a Membership Categorization Analysis methodology, which aims to document how the lecturer views himself as a content lecturer teaching in English and how categories are produced and negotiated both in the interview and in his classroom teaching. Specifically, the paper seeks answers to the following research questions:

- (1) How does the practice of EMI affect how Jaime self-positions as a professional?
- (2) What are the self-reported teaching practices that he engages in?
- (3) How do these practices unfold in the classroom?
- (4) To what extent and how do these practices construct him as a particular type of EMI instructor?

The paper is organised as follows. In the next section, we provide some conceptual background, selectively examining relevant issues around Englishization in higher education, English medium instruction (EMI) and what we will call *CLILised* EMI. This done, we move to consider the research context and design, before discussing identity, positioning theory and finally, Membership Category Analysis, our main analytical framework. In the second half of the paper, we discuss our analyses of selected stretches of data from the interview and the classes observed. We end the paper with a consideration of what we have learned from our research, adding some general conclusions.

From EMI to *CLILised* EMI

It is now something of a truism to say that higher education institutions worldwide have undergone intensive processes of internationalisation over the past several decades (Ennew and Greenaway 2012; Law and Hoey 2017), where internationalisation is understood to be an explicit policy adopted by a university with the aim of increasing the number of alliances and agreements with universities based in different nation-states around the world. When it occurs outside of English-speaking countries, internationalisation also means *Englishisation*. In prosaic terms, Englishisation may be defined as the use of English in contexts where previously local languages were used. A key element of the Englishisation of HE institutions, and the one that most interests us here, is EMI. EMI is generally understood as the teaching of academic subjects in English in contexts where this language is not typically used for most day-to-day activities (Macaro et al. 2018).

In theory, EMI means that instead of using the language that they share with the majority of the students (or in some cases, all students), lecturers use English for both classroom management and the organisation and delivery of disciplinary content. Universities generally justify this policy as a way to attract international students and to facilitate communication where student bodies are linguistically diverse (Dearden and Macaro 2016). However, progressively EMI is being positioned as an opportunity for students to improve their English academic skills (Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés 2015), even if, as Dafouz (2018) notes, this objective is not made explicit by those responsible for course curricula and therefore exists with no content or pedagogical forethought. In our view, this application of EMI with English language learning as a key objective is based on a naïve theory of second language acquisition, according to which language learning takes place by osmosis, simply via exposure to content in English due to EMI's immersive nature. Here there seems to be an undeclared and relatively underdeveloped application of Stephen Krashen and Tracy Terrell's (1982) 'natural approach' to second language teaching, based on the former's theories of second language acquisition (e.g. Krashen 1981). The Natural Approach is an indirect, inductive methodology, that is, there is no explicit focus on grammar or lexis (and no error correction) as the provision of comprehensible input is deemed to be the key to the acquisition of language in a spontaneous and unconscious manner.

This shift to the inclusion of language learning as an aim of EMI means that EMI becomes *CLILised*. In effect, it becomes, at least partly, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), which Do Coyle, Peter Hood and David Marsh define as 'a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language (Coyle

et al. 2010: 1). It is worth adding here that when authors such as Coyle et al. say 'dual-focused', they have in mind a planned and well-coordinated fusion of content and language teaching and learning. In fact, as Airey (2016) has argued, 'it is a fallacy to think that content and language can be separated', and although EMI may be seen by some as being exclusively about content, 'content and language are inextricably entwined' (Airey 2016: 73). In this paper, we use the term *CLILised* EMI to capture this notion, that EMI is a site for both content and language learning.

Research background

As indicated above, the key informant in this paper is Jaime, an Agronomic engineering lecturer. Specifically, we examine a 15-week BSc-level course on swine production that he taught in English in spring 2017. Over the 15 weeks, there were two class sessions per week, and each session lasted two hours. A total of 26 students (20 national students, bilingual in Catalan and Spanish, and 6 international students) were enrolled in the course. Here we focus on two interviews with Jaime, conducted in Spanish and carried out on 7 March 2017 and 29 January 2018, as well as class sessions which were simultaneously observed by the researchers (who took field notes) and video recorded on 2 March and 17 March 2017, using a fixed camera situated at the back of the classroom.

As regards the presentation of interview excerpts and class excerpts, we have followed a simplified set of transcription conventions that capture basic essential aspects of spoken language while not impeding readability. We have proceeded in this manner because we are doing content analysis in this paper and therefore a lot of detail about how speech was processed is not necessary. The conventions we have used by can be found in appendix 1. It is also worth noting that for reasons of space, we present only the English translation of interview excerpts. These translations were carried out by the authors, both of whom are fully proficient in English, Spanish and Catalan.

From the interviews and other contacts with Jaime, we learn that he is a bilingual speaker of Spanish and Catalan and in his first interview he commented that he had always enjoyed languages, seeing them as enriching. He uses English mainly to write academic articles and to present conference papers, seeing it as an important tool for his professional future. His experience as an English lecturer started out of personal curiosity and as he explains matters, it was not a requirement from the university but an option that he took up. He has been a lecturer for 5 years now and at the time of the research had been an EMI lecturer for three years. Of interest here is how Jaime talks about himself with regard to his EMI experiences, namely as a teacher of content and not as a teacher of English. His one and only function is to ensure that students understand and learn disciplinary knowledge, and any English language learning that occurs is regarded as incidental. Above all, he is not conscious of ever employing teaching strategies aimed at language learning.

From this background information about Jaime, we move to examine certain features of EMI in action, based on observations and field notes and transcriptions of the two video-recorded classes. This database allowed us privileged access to several issues arising. One such issue is the relative weight of the three languages used during classes (English, Spanish and Catalan). In particular, it is interesting to see how English is used and not used, how much English is used as opposed to Spanish and Catalan during classes. This focus leads us to consider how interactions were initiated and maintained by students with the teacher and whether the teacher used Spanish and Catalan on occasion or worked exclusively in English. Another related phenomenon is translation, in particular episodes of solicited or unsolicited translation.¹ Indeed, one point discussed in the second interview with Jaime was why he seemed to use translation as a teaching strategy. Finally, there is the need to consider what all of these patterns of behaviour actually mean in EMI classes, and ultimately how through his talk *about* his teaching and his talk *in* his teaching, Jaime constructs a particular EMI lecturer in identity.

It should be noted at this juncture that our research has been carried out in a university in which EMI exists in practice but not in policy, as there are no official university documents which outline in

detail the precise *what, why and how* of this practice. What we do find, via formal and informal contacts with university administrators, is the general assumption that EMI must exist as a natural extension of the university's internationalisation policy. There is, therefore, a policy in word but not deed, which means that there is no formal guidance for EMI lecturers who, in turn, are left to get on with their EMI teaching as best they can. We will come back to this lack of planning and oversight of EMI later in this paper.

Identity, positioning theory and membership category analysis

In our data analysis, we adopt a broadly poststructuralist approach to identity, which is based on the work of scholars in social theory and sociology from the 1980s onwards (Block 2013). This approach understands identities (in plural to indicate the multiplicity of the phenomenon) to be socio-culturally constructed ongoing narratives, which develop and evolve across different spatio-temporal scales, ranging from the micro, local and immediate to the macro, global and long-term. These socio-culturally constructed narratives are based on both self-inhabited and other-ascribed categorizations, around identity inscriptions such as gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, sexuality, religion, age and social class. In this paper, we are primarily concerned with self-inhabited and other-ascribed categorizations related to teacher identities, which may be understood as how

individuals, who both self-position and are positioned by others as teachers, affiliate to different aspects of teaching in their lives [, such as] ... ongoing contacts with fellow teachers and students, as well as the tasks that ... [they] engage[...] in, which can be said to constitute teaching. (Block 2015: 13)

Our understanding of positioning is derived from Positioning Theory (hereafter PT), developed by Rom Harré and his colleagues from the 1980s onwards. According to Davies and Harré (1999: 37), '[p]ositioning is the discursive process whereby people are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced storylines'. By 'discursive process', the authors mean individuals' day-to-day participation in communicative events involving one or more other individuals. Elsewhere, Harré (2004: 4) explains that PT also entails 'the study of the way rights and duties are taken up and laid down, ascribed and appropriated, refused and defended in the fine grain of the encounters of daily lives'.

Our primary interest here is how Jaime positions himself as an EMI lecturer via his categorisation of events and experiences in terms of who he is and what he does. For this reason we have found Membership Category Analysis (MCA) of use as a means of data analysis. MCA has roots going back to the 1960s, when Harvey Sacks (see Sacks 1992) first turned his attention to how individuals make sense of their social identities, that is, how they understand, associate and categorise (classify) the social world around them by making use of social categories and cultural associations (Paulsen 2018). From this perspective, spoken data provides 'instances of locally achieved sense-making where people rel[y] upon common-sense social knowledge and engaged in practical theorising' (Housley and Fitzgerald 2015: 4).

The key concepts in membership categorisation are *device, category and category-bound activity* (CBA) and *category-bound predicate* (CBP) (Housley and Fitzgerald 2015). A device serves to collect and organise categories, where a category is understood as a reference to persons or things. For example, in this paper a certain category 'English-teacher' is associated with the device 'type of teacher'. In addition, the category itself activates certain expectations about the activities and predicates related to it, such as levels of linguistic knowledge or teaching strategies used in class. And further to this, category-bound predicates and activities are 'a kind of stock knowledge-in action ... which involves common-sense knowledge about the world and how social categories are expected or assumed to act in general and in particular situations' (Housley and Fitzgerald 2015: 8). The difference between CBA and CBP is that while CBAs are about doing, referring to the activities associated to categories, CBPs are about being, referring to 'the invocation of rights, obligations, knowledge, attributes, entitlements, etc' (Roca-Cuberes 2008: 548). Meanwhile, categories are not

always explicitly and unambiguously stated and can be 'less explicit, less direct, where the speakers themselves produce a category where the upshot is beautifully and artfully implied' (Rapley 2012: 324). Ultimately, MCA analysis is interested not so much in how categories are named in interaction but how individuals engaged in interaction construct categories with predicates and activities, resulting in social categories used in a particular context.

This paper focuses on how categories are produced and negotiated between the interviewers and the interviewee (Jaime) in order to understand what activities and predicates the lecturer attributes to his identity as an EMI-lecturer. The analysis focuses on the prospect of an English-teacher identity emergent in his experience as an EMI-lecturer. In the following sections, we explore how Jaime orients his discourse towards two specific membership category devices (MCDs), 'types of teachers' and 'types of subjects'.

Jaime's self-positioning as a professional and his self-reported teaching practices

In his first interview, Jaime often talked about his characteristics as a content lecturer who teaches in English at a university level, which he contrasted with the properties and actions that he assigned to an English teacher profile. In the following excerpt from our first interview with Jaime, he responds to a question about whether or not his classes in English are likely to lead students to obtain a Common European Framework Reference for Languages (CEFR) B2 level in English, the Catalan government's notional exit level for all university graduates (Generalitat de Catalunya 2016).²

JAI: no but yes/these four months they are/although in a very intense way ... flooded with English terms/not grammar/because we don't do grammar/and we butcher the language [laughing]/but you have to do something else/it's like when watching television in English right?/well it's not that you learn anything in particular/but that contact right? (Jaime, interview 1, 7 March 2017)

Here Jaime states that although students are 'flooded' with English terms, there is no grammar because he doesn't *do* grammar and they, lecturer and students, 'butcher the language'. These comments are reminiscent of those produced by the lecturers in Airey's (2011, 2012) research on EMI in Sweden, and amount to the simple claim of 'I don't teach language'. As in Airey's research, Jaime does not consider teaching language as one of his professional responsibilities (or in PT terms, duties) because language does not appear explicitly as the goal in disciplinary content subjects. We have labelled this type of teacher 'EMI content lecturer' (within the MCD 'types of teachers') based on the way he describes his content classes in English. This type of lecturer is constructed by Jaime as performing the following CBAs: 'we flood students with English terms', 'we don't do grammar', and 'we butcher the language'. The main characteristic of EMI content lecturers is that they can make mistakes because the goal is not grammar or language accuracy, but terminology. Apart from categorising himself as an EMI content lecturer, at the end of the excerpt he also categorises the subject he is teaching, 'EMI subject' (within the MCD 'type of subjects'). One of the CBAs assigned to this category is that the subject is not designed to 'learn anything in particular', by which we assume he means English language. The second CBA is that the subject provides students a 'contact' with the English language, much like watching television in English does. This type of disciplinary subject taught in English helps students stay in touch with the language but the aim is not to teach them specific rules about how the language itself works.

In the next interview excerpt, Jaime continues assigning activities and predicates to the already mentioned categories, as two new categories are introduced:

JAI: in the teaching guide the assignment is listed/what I don't/I mean/I don't yet have the training to know skills/I guess you mean oral communication written communication/yes then it would be oral communication/a minimum oral communication/and then a minimum written comprehension/because the exams will then be in English too/

INT1: okay comprehension/

JAI: they have to/

INT1: and production maybe?/

- JAI: no/I'm going to try to make it so they hardly have to write in English/I mean the exams will be/
 INT1: why not then?/ ... /
 JAI: because I don't really have the training/to be able to correct eh/or to know when it's *may should* or an
 255 *ought to*/I think that's the job of you/I mean people who really have a superior linguistic knowledge/but I
 don't know if I'm doing things the right way eh?/
 INT1: there is no formula/what do you think would be the formula so that the student/finished the subject of/
 so well/receiving this *feedback* on this *should* or *may* that you are talking about right?
 JAI: of course in that case/yes I do/what I've told them is I'm not going to do/to correct anything of their
 English/and they only have to use use/I mean that they use English that they can understand/the
 260 English that is being communicated/ and that they know how to transmit a little
 INT: okay
 JAI: but without going beyond that/without going into the grammar/
 INT1: you mean the goal is comprehension right?/the goal is comprehension
 INT2: and as for the part that's production/that would be in a class of English/a class of English/
 JAI: yes/
 INT2: grammar would be working on/lexis/
 265 JAI: yes/
 INT2: the pronunciation/and you concentrate on lexis especially right?/ because that's where/
 JAI: I concentrate on lexis/but of course that's because pronunciation/ ... /I also have my deficits/and then it
 also depends on the source you go to/so in a video I see that an American pronounces it one way/ you go
 to the video of a British person/and then yes/there are basic things that/
 INT2: right right/
 270 JAI: but I don't/I don't feel ABLE to correct anyone/aspects of pronunciation/
 INT2: okay/
 INT1: why do you think there is ... a single way of saying it ... correctly?/
 JAI: NO no no/ ... /I know that there are many ways/ ... /but I understand that/well with my training/I can't do
 much/ (Jaime, interview 1, 7 March 2017)

275 Here we see how on several occasions Jaime repeats that he does not have enough professional
 training in English to teach it. A new CBP is therefore assigned to the category 'EMI content lecturer' –
 'not having the training yet' in language. Also, the category 'EMI subject' is further developed by the
 attribution of new CBAs: it requires 'a minimum oral communication' and it requires 'a minimum
 written comprehension' meaning that students will not be required to have high skills in terms of
 280 speaking and reading. In fact, the 'EMI subject' is also attributed the CBA 'hardly have to write in
 English', since the lecturer will not require students to develop their writing skills, given that this is
 not a subject requirement. Again, Jaime justifies this decision by returning to the same CBP that
 he has 'no training' in language and therefore he will not correct students, even raising his voice
 for emphasis: 'I don't feel ABLE to correct anyone'. Here we are reminded of Airey's (2012: 74) lecturers
 285 who stated that they 'would not feel comfortable correcting students' English'. As an EMI content
 lecturer, Jaime is 'not going to correct anything of their English' and he is not 'going into the grammar',
 given that he does not know the difference between the modal verbs 'may', 'should' or 'ought to'.
 Indeed, dealing with such a distinction would be an activity belonging to the category of the
 'English teacher' and he does not situate himself in that category.

290 Jaime positions himself as EMI lecturer in opposition to the interviewers, both of whom have back-
 ground in English language teaching, referring to them as 'you', assigning to this category the CBP
 'having superior linguistic knowledge'. He follows this statement with an apologetic comment
 about his English abilities – 'I also have my deficits' and so he is not sure if he is 'doing things the
 right way', to which one of the interviewers responds with the encouraging comment – 'there is
 295 no formula ... what do you think would be the formula?'. The recurring CBP that Jaime has no
 specific training in language appears again and then he assigns two new CBAs to 'EMI subject': 'it
 doesn't include grammar', 'it focuses on comprehension', it requires only 'to know how to transmit
 a little', without clearly stating what this minimum requirement refers to. The second interviewer
 then assigns to the category of 'English subject' the CBAs: 'focused on production', 'do grammar,
 300 lexis and pronunciation'. On the other hand, the 'EMI content lecturer' category is assigned by the
 interviewer the CBA 'concentrate on lexis'. The excerpt ends with the recurring CBP that Jaime

does not have training in language by attributing to the ‘EMI content lecturer’ category the CBAs: ‘with my training (in English) I can’t do much’ and ‘not able to correct aspects of pronunciation’. Jaime emphasises again the fact that his training in English is not enough to make him feel comfortable dealing with linguistic matters, such as grammar, syntax and phonology, let alone acting as a model for students. In this sense, his EMI lecturer identity is in conflict with his potential English teacher identity, which, as we see, is an identity to which he does not affiliate. In Table 1 below, we summarise the CBAs and CBPs arising in the first interview with Jaime.

EMI in action: Jaime’s classroom teaching

Taking into account Jaime’s self-positioning as an EMI content lecturer and the MCDs identified in his speech, we now move to an analysis of the practices and patterns of linguistic behaviour taking place in the classroom that reproduce and reflect the teacher identity and MCDs that arose in the pre-interview. The first issue arising is the relative weight of the three languages used during classes -English, Spanish and Catalan. In particular, it is interesting to see how English is used and not used; and to what extent English is used as opposed to Spanish and Catalan. Following Glen Levine’s (2011) case study of two language classes aiming to answer ‘who speaks what, to whom, and in what contexts?’ (Levine 2011: 85), we developed a descriptive picture of ‘how much’ L1 and L2 were used in the EMI class. In his research, Levine did not aim to achieve a completely accurate recording of all language choices made by the lecturer and students on a moment-to-moment basis; rather, the goal of the analysis was to provide a brief appraisal that would equip him with enough information to make inferences from the observed practices of fairly ‘typical’ classes. In our research, we have worked in a similar fashion with similar aims.

We observed the video of the first classroom and took notes every 30 seconds, resulting in two charts per minute. With a total of 51 minutes with 2 charts per minute, we obtained 102 readings. Following Levine’s observational chart with some modifications, we kept the variables of interlocutors, function and code choice. These variables were converted into three questions we needed to answer every 30 seconds: *who is talking to whom?* (constellation of interlocutors), *is language used for content or language teaching?* (function) and *what code/s is/are used?* (code choice). Similar to Levine, we found dual code use to ‘mean either (1) an individual speaker was using two or more languages in an utterance or exchange or (2) both languages were being used by multiple individuals

Table 1. Summary of MCDs, categories, CBAs and CBPs.

MCD	Categories	CBAs/CBPs
Types of teachers	EMI content lecturer	‘we flood students with English terms’ ‘we don’t do grammar’ ‘we butcher the language’ ‘we don’t have training in language’ ‘we don’t go into grammar’ ‘we are not going to correct anything of their English’ ‘we concentrate on lexis’ ‘we have deficits [in language]’ ‘we are not able to correct aspects of pronunciation’ ‘we can’t do much’ [in terms of language] ‘they have superior linguistic knowledge’
Types of subjects	English teacher EMI subject	‘it is not designed to learn anything specific’ [about language] ‘it provides a contact with the English language to students’ ‘it requires a minimum oral communication’ ‘it requires a minimum written comprehension’ ‘it hardly requires to write in English’ ‘it doesn’t include grammar’ ‘it requires to transmit a little bit’ ‘it focuses on comprehension’
	English-language subject	‘it focuses on production’ ‘it does grammar, lexis and pronunciation’

at that moment' (Levine 2011: 87). Focusing on the first class, we found that the predominant language was the L2, English, which occupied 75% of class time. Still, there are instances in which both Jaime and the students change language as both English and Spanish (dual code) were heard 19.1% of the time, and Spanish only was used 5.9% of the time. This is not surprising given that we are, after all, talking about an EMI class. However, it is an EMI class where English dominates with a distinction. If we focus only on the lecturer, we observe that Jaime for the most part monopolises classroom discourse, accounting for 80.3% of all talk. When he is talking to the whole class or expecting a choral response the code that dominates is English, with only a 0.7% of L1 and 15.2% of dual code. However, when he speaks directly to students, use of the L1 increases to a 7% and 10.5% English, respectively.

One drawback in this mode of analysis is the focus on the lecturer's use of language and not the class as a whole. Nevertheless, if Levine found that 'in the classes recorded, students did not actually talk very much overall (in either language)' (Levine 2011: 73), so too in the classes observed here students were, on the whole, not very active linguistically. And while researchers' field notes did make reference to instances of students talking amongst themselves, as they attempted to follow and understand new concepts, these conversations almost always occurred in their L1s (Catalan and Spanish). Actually, one of the most memorable comments from one researcher's field notes was: 'In a class like this one, students can get away with speaking not a word of English'. In this sense, this EMI classroom does not seem to offer much in the way of opportunities to practise spoken English.

Exploring language use in this way allows the documentation of switches between and among the three languages, as well as the identification of patterns of behaviour and their possible meanings. During the class we observed on March 2, Jaime switches from English into Spanish in order to ensure a full understanding of what he is explaining:

SF4: but only the lysine?/

JAI: no only amino acids/only amino acids/we took lysine because it's the first ... amino acid/but this was an example **entendéis?/el calentamiento de algunos procesos de de fabricación de ingredientes para piensos afecta negativamente/y hay que considerar esa pérdida** {do you understand?/the heating involved in some of manufacturing processes of feed ingredients has a negative effect/and we have to bear this loss in mind}/ okay?/we have to take into account this this loss/it's very important/
(class excerpt, 2 March 2017)

Jaime does not stigmatise the use of L1s in class and he himself resorts to their use because he sees some pedagogical value in doing so. This L1 use extends to translation, which may be solicited or unsolicited. In his research on CLIL programmes at universities in Italy, Costa (2012) found that lecturers made use of pre-emptive focus on form (FonF), showing 'some degree of linguistic interest and awareness' (2012: 30). In his research, Costa adopts a different and more narrowly constrained view of FonF than that found in mainstream second language acquisition research,³ defining it 'as the level of attention to language on the part of lecturers of scientific subjects teaching through English' (Costa 2012: 31). He identifies four types of FonF: lexical pre-emptive FonF, grammatical pre-emptive FonF, typographical input enhancement and codeswitching. The two that interest us here are lexical pre-emptive FonF and codeswitching. Lexical pre-emptive FonF occurs when the lecturer believes that students will have difficulties with new lexical items and makes a conscious move to explain these items in order to avoid these difficulties. Meanwhile, codeswitching is understood as the moving back and forth between the L1 and the L2. In our study of Jaime's teaching, we see that he combines lexical pre-emptive FonF and codeswitching as he translates terminology.⁴

We can see in classroom practices that Jaime's focus is on lexis: for example, he mentioned in his first interview that he only translates terminology related to the topic of the lesson. Interestingly enough, when he translates vocabulary, Jaime can be said to be taking on, even if minimally, the role of English language teacher, as he is, in effect, teaching vocabulary. The paradox, however, is that he becomes an English teacher specifically when he goes off script and uses the students'

L1s. Throughout the class, Jaime uses unsolicited translation of lexical terms showing that his interest is in students knowing the terminology in English and in Spanish. In fact, in the first class, there are 18 instances of unsolicited translations and only 3 instances of solicited translation by the students. The following excerpt shows Jaime in translating mode:

JAI: yes there are/it's a/it's a list of ten words/ten/well words/or well/you have the video but it could be okay that you/ ... /then we have to construct the floor slab okay?/the and manure pit/**los las fosas de purín lo veis?** {the the manure pits you see?}/these two were the floors okay?/floor slab and manure pit which are the/**las fosas vale?** {the pits okay?}/manure pit/ ... /pre-cast floors or slabs as well/ ...)above manure pit/ ... /then we have to install the trusses/**los pórticos** {the trusses}/okay?/the trusses below the roof okay?/trusses/the roof or the parallel roof sheets/which are **las correas de: de la cubierta** {the sheets of: of the roof}/ ... /sometimes not usually there are drop ceilings okay?/below the roof there are drop ceilings/but this is more common in poultry than in swine okay?/ drop ceilings **sería un falso techo techo** {would be a false ceiling}/ ... /**vale un forjado** {okay a slab}/ ... /then we have the automatic feeding systems we have to/to install the automatic feeding systems/ ... /which receive feed from the feed bins/**los silos vale?** {the feed bins okay?}/

(class excerpt, 2 March 2017)

Somewhat surprisingly, one of the few instances of student-solicited translation leads Jaime to respond that there is actually no need to translate all the words but just the most important ones:

SF7: but slab what's that?/
JAI: is **la/la solera la** {the/the flooring the}/ ... /not all the words are necessary to/just the most important/ ... /for the slabs here they say pre-cast floors/but anyway it doesn't matter the/
SM17: is the same as a slab?/
JAI: **sí sí sí** {yes yes yes}/

(class excerpt, 2 March 2017)

However, he had already provided translations for words such as *walls* or *columns*, which contradicts his stated policy that he only translates highly-specific technical words related to the topic. The translation of these common words also contrasts with the fact that he then encourages students to focus only on the most important words:

JAI: an area before the construction/then we have to make columns okay?/**los pilares** {the columns}/then build walls/**las paredes** {the walls}/okay can you write down please the words?

(class excerpt, 2 March 2017)

In a second interview carried out ten months after the observation of his classes, Jaime was asked to think about his language use, specifically the use of translation. In response, he said that he needed to translate vocabulary because *he* is the one who needs the L1 word so as to conceptualise the term in his mind. Thus, translation is not just beneficial for the students, as it also helps the lecturer to teach disciplinary knowledge:

JAI: yeah/because/ ... /for me/I mean I always need to translate them/that's something that sometimes those of you who are like that/of English/no you don't need to translate everything/but maybe everything/not everything/but you need the tra-/or at least I need it/and now we have it there on Google/ (Jaime, interview 2, 29 January 2018)

A third issue arising in our data is linguistic *creativity* occurring during classes. In the pre-interview, Jaime stated that he and the students 'butcher the language', and in our examination of interactions taking place during classes, we found a few instances where this could be seen to be the case. For example, in the second class, he says '*due to presion of water*', which we assumed was meant to be 'due to water pressure'. Because the majority of students – the local ones – share with Jaime full competence in Spanish and Catalan, we would assume that they can infer the meaning of the expression, as uttered by Jaime, given that in Spanish and Catalan it would be *presión de agua* and *pressió d'aigua*, respectively. What we do not know is what the six students who did not share this linguistic profile with Jaime made of such phrasing.

On another occasion, Jaime appeared to invent of a new term 'brench':

JAI: the majority of of pig buildings/especialy those for/ .../recently/ .../pigs/ those for lactating sows must be environmentally controlled here/ you have the minim/ .../the brench for temperatures/the recommended temperatures for/for pigs in the the different/in the different areas

(class excerpt, 7 March 2017)

Here the word 'brench' would appear to be 'benchmark'. However, while *presión*, used in the previous example, is a cognate and therefore easily understood, it is uncertain to what extent students could deduce that by 'brench' the lecturer meant benchmark. In this case, the Spanish and Catalan translations (*punto de referencia* and *punt de referència*, respectively) bear no resemblance to the English word. Once again, we do not know what the six non-local students made of this. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that this particular kind of creativity, in effect word invention, may be seen as problematic if EMI lecturers are expected by university administrators and/or students to act as linguistic role models.

Discussion and conclusion

In the second half of this paper, we first focused on an interview with Jaime, in which he clearly positioned himself as an EMI content teacher, while providing details about the teaching practices he uses in the EMI classroom. We then examined excerpts from two full class transcriptions, as well as field notes taken by researchers during real-time observations. These observations were carried out with a view to seeing if the practices Jaime mentioned in the interview actually came to life in EMI in practice. We have therefore managed not only to examine how Jaime self-positions in terms of membership categories but also how these categories materialise in his EMI classes. Further to this, we examined how, in a second interview carried out several months later, he was able to reflect on and make sense of events.

With regard to research question (1) – How does the practice of EMI affect how Jaime self-positions as a professional? – we have seen throughout this paper how Jaime is not comfortable with the category English teacher as part of being an EMI lecturer, showing a certain alignment with the informants in Airey's (2011, 2012) research in Sweden. Jaime repeatedly categorised himself as a specialist in disciplinary knowledge and so his duty towards students was to teach subject content, but not English. A recurring theme in both interviews is that he does not believe that he has a full command of the English language and because of this, he does not address language issues in class. His identity as an EMI lecturer is in conflict with a potential English teacher identity, the latter being an identity he does not affiliate to because he does not consider teaching language as part of his EMI-lecturer identity.

With regard to research question (2) – What are the self-reported teaching practices that he engages in? – and research question (3) – How do these practices unfold in the classroom? – we see on multiple occasions the use of the L1s shared by Jaime and his students, Spanish and Catalan. In addition, we have noted how Jaime assigns a pedagogical value to translation strategies, translating highly specific words as well as common words. During the two classes analysed, there are a total of 25 unsolicited translations and 8 instances of solicited translation. This tendency in favour of unsolicited translation suggests that Jaime may think that students are not competent enough in English to follow an English-only class. In this scenario, he uses translation to secure students' attention, maintain communication and ensure the comprehension of disciplinary knowledge. However, in the second interview, during which Jaime was asked to reflect on such practices, he seemed to question their pedagogical purpose when he said that *he* was the one who needed the translation. In this case, translation does not come across as well-thought-out or well-planned pedagogical strategy. Nevertheless, in learner logs collected from students after each class, students did not complain about the use of unsolicited translation or the presence of the L1s. Thus, even if they are not well-planned, these practices would appear to have some pedagogical value, or in any case, they are acceptable in the emergent culture of Jaime's EMI classes.

With regard to question (4) – To what extent and how do these practices construct Jaime as a particular type of EMI instructor? – we see that he is an EMI lecturer who uses his L1s and translation as teaching strategies aimed at facilitating the comprehension of key concepts. However, he also engages in these L1-based practices because, as he explains in his interviews, he is very conscious of the fact that he is a non-native user of English. Jaime talks down his competence in English, a language he clearly does not see as a mediator of who he *really is*, despite the fact that he devotes a substantial amount of his time doing things in English – reading, writing, giving talks at conferences, and, of course, teaching. In doing so, he effectively denies himself what Bourdieu identified as two key aspects of linguistic competence, ‘the capacity to command a listener’ and ‘the right to impose reception’ (Bourdieu 1977: 648). In this sense, we need to ask ourselves if EMI does not, in some cases, represent a site in which lecturers, perfectly competent professionals when teaching in their L1s, experience what we might call ‘role diminishment’. Here role is understood as ‘a social position a person holds in a larger social structure, considers self-descriptive, and enacts in a role relationship with at least one other person’ (Owens et al. 2010: 479) and diminishment refers to those instances when an individual feels out of his/her depth or simply uncomfortable in a context in which he/she has normally felt both competent and important. A key issue arising here is the extent to which Jaime, and indeed other EMI lecturers, find that their social position as content lecturers is somehow compromised as a result of teaching in English. More research exploring this prospect is surely called for.

Ultimately, if lecturers like Jaime do not take on the role of English teachers, then the CLILised nature of EMI – the *de facto* policy of the university in the absence of any formal policy – is questioned as the lecturers do not see EMI as an opportunity to address discipline-specific language communication and so develop students’ linguistic competence in their disciplines. As Mancho-Barés and Arnó-Macià (2017) note, one action that may be taken by universities in response to this situation is to offer of CLIL methodology courses for EMI lecturers, which can serve the purpose of encouraging the integration of content and language. However, they point out that if these courses are not part of an official shift in university policy, towards what they call ‘full-fledged (sic) CLIL’, then said integration is likely to be piecemeal ‘in the hands of content lecturers alone’ (Mancho-Barés and Arnó-Macià 2015: 276).

Although the implementation of CLILised EMI is based on the notion that English language learning will incidentally result from the study of content in this language and on the casual explicit teaching of content terminology, lecturers still do not recognise that they have any responsibility for students’ English-language proficiency as English teachers. In her study of engineering lecturers’ beliefs about their teaching goals regarding CLIL and EMI, Aguilar (2017: 732) found that ‘perceived teaching duties are content-specific and language free, because self-assessed English is insufficient’. While this statement would appear to apply to Jaime, we observe how Jaime assumes, albeit very slightly, the role of English teacher. This occurs above all when he places a great deal of emphasis on vocabulary learning through explicit and direct focus by means of translation strategies. This interest in vocabulary learning from the present study has also been documented in Aguilar (2017) and Pecorari et al. (2011). Nevertheless, as Hüttner et al. (2013: 277) point out, ‘it does remain a little unclear, however, where teachers draw the distinction between vocabulary learning and learning new concepts’.

In conclusion, this paper provides much food-for-thought on how the absence of clearly articulated EMI policy on the part of the university and Jaime’s understanding of his role as an EMI lecturer (but not a language lecturer) together have an impact on classroom practices. In the scenario examined here, English is used to *communicate* and to transmit disciplinary knowledge, but it is not seen as the main objective, or even co-objective, of classes taught, which leaves considerable space for learning opportunities to be bypassed and for EMI, framed here as CLILised EMI, not to achieve its potential. Not for the first time, we see that what happens on the ground differs considerably from what EMI organisers and administrators have in mind, an example of how policy all too often runs ahead of research (Dafouz 2018). Overall, a far-from-ideal picture of EMI in action is obtained,

although more research of the kind we are currently carrying out is needed if we are to fill out this picture, on the way to proposing possible remedies for the problems identified.

Notes

1. While solicited translation refers to when students explicitly and overtly ask for the translation of an explanation or of a term – be it a technical or a common word – unsolicited translation occurs when the lecturer provides the translation without being asked for it.
2. A person with a B2 level will be able to understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization [...] ... interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party [...] and] produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options. (Council of Europe 2018, npn)
3. For example, in a recent critical discussion of FonF in SLA, Rod Ellis (2016) notes how it has always been about drawing learners' attention to linguistic forms whilst they engage in meaning-making activities (tasks), as opposed to the more traditional focus on forms (FonFs) whereby linguistic forms are taught explicitly and in isolation from meaning-making activities.
4. Here we follow Costa in his use of codeswitching, although we might equally have used 'translanguaging' as the currently more widespread term of use to refer to multilingual acts of communication and meaning making (see Garcí'a and Wei 2014).

Acknowledgements

We thank Guzman Mancho, Marta Aguilar, Maria Sabaté and Sarah Khan for their feedback on earlier drafts of this paper. We also thank the anonymous reviewers and the editor of *Language Learning Journal*, Norbert Pachler, for their helpful comments. Obviously, any remaining deficiencies are attributable to the authors exclusively. The data discussed in this paper are from the project entitled *Towards an empirical assessment of the impact of English medium instruction at university: language learning, disciplinary knowledge and academic identities* (ASSEMID). The project was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (*El Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad* - MINECO), code FFI2016-76383-P. 30 December 2016–29 December 2019.

Disclosure statement

Q8 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

Q2 The project was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (El Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad - MINECO), code FFI2016-76383-P. 30 December 2016–29 December 2019.

Q9 References

- Aguilar, M. 2017. Engineering lecturers' view on CLIL and EMI. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20: 722–35.
- Airey, J. 2011. Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. *Ibérica* 22: 35–54.
- Airey, J. 2012. 'I don't teach language': the linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden. *AILA Review* 25: 64–79.
- Airey, J. 2016. EAP, EMI or CLIL? In *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, ed. K. Hyland and P. Shaw, 71–83. London: Routledge.
- Arnó-Macià, E. and G. Mancho-Barés. 2015. The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: challenges and implication for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes* 37: 63–73.
- Block, D. 2013. Issues in language and identity research in applied linguistics. *Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada* 13: 11–46.
- Block, D. 2015. Becoming a language teacher: constraints and negotiation in the emergence of new identities. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature* 8: 9–26.
- Block, D. 2018. *Political Economy in Sociolinguistics: Neoliberalism, Inequality and Social Class*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Bourdieu, P. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Sciences Information* 16, no. 6: 645–68.
- Costa, F. 2012. Focus on form in ICLHE lecturers in Italy. Evidence from English-medium science lecturers by native speakers of Italian. *AILA Review* 25: 30–47.
- Council of Europe. 2018. *Global Scale - Table 1 (CEFR 3.3): Common Reference Levels*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/table-1-cefr-3.3-common-reference-levels-global-scale> (accessed 15 May 2018).
- Coyle, D., P. Hood and D. Marsh. 2010. *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dafouz, E. 2018. English-medium instruction in multilingual university settings: an opportunity for developing language awareness. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language Awareness*, ed. P. Garret and J.M. Cots, 170–85. London: Routledge.
- Davies, B. and R. Harré. 1999. Positioning: the discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20, no. 1: 43–63.
- Dearden, J. and E. Macaro. 2016. Higher education teacher's attitudes towards English medium instruction. A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 6: 455–86.
- Dimova, S., A.K. Hultgren and C. Jensen, eds. 2015. *English Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ellis, R. 2016. Focus on form: a critical review. *Language Teaching Research* 20, no. 3: 405–28.
- Ennew, C.T. and D. Greenaway, eds. 2012. *The Globalization of Higher Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O. and L. Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Generalitat de Catalunya, Departament de Cultura. 2016. *Informe de política lingüística*. http://llengua.gencat.cat/web/content/documents/informepl/arxiu/IPL2016_web.pdf (accessed 15 June 2018).
- Harré, R. 2004. Positioning theory. www.massey.ac.nz/~alock/virtual/positioning.doc/ (accessed 10 September 2018).
- Housley, W. and R. Fitzgerald. 2015. Introduction to membership categorisation analysis. In *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis*, ed. R. Fitzgerald and W. Housley, 1–22. London: Sage.
- Hüttner, J., C. Dalton-Puffer and U. Smit. 2013. The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16, no. 3: 267–84.
- Krashen, S. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. and T. Terrell. 1982. *The Natural Approach*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Law, D. and M. Hoey, eds. 2017. *Perspectives on the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Levine, G. 2011. *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E., S. Curle, J. Pun, J. An and J. Dearden. 2018. A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching* 51, no. 1: 36–76.
- Mancho-Barés, G. and M. Aguilar-Pérez. 2016. Problematizing on language learning issues in EMI: opinions of science and technology EMI lecturers. In *CLIL + Science: New Directions in Content and Language Integrated Learning in Science and Technology*, ed. R. Breeze, 110–13. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.
- Mancho-Barés, G. and E. Arnó-Macià. 2017. EMI lecturer training programmes and academic literacies: a critical insight from ESP. *ESP Today* 5, no. 2: 266–90.
- Owens, T.J., D.T. Robinson and L. Smith-Lovin. 2010. Three faces of identity. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 477–99.
- Paulsen, J. 2018. Membership categorization analysis as an important qualitative method in evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 67: 138–45.
- Pecorari, D., P.H. Shaw, H. Malmström and A. Irvine. 2011. English textbooks in parallel-language tertiary education. *TESOL Quarterly* 45: 313–33.
- Rapley, T. 2012. Order, order: a 'modest' response to Stokoe. *Discourse Studies* 14, no. 3: 321–8.
- Roca-Cuberes, C. 2008. Membership categorization and professional insanity ascription. *Discourse Studies* 10, no. 4: 543–70.
- Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Appendix 1. Transcription conventions

Convention	Function
/	Indicates natural pauses between units of speech.
...	Superfluous text edited out (e.g. hesitations, false starts, pauses of one second or more, incomprehensible speech).
italics	In the English translations of the interview excerpts, anything that was said in English in the original Spanish version is italicised.
bold	In the class excerpts, anything not said in English is marked in bold.
{ }	English translations of classroom speech in Spanish are provided in curly brackets.
Capital letters	Words uttered with emphasis.
[]	Extra-linguistic activity is described in square brackets.
?	Rising intonation (as in a question).