Global Education and Classroom Teaching: From CBI to EMI

Paul Carty
Ryukoku University

Bernard Susser
Ritsumeikan University

As Japanese universities establish English-medium instruction (EMI) programs, EFL instructors are being asked to convert their content-based instruction (CBI) English classes into subject-matter courses taught in English for Japanese and international students. This paper presents a framework to implement this conversion based on five elements derived from the internationalization of higher education literature: curriculum, pedagogy, interaction, content/language, and assessment. After describing these elements we give two examples showing how the framework can be used. The original course was an EFL CBI course about Kyoto for Japanese students, emphasizing reading and presentation skills. This was converted using the framework first into a short-term Kyoto studies course for international and Japanese students, and then into Business and Society in Kyoto, a course in an EMI department. We conclude with some considerations regarding the role of EFL teachers in EMI programs.

日本の大学が（教授言語としての）英語で教える教育（EMI）プログラムを確立する中で、EFL指導者たちは海外からの学生や日本人学生への英語での授業を、内容重視の英語科目(CBI)の授業から、英語で教える学科の科目としてのコースへと変更することが求められている。この研究では、高等教育分野の国際化からもたらされた5つの要素（カリキュラム、教授法、相互作用、内容/言語、アセスメント）に基づいたこの変化の枠組みについて述べる。これらの要素について述べた後、枠組みがどのように使えるのかを見せるため、2つの事例を挙げる。当初のコースは、京都の歴史と文化を学ぶ、リーディングとプレゼンテーション技術に特化した日本人学生のためのEFL CBIコースであった。これはまず、「京都文化と歴史」として海外からの学生と日本人学生のための短期コースとして変更され、後に英語で教える専門科目教育のコースである「京都のビジネスと社会」に変更された。最後に、EMIプログラムにおけるEFL教員の役割について述べる。

ONE ASPECT of the internationalization of higher education institutions in non-English-speaking countries is the establishment of English-medium instruction (EMI) programs, and Japan is no exception (Brown, 2014). These programs differ from content-based language instruction (CBI) in that their focus is on content learning. Language learning outcomes are a secondary priority, if they are considered at all. To staff these EMI programs, universities are hiring lecturers from overseas as well as recruiting Japanese faculty in various disciplines who are proficient in English. Further, international faculty members, hired originally to teach EFL to Japanese students, are being asked to convert their EFL CBI courses into subject-matter courses for EMI programs.

This paper provides a framework to assist EFL teachers facing this situation to convert their CBI courses into content courses for international students. Drawing on the literature of higher

education internationalization, the authors isolated five elements essential for course (re)design: curriculum, pedagogy, interaction, content/language, and assessment. We first describe these five elements and then provide two examples illustrating how the framework can be used in practice.

Description of the Framework

The framework consists of a simple grid listing the five elements essential for course (re)design, with spaces for considering the requirements or conditions under which the course must be taught, and what action needs to be taken for each element (Figure 1). Following is a brief explanation of each element.

Element	Requirements/ Conditions	Action
Curriculum		
Pedagogy		
Interaction		
Content/Language		
Assessment		

Figure 1. Framework for converting CBI courses for international programs.

Curriculum

Internationalization of the curriculum is "the incorporation of an intercultural and international dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning processes and support services of a program of study" (Leask, 2009, p. 209). The first step in incorporating this "dimension" into one's own course is to learn just what your institution's principles of curriculum internationalization are. These may be found in the university's mission statement or president's message, or in statements of the qualities or attributes expected of students after completing their university education. These statements may include not only generic qualities such as "demonstrates knowledge of other cultures" (Green & Schoenberg, 2006, p. 2) but also "value-laden" attributes (Haigh & Clifford, 2010, "Values in Higher Education," para. 1) relating to social justice, environmental sustainability, and even understanding "the nonuniversality of culture, religion, and values" (Olsen, Green, & Hill, 2006, p. 87).

Pedagogy

Internationalization of the curriculum provides "opportunities for creating a new kind of teaching and learning in universities and for the rethinking of pedagogies" (Sancho, 2008, p. 260). Furthermore, "the shift from L1 to EMI...usually requires an adaptation of the teaching methodology" (Cots, 2012, p. 117). The literature favors some form of student-centered learning. For example, Leask and Wallace (2011) argued that with international students the "large lecture format . . . is not conducive to active learning" and recommended instead "small group learning opportunities such as the tutorial" (p. 31). As a rule, international education "involves a clash between different learning traditions" (Tange, 2010, p. 145). However, when all of the students in the EMI program are domestic, as is often the case in Japan, there is no "clash" and less need or incentive to change teaching methodology.

Interaction

Most teachers would agree that "classroom diversity and interaction among students from ethnically diverse backgrounds can have a positive effect on learning outcomes" (Arkoudis & Baik, 2014, p. 52) and that "group work is vitally important in an internationalized curriculum" (Leask, 2008, p. 21). There is even research suggesting that multicultural groups display better performance than those

that are culturally homogeneous (Strauss, U, & Young, 2011, p. 815). However, facilitating peer interaction in classes with students from a variety of cultures and language backgrounds is not easy; "merely placing students in mixed culture groups to work on unstructured tasks unrelated to the exploration and sharing of cultural and national perspectives is unlikely to result in the development of international or intercultural perspectives" (Leask, 2012, p. 76).

The desired interaction can be achieved through two actions on the instructor's part: direct intervention and task design. One example of intervention would be assigning students to pairs or groups at random and frequently reshuffling group membership; this prevents students from forming groups based on their national/cultural backgrounds. Concerning task design, Leask (2009) suggests tasks be "structured in such a way that they cannot be successfully completed without a meaningful exchange of cultural information," adding that the "activities must have meaning within the context of the course and students should not be able to complete [them] unless they engage with cultural others" (p. 211). With careful task design and an interventionist pedagogy, instructors can bring out the full potential of EMI classes.

Content/Language

The framework described in this paper is meant to be applied to content (subject-matter) courses, not English language courses. However, in many non-English speaking countries, EMI programs are primarily for the home students; as Brown says (concerning Japan), "the EMI programmes' main target seems to be domestic students" (2014, p. 57). In such cases there is concern over the students' ability to grasp the subject matter when taught in English, and methodologies such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) are used (e.g., Iyobe, Brown, & Coulson, 2011). Whether or not English language instruction is part of the course syllabus will be determined by the curriculum; it usually is not a matter for individual teachers to decide.

Even if English language instruction is not a course aim, there are other language-related issues in EMI content courses. When the students come from many different countries, English serves as the lingua franca. In practice, however, the students' English language ability may vary widely from highly proficient to weak. Also, to complicate matters, some students may use a dialect or variety of English that is not readily intelligible to the others. Researchers of English as a lingua franca (ELF) situations argue that "ELF speakers are not considered merely *learners* striving to conform to native-speaker norms but primarily *users* of the language, where the main consideration is not formal correctness but functional effectiveness" (Hülmbauer, Böhringer, & Seidlhofer, 2008, p. 28); they communicate successfully among themselves by use of "cooperation, accommodation and simplification strategies, the ability to signal non-understanding in a face-saving way, lingua-cultural awareness and open-mindedness towards innovative linguistic forms" (p. 33). How successful the communication in classroom discussions or presentations is, and what the teacher decides to do about it, are the crucial points.

Assessment

In any content course instructors want to assess how well the students have learned the relevant knowledge and skills covered by the syllabus. If improvement in English skills has been a course goal, that also must be tested. Finally, if the institution, the discipline, or both have adopted an internationalized curriculum, how well the students have become "internationalized" must be assessed as well. Testing of content should be done in such a way as to eliminate any bias caused by the students' different varieties of English and varying levels of English proficiency; testing improvement in English language skills must be done considering the students' various English levels (including "near native") at the start of the course. Concerning improvement in the students' global outlook, much work has been done on defining the constructs of "internationaliza-

tion," "global learning," and so on, and how they may be tested (e.g., Olsen et al., 2006). Even so, given that "intercultural awareness . . . pertains fundamentally to meaning-making" (Scarino, 2011, p. 266), this construct does not lend itself easily to assessment, "whose dominant paradigm lacks a discourse which acknowledges that the meanings that an individual may believe to be invariant are, in fact, subject to variable understanding" (p. 267). Recommended methods for assessment include open-ended tasks, portfolios, interviews, essays, journals, and so on (Olsen et al., 2006; Scarino, 2011, p. 267).

Using the Framework to Redesign a Course: Two Examples

The Original Course

The original course taught by one of the authors was a CBI course on Kyoto studies in an EFL program at Doshisha Women's College (DWC). This 1-year course for 3rd-year native speakers of Japanese provided an overview of Kyoto's history and culture. The course focus was on improving students' English language skills while learning about Kyoto. Students practiced specific English language skills and 80% of the time was spent on pair or group work. This course is described in detail in Pallos, Fujiwara, Carty, and Garafalo (2008); details of the original and the two redesigned courses can be found in Carty (in press). How the framework was used to convert the original EFL-CBI course into one suitable for an EMI program is shown below.

Kyoto Studies for a Japanese Studies Program

The DWC Japanese Studies Program is a 12-week EMI program of Japanese language and culture courses for students from DWC's affiliated schools overseas. Kyoto Culture and History was one of four courses offered in the Japanese Culture and Society stream. Home students may take classes in this stream for credit; however,

they need at least a 500 on the TOEFL paper test and must pass an interview. As a result, approximately half of the class members were visiting students from English-speaking countries and the other half were Japanese native-speaker home students. Therefore, the original CBI course had to be converted to an EMI-type course in which content became the main focus.

Curriculum

Requirements/Conditions: DWC's educational philosophy places a strong emphasis on "internationalism" and "international education" (Doshisha Women's College, 2011). There was no direct instruction from the administration about specific outcomes for students' global awareness; however, it was quite clear that a high level of attention was given to this exchange program. From this it was inferred that visiting students should have a challenging academic experience while home students should be able to benefit from the experience of taking a class with native speakers.

Action: The course was made more academically challenging for visiting students; at the same time, it was made accessible for the home students. Further, the assignments took advantage of the new international dynamic by directing the students to compare their cultural backgrounds.

Pedagogy

Requirements/Conditions: In the EMI environment the focus was no longer on language skills practice although there were still many questions about language and meaning. The main challenge of this class was how to balance the needs and skills of the students, half of whom were L2 and half L1. What percent of the class should be lecture and what percent communicative, student-centered learning?

Action: The communicative-style classroom was retained although the percentage of lecture time did increase to about 30%. The key

point was that the L2 students would have had difficulty with more than 10 minutes of lecturing; they could ask questions and discuss homework assignments more comfortably in pairs or small group work. The L1 students could also benefit from interacting with home students in that they could ask them specific questions about Japanese culture during small group discussions.

Interaction

Requirements/Conditions: The requirement here was to unite the L1 and L2 groups. To promote peer interaction, an environment must be established in which the students can bond easily. As mentioned above, an international group in and of itself is not enough to develop a global perspective. International students and home students do not spontaneously mix, they prefer to stay in monocultural groups (Arkoudis & Baik, 2014). Thus, it was necessary to pair an international student with a home student and establish a system to rotate partners each week. In addition, activities needed to be carefully structured to promote intercultural skills.

Action: In the first class, the midterm poster project was introduced and explained. Home students had to pair with visiting students, then visit a museum in Kyoto with their partner and interview some visitors and at least one person on the staff. They had to work together on the poster and the presentation. This type of project required a meaningful interaction of cultural information. The specific strengths of each group were necessary to make this project a success. Such task-based learning has made strong connections among the students; student feedback on this project has been overwhelmingly positive.

Content/Language

Requirements/Conditions: The presence of L1 speakers led to a significant increase of content from the first version (CBI) of the Kyoto studies course. In addition, there was also a dramatic reduction in

English language practice activities. The main challenge here was balancing the different levels of English between the L1 and L2 students and making sure students were able to communicate effectively with each other. The L2 students were similar in skills but differed slightly in confidence levels.

Action: To ensure that discussions were effective, two points were stressed in the first class and continually repeated. The home students were reminded to ask for repetition and check that they had understood. Visiting students were reminded to moderate their language, especially speed and difficult idioms. They should repeat key phrases, paraphrase, and avoid dominating the conversation. These accommodation, cooperation, and simplification skills are essential for effective communication. In this EMI environment, an ELF approach to nonstandard language was adopted; as long as the meaning was clear, no correction was offered.

Assessment

Requirements/Conditions: The challenge for assessment was that English language proficiency varied greatly between the home and visiting students. The solution was to use assessment activities that promoted discussion and an active engagement with the content. Improvement of English was not a course goal and so was not graded.

Action: Nearly half the grade was based on answers to homework and discussion questions. Students had three chances to find the answers: (a) reading the text, (b) asking a partner in group discussions, and (c) asking the teacher or listening to the teacher's lecture. This promoted a class that worked together to find answers: No matter their level of English, students could show their involvement with the material. The other half of the grade was based on a midterm poster presentation done with a partner and a final paper. This final paper allowed students to research one aspect of Kyoto culture deeply.

Kyoto Studies in an International Department

The third version of the Kyoto studies course was made for the International Liberal Arts (ILA) Institute at Doshisha University, an English-medium instruction institute. ILA was established to satisfy Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) guidelines to increase the number of international students at Global 30 universities. (Global 30 was one of several Japanese government programs that provided funds to selected universities to promote their internationalization; Ishikawa, 2011). The course, Kyoto Business and Society, was in the business cluster of the ILA Institute. The students came from many countries and language backgrounds, including Japanese. The students' English levels were mainly fluent, near fluent, or advanced (TOEFL iBT 80 or above). This was an elective class and students from all years took part. The main goal was to understand the sources and roles of some major business elements of contemporary Kyoto society.

Curriculum

Requirements/Conditions: The instructor was told to make the class academic. Because Doshisha was an initial member of the Global 30 universities, there was strong encouragement to prepare students for an increasingly global world.

Action: Academic readings were assigned that covered the social and business aspects of Kyoto. These articles focused on the economic effects of certain events in history, such as the effect of the opening of trade in the Meiji period on the textile industry. The classes covered companies in various fields such as technology and education. Students were asked to explain the circumstances in their home countries related to the week's topic; in this way, students acquired knowledge of the situations in a variety of countries.

Pedagogy

Requirements/Conditions: The primary concern was to make sure the students communicated with each other and shared ideas. The challenge for the instructor was to make full use of the mix of ethnic and language backgrounds in the class.

Action: A lecture-style class would not optimize this precious resource so there was a limit on lecture time and most time was spent on discussion. Students did the readings for homework and discussed the answers in class with classmates.

Interaction

Requirements/Conditions: The literature and personal experience have shown that if specific activities are not created, international and home students tend not to mix and share their backgrounds.

Action: The key was to select the right questions. For example, we discussed textiles and their significant role in Kyoto's history, but we also discussed traditional dress. Students were asked if their country had traditional clothing, and if it was flourishing or disappearing in this global world of multinational clothing companies such as Uniqlo and the Gap. For each topic, there were questions that allowed students to share their background and unique knowledge with classmates.

Content/Language

Requirements/Conditions: This class was composed of upper intermediate to native English language speakers with a great variety of English styles and accents. The main goals were to focus on content, take advantage of the international background of the class, and create an environment in which a global perspective could develop among students.

Action: In this class the focus was almost all on content. Performance errors in English were not corrected but when there was

a breakdown in communication, students were encouraged to rephrase the statement or question. In their groups, speakers were instructed to make sure they spoke clearly and listeners were asked to check when they had a problem understanding. It was very important to give immediate feedback when communication failed. The instructor used worksheets and guidelines throughout the term to make sure students were using these accommodation strategies.

Assessment

Requirements/Conditions: The students had different varieties as well as various levels of English. An assessment tool was needed that could measure their understanding of the readings, encourage them to make connections between the readings and their lives, and promote the sharing of ideas.

Action: The final grade was based on weekly homework questions on the readings, a midterm presentation, and a final presentation. Each of these required sharing information and active discussion. For the homework questions, students were encouraged to find answers from not only the readings but also classroom discussion. Moreover, they were strongly encouraged to draw connections between their backgrounds and personal experiences and the assigned texts. By thinking about, listening to, and discussing various ethnic and cultural backgrounds, students developed a more international outlook.

Conclusion

As EMI programs become more common in Japan, EFL instructors increasingly are being asked to offer content courses under these new conditions (Brown & Iyobe, 2014). The framework and examples presented above will help EFL instructors to redesign their CBI courses for Japanese students learning English into EMI courses for Japanese and international students studying a given subject matter. Some readers might object that the framework ignores an important element: the instructor's expertise or qualifications to teach a content course. It has been our experience in Japan that EFL instructors who choose (or are chosen) to teach CBI courses have some expertise in the subject, such as an undergraduate major or minor, or perhaps extensive private study. Of course, this expertise cannot be compared to the qualifications of a discipline specialist with an advanced degree and publications in the field. That said, faculty with doctorates in the disciplines often have not studied teaching methods. Asked to teach international students in English, they find themselves in need of training to do so (Leask & Beelen, 2009). On the other hand, EFL instructors are likely to have had training in pedagogy and be well equipped to handle the difficult pedagogical problems of EMI classrooms described above. In this sense the students in EMI programs may benefit greatly from the redesigned courses taught by EFL instructors.

Bio Data

Paul Carty is a lecturer at Ryukoku University and teaches in the Faculty of Humanities. <paulcarty@gmail.com>

Bernard Susser is professor emeritus of Doshisha Women's College and now teaches international students at Ritsumeikan University. <bernsusser@gmail.com>

References

Arkoudis, S., & Baik, C. (2014). Crossing the interaction divide between international and domestic students in higher education. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education*, *1*, 47-62.

Brown, H. (2014). Contextual factors driving the growth of undergraduate English-medium instruction programmes at universities in Japan. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 50-63.

Brown, H., & Iyobe, B. (2014). The growth of English medium instruction in Japan. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings*. (pp. 9-19). Tokyo: JALT.

Carty, P. C. (in press). Kyoto Studies: Local to global education. In G. Brooks (Ed.), *JALT 2014 Pan-SIG Proceedings.* Tokyo: JALT.

Cots, J. M. (2012). Introducing English-medium instruction at the University of Lleida, Spain: Intervention, beliefs and practices. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 106-128). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Doshisha Women's College. (2011). *Educational philosophy*. Retrieved April 21, 2015 from http://www.dwc.doshisha.ac.jp/english/about/educational_ideal.html

Green, M. F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, D.C: American Council on Education.

Haigh, M., & Clifford, V. (2010). Widening the graduate attribute debate: A higher education for global citizenship. *Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching*, *2*(5). Retrieved from http://bejlt.brookes.ac.uk/paper/widening_the_graduate_attribute_debate_a_higher_education_for_global_citize-2/

Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H., & Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Synergies Europe, 3*, 25-36.

Ishikawa, M. (2011). Redefining internationalization in higher education: *Global 30* and the making of global universities in Japan. In D. B. Willis & J. Rappleye (Eds.), *Reimagining Japanese education: Borders, transfers, circulations, and the comparative* (pp. 193-223). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Iyobe, B., Brown, H., & Coulson, D. (2011). Teaching lab: Gearing up for English medium classes. In A. Stewart (Ed.), *JALT2010 Conference Proceedings*. (pp. 627-634). Tokyo: JALT.

Leask, B. (2008). Internationalisation, globalization, and curriculum innovation. In M. Hellstén & A. Reid (Eds.), *Researching international pedagogies: Sustainable practice for teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 9-26). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *13*, 205-221. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315308329786

Leask, B. (2012). Taking a holistic approach to internationalisation: Connecting institutional policy with the every reality of student life. In J. Beelen & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation revisited: New dimensions in the internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 71-86). Amsterdam: Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management (CAREM).

Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2009, October). Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education. In IEAA-EAIE Symposium: Advancing Australia-Europe engagement: Engaging academic staff in international education in Europe and Australia, Background paper 2. Retrieved from the International Education Association of Australia website: http://www.ieaa.org.au/documents/item/41

Leask, B., & Wallace, J. (2011). *Good practice report: Learning and teaching across cultures*. Retrieved from the Australian Government, Office for Learning & Teaching website: http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/GPR_Learning_and_Teaching_Across_Cultures_Leask_2011.pdf

Olsen, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. A. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Pallos, L., Fujiwara, B., Carty, P., & Garafalo, R. (2008). CASE: A content-based English program (Part 2). *Journal of Contemporary Social Studies, 4,* 50-70.

Sancho, J. M. (2008). Opening students' minds. In M. Hellstén & A. Reid, (Eds.), *Researching international pedagogies: Sustainable practice for teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 259-276). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Scarino, A. (2011). Absence as deficit in assessing intercultural capability. In C. N. Candlin & J. Crichton (Eds.), *Discourses of deficit* (pp. 256-272). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Strauss, P., U, A., & Young, S. (2011). 'I know the type of people I work well with': Student anxiety in multicultural group projects. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*, 815–829. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.488720

Tange, H. (2010). Caught in the Tower of Babel: University lecturers' experiences with internationalisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *10*, 137-149. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14708470903342138