Students' Perspectives on the Role of English-Medium Instruction in English Learning: A Case Study

Shungo SUZUKI, Tetsuo HARADA, Masaki EGUCHI
Shuhei KUDO, Ryo MORIYA

Introduction

The Department of English Language and Literature at Waseda University started to offer about 40 undergraduate content courses in English-Medium Instruction (EMI), and two preparatory content-based English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses for freshmen in 2016. Motivated by the findings from previous departmental needs analyses, this curriculum revision intends to maximize the chances for students to use English meaningfully and purposefully even in Japan where English use outside of language classrooms is substantially limited (i.e., English as a Foreign Language [EFL] context; Harada, 2017). However, it seems plausible to assume that there is still plenty of room for further revision as the reforms are in its initial stages. As curriculum development cyclically proceeds in general, evidence of students' needs and achievements in the present curriculum is expected to be constantly collected (Christison & Murray, 2014). Following this principle, our precursor research (Kudo, Harada, Eguchi, Moriya, & Suzuki, 2017; Suzuki, Harada, Eguchi, Kudo, & Moriya, 2017) investigated the affective issues around students' language use in EMI such as anxiety and self-perceived achievements. Although the findings revealed that students tend to struggle with spontaneous speaking in an EMI classroom (e.g., group discussion on questions and issues relevant to the content), it is necessary to examine (a) their prior experience of L2 instruction and (b) their future target language use of English for more comprehensive understanding of students' needs. Therefore, the current study attempts to identify undergraduate students' needs from the perspectives of both past and future of their English learning, by returning to the dataset from Kudo et al. (2017) and Suzuki et al. (2017). This paper will begin with an overview of theoretical issues around the role of needs analysis in curriculum development, followed by the description of our methodological procedures relating to how students' needs were collected and analyzed in the study. Finally, the findings will be discussed with regard to further developments of the existing curriculum.

Theoretical Background

Needs Analysis in Curriculum Design and Development

Reviewing the existing literature on needs analysis (e.g., Graves, 2014; Nation & Macalister, 2010), one can argue that there are two different approaches to needs analysis. If students have a specific target situation in which they will use the target language, needs analysis includes gathering information about (a) the current status of students (e.g., what they already learned), and (b) their prospective needs and goals for learning (e.g., what they need to learn). On the other hand, in the case of students who have no immediate needs for using the target language, needs analysis can solely target the former type of information (Graves, 2014). Alternatively, teachers and curriculum designers can determine students' target situations as in-class contexts which are appropriately designed based on students' current capability (Graves, 2014). Such different foci of needs analysis result from the contextual variability including the purpose and target population of needs analysis.

Regardless of the range of information, curriculum designers commonly categorize the information gathered through needs analysis into three different subdomains of learners' needs: necessities, wants, and lacks (see Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Nation & Macalister, 2010). *Necessities* refer to the communicative needs in the target language use (TLU) domains/situations (see Bachman & Palmer, 2010). In this sense, necessities can be useful information about the ultimate goal of students' learning –what they are required to know and perform in their target situations. Accordingly, necessities are objectively identified through the analysis of target discourse. Meanwhile, *wants*, which are the second component of needs, are typically specified through students' subjective judgements on what they desire to learn. The information about wants possibly ranges from students' prospective wishes (e.g., desire to attain native-like pronunciation) to the choice or preference of classroom activities. Compared to the first and second components of needs, *lacks* concern the present status of students, particularly the existing challenges with respect to the prospective situations (i.e., TLU). In other words, lacks focus on what students need to learn immediately (i.e., learning needs). Since the investigation of lacks requires the appropriate assessment tools and analytic techniques, the information of lacks is typically collected in an objective manner. With this view about needs analysis in mind, we will overview the characteristics of EMI in an EFL setting.

English-Medium Instruction in English as a Foreign Language Settings

According to the classical literature on content and language learning, EMI is originally not conceptualized as language instruction; EMI refers to a pedagogical approach where academic subjects are taught through English as a common language for students from different backgrounds, especially in

European universities (see Hellekjaer, 2010; Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, & Dearden, 2018; Smit & Dafouz, 2012). In line with this conceptualization, the improvement of English proficiency via EMI is regarded as a *by-product* (Taguchi, 2014a), due to the lack of systematic external control for language learning (e.g., linguistic objectives, assessments for linguistic skills). However, some universities in EFL settings have recently postulated and empirically confirmed that EMI has a pedagogical potential for English development as an optimal situation for authentic use of L2 English (e.g., Lei & Hu, 2014; Pessoa, Miller, & Kaufer, 2014; Suzuki, 2018; Taguchi, 2014b). Despite such positive aspects of EMI, it should be noted that one of the substantive challenges in EMI implementation is identified as individual variability in students' preparedness to be taught and attain subject matters in English (Doiz et al., 2013). Motivated by this challenge, it has been proposed that separate EAP courses should be simultaneously provided to increase their preparation for EMI (Yeh, 2014), whereas some scholars are concerned about the possibility that such regular English courses fail to solve students' language problems specific to EMI (see Chang, Kim, & Lee, 2015; Hu & Lei, 2014). For these issues, previous studies have commonly investigated the roles of both prior instructional experiences with English learning and simultaneous language support played in the effectiveness and benefits of EMI implementation. For the purpose of maximizing the linguistic outcome of EMI, some universities also promote the modification of EMI course implementation (e.g., ensuring sufficient time for rehearsal; Chang et al., 2015) and the curriculum revision (e.g., establishing the close connection between English for Specific Purposes [ESP] and EMI courses; Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015). These pedagogical decisions are empirically underpinned with their needs analyses.

To the best of our knowledge, few empirical studies have yet reported the use of needs analysis for pedagogical decisions in the context of EMI in EFL settings. Chang et al. (2015) conducted their needs analysis for the purpose of evaluating a language support program for EMI at a Korean university. They focused on the subjective judgments on EMI courses and their language support program from both students' and lecturers' perspectives. Their data were solely collected from a questionnaire survey including closed and open items. The results revealed that their EMI courses generally lacked the time for rehearsal and feedback on language. Moreover, both students and lecturers believed that the content of the language support program should have been more specific to students' major to enhance the effectiveness of the program. In response to these findings, the authors recommend that EMI instructors be assisted in teaching content to students with different English proficiency levels (Hu & Lei, 2014), and that more students' discipline-specific language support programs be offered. In terms of tools for needs analysis, it is noteworthy that their study has successfully collected significant information solely via a questionnaire survey.

In a similar vein, Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés (2015) also conducted needs analysis to explore

the optimal balance between ESP (as formal language instruction) and EMI courses in the context of a university in Spain[1]. More specifically, they investigated what roles each of ESP and EMI plays within the whole curriculum for students' English learning. Using a variety of data collection tools ranging from a questionnaire survey to institutional documents, they described the current status of ESP and EMI from both subjective (i.e., students' and lecturers' perceptions) and objective (e.g., classroom observations) perspectives. The findings showed that both students and lectures were conscious of a huge gap between ESP and EMI in foci (e.g., grammatical knowledge vs. authentic communication). Furthermore, several pedagogical suggestions were also collected from the stakeholders: (a) discipline-specific ESP courses, (b) language support in EMI, and (c) the gradual increase of language demands in EMI. Accordingly, they called for more explicit connection between ESP and EMI courses to maximize the effectiveness of the whole curriculum.

Research Questions

Taken together, these lines of research above indicate the significance of modification of EMI based on students' needs and disciplines. Meanwhile, such pedagogical applications should be differently optimized according to the institutional contexts. Thus, with one of the elective EMI courses in our Department (English Language and Literature) selected, the current study focuses on students who are willing to take an EMI course. As a small-scale classroom study, the students' needs are discussed in relation to their backgrounds (e.g., major, prior instructional experience). To identify their necessities, wants, and lacks, four guiding research questions (RQs) are formulated as follows:

1. What kinds of instructional experience do students enrolled in the EMI course have?
2. What target language use situations and learning needs do the EMI students specify?
3. What linguistic outcomes do the students expect from English-medium instruction?
4. What learning difficulties do the students have in English-medium instruction?

Methodology

Participants

Participants were recruited from an undergraduate course in the Department of English Language and Literature at Waseda University. Whereas 21 students were officially enrolled in the course, 15 students successfully completed a set of questionnaires. While a gender balance among them was approximately equal (7 males, 8 females), the majority of them were juniors and seniors (n = 9 and 3, respectively). This demographic tendency may pertain to the Department's curriculum. At the Department, students are assigned to a seminar for two years from the third year. Most of the seminars

focusing on English education (e.g., bilingual education, language assessment) are conducted in English (i.e., EMI). Therefore, juniors and seniors tend to be relatively confident in their English skills to survive EMI courses. Regarding their language backgrounds, all the participants were Japanese speaking learners of English at an upper-intermediate level of proficiency ($M_{TOEFL\ ITP}$ = 519.1, SD = 29.1).

The Target EMI Course

The target EMI course was a semester-long elective course, targeting Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) as a course topic. The instructor (the second author) was a native speaker of Japanese who had 18 years of EMI teaching experiences at universities. In addition, four MA students (the first, third, fourth, and fifth authors) voluntarily participated in the class as facilitators in the class discussion. The course offered a 90-minute session weekly over 15 weeks. Every lesson routinely consisted of five activities: (a) reading assignments (prior to classroom sessions), (b) a written quiz, (c) the instructor's lecture, (d) two students' presentations, and (e) group discussions during the lecture and presentations. All the activities were conducted in English. According to the syllabus and classroom observation, this EMI course seemed to require students to use L2 English communicatively and purposefully across different modalities (i.e., reading, listening, writing and speaking). Especially in the classroom, the group discussions as well as the interaction between the instructor and students appeared to account for the major part of classroom sessions (for a detailed description, see Kudo et al., 2017; Suzuki et al., 2017).

Data Collection and Analysis

To address RQ 1, a language background questionnaire was created. Since this needs analysis targeted what kinds of language skills had been acquired through formal language instructions at the Department, students were asked to list the skills which have appeared to be targeted based on their retrospective perceptions (e.g., presentation, daily conversation)[2]. Regarding RQ 2 to 4, another set of open-ended items offered questions for all the issues (*necessities, wants, lacks*) separately for content and language[3]. The rationale behind separating items is to avoid students' confusion regarding the classification of needs as much as possible (i.e., content- vs. language-driven). Although the questionnaire was handed out in the classroom in the middle of the semester, students were encouraged to answer at home. Accordingly, the collection time varied from Week 8 to Week 15 (the final week)[4].

In order to describe the group tendency, the present study took an inductive approach to coding the responses. Initially, the first author open-coded all the responses, and developed a coding scheme. Afterwards, the fourth author blind-coded all the responses, following the coding scheme. A series of simple percentage agreements indicated the variability of agreements across the sections of question-

naire (56% to 97%). The least agreement was found in the section of learning needs. The reason behind this may have resulted from the ambiguity of responses; the participants appeared to answer their learning needs briefly and generally. Finally, all the disagreements in data coding were resolved through discussion.

Results and Discussion

Previous Experience of Formal Language Instruction

The first objective of needs analyses was to describe the students' current status which was operationalized as their previous experiences of language instruction offered by the Department (i.e., English for General Purposes [EGP] courses). To this end, the students reported the language skills which they perceived to have been taught for each course they actually took. In other words, this section summarizes the targeted language skills of previous language classes in terms of students' own perception rather than pre-determined course objectives by EGP instructors (e.g., syllabi).

As summarized in Table 1, two major tendencies were identified. First, the existing departmental language courses appeared to focus more on productive skills (i.e., Speaking and Writing; n = 12, 7, respectively), compared to receptive skills (i.e., Listening and Reading; n = 5, 6). This priority on productive skills can be explained by the university entrance examinations which mainly assess applicants' receptive skills. Accordingly, both instructors and students possibly assume that students' productive skills are relatively insufficient even after they have received English education at least for six years at

Table 1　Descriptive Summary of Students' Previous Experience of Language Instruction

Target focal skills	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Median*	*Min*	*Max*
Language Instruction (overall)	13	3.5	1.4	4	1	5
Speaking	12	1.8	0.9	2	0	3
Presentation	10	1.2	0.8	1	0	2
Group discussion	3	0.3	0.5	0	0	1
Conversation	4	0.4	0.9	0	0	3
Writing	7	0.5	0.5	0	0	1
Listening	6	0.8	0.8	1	0	2
Reading	5	0.6	0.7	1	0	2
Vocabulary	4	0.6	1.1	0	0	3
Culture	6	0.5	0.7	0	0	2
Learning strategy, Test-specific	8	0.7	0.6	1	0	2
Others (Grammar, Discussion in L1)	3	—	—	—	—	—

N.B. Multiple responses were allowed. Two students had the required language courses waived due to a satisfactory score on a high-stake test (e.g., TOEFL). *N* column refers to the number of students who responded, and the other descriptive statistics refer to the number of language courses per person.

a secondary level. Therefore, it seems plausible to argue that the departmental instructors may have tended to offer language courses focusing on productive skills, and/or also that students themselves may have been willing to selectively attend such courses.

Despite the overall priority of productive skills, speaking and writing skills seem to be unequally emphasized; speaking skills were found to be more targeted, compared to writing skills. The results showed that the majority of students (n = 10) had experienced language courses focusing on oral presentation (i.e., prepared and extended monologue) whereas few students had chances to attend the courses targeting group discussion and conversational activities (i.e., extemporaneous dialogue; n = 3, 4, respectively). These findings suggest that the existing departmental language courses might not offer sufficient opportunities for students to improve their interactive/dialogic skills. However, this should be cautiously interpreted; the students in this study voluntarily participated in the target EMI course, so that they were expected to be more conscious of their own English learning. Therefore, it is highly possible that the entire group of students at the Department might be more unprepared for those interactive speaking activities.

The second overall tendency is that students perceived their target needs to be a variety of skills and knowledge. More specifically, some instructors covered cultural knowledge (e.g., British movies, backgrounds of literature) in a similar manner to content teaching, whereas others focused on strategies related to English language learning, such as the analysis of high-stake tests (e.g., TOEIC) and the techniques for note-taking. This diversity of targeted skills in language courses can be explained by the fact that individual instructors are allowed to design their own courses including course objectives and materials. In other words, the department may lack a standardized guideline toward developing students' English proficiency across courses. The lack of such a guideline is found to result in variability in the achievement of English learning among students (see Doiz et al., 2013).

Students' Target Needs and Learning Needs

The second objective of our needs analysis was to describe the target needs of students who were willing to take EMI courses. According to the results of their coded responses to open-ended questions, the most frequent target needs among the students in the EMI course was English skills for classroom teaching (n = 9), followed by English for business purposes (n = 7), as summarized in Table 2. In other words, although it can be expected that English use in EMI is arguably characterized as academic English, most of the students have different target needs from English for academic purposes. However, this overall tendency should be carefully interpreted with regard to the topic of the target EMI course (i.e., CLIL). According to the documented syllabus, students must have been aware that they were required to demonstrate microteaching in the classroom. Thus, one of the possible explanations is that

Table 2. Summary of Students' Target Needs

Target needs for English use	N
English for Classroom Teaching	9
English for Business Purposes	7
English for General Purposes/Traveling	3
English for Academic Purposes	1

N.B. Multiple responses were allowed.

they might have prioritized the content and/or topic of the target EMI course over English learning through EMI when they decided to take it.

Meanwhile, the students' variability in target needs should not be underemphasized; even though they all belong to the same department of English Language and Literature, they should be regarded as a mixed group of students in terms of TLU domains of English (e.g., classroom teaching, business settings). This might be explained by the existing characteristics of the School of Education. It is possible to postulate that only a limited number of students in the Department (20% or less) initially specify their future career as English teachers. However, some of them might drop out from the teacher-training courses and decide to get a position in some companies. Considering this variability of target needs, the Department may need to conduct situational analyses in business contexts (i.e., TLU domains) to identify the similarities and differences between academic and business contexts (see Bachman & Palmer, 2010; Graves, 2014; Long, 2015). In line with such situational analyses, tasks in EMI courses can be optimized with respect to commonly useful linguistics features in both contexts (see Serafini & Torres, 2015). Otherwise, a new module specific to English for business purposes could be established for students to receive credits with courses relevant to their future careers. Such diverse options for language courses may also reduce potential gaps between course objectives and students' English learning orientation[5].

Similarly, Table 3 summarizes what skills students thought they need to acquire to achieve their target needs –learning needs– from their perspective. According to the analyses of coding, most of them realized that they need to improve their speaking skills ($n = 11$) whereas a variety of different aspects were also relatively emphasized, indicating that specific learning needs might vary depending on individual orientations and/or target needs. Furthermore, this overall tendency shows similar patterns to their previous experiences of formal language instruction (i.e., EGP) at the university (RQ1). Therefore, it could be argued that students may have selected formal language courses according to their perception of learning needs. Meanwhile, focusing on more specific learning needs within speaking skills, some students emphasized the importance of daily communicative skills ($n = 7$) while comprehensible speech was also identified as a requirement for their target needs ($n = 4$). This distribution is slightly different

Table 3.   Summary of Students' Learning Needs

Learning needs	N
Speaking skills	11
Daily communication	7
Comprehensible speech	4
Vocabulary	4
Listening	3
Writing	3
Grammar	3
Pronunciation	2
No response	1

N.B. Multiple responses were allowed.

from that of previous instructional experience. Even though the language courses focused on speaking skills, the major focus tended to be monologue and/or presentation (see Table 1). However, students realized the importance of daily conversational communication. This can indicate that there might be a possibility that the availability of language courses on dialogic/interpersonal communicative contexts was unsatisfactory for students, although they were required to take Tutorial English, in which they were expected to develop interpersonal communication skills in a group of 4 to 5 students. For further investigation, the availability of such EGP courses should be systematically examined based on the issued institutional documents (e.g., course syllabi).

Students' Expectations of English improvement via EMI

The third objective of response analysis was to capture students' expectation of linguistic outcomes via taking the EMI course. According to the coding results (see Table 4), a total of 12 out of 15 students provided their expectation of English learning and/or maintenance as one of the reasons to take the EMI course. With the aim of avoiding students' confusion regarding distinction in expected outcomes between content and language learning (see the Methodology section), care was taken to create another set of corresponding questions for content learning expectation. This means that if students have expectations about learning outcomes only in content learning, they would not provide any responses on language learning outcomes. Therefore, it could be concluded that students who are willing to take EMI courses tend to expect some English learning outcomes via attending EMI courses (i.e., *by-product*). However, despite their expectations of linguistic outcomes, they were not purported to mention specific prospects of English improvement as a reason to take the target EMI course. In other words, their expectations of English learning through EMI might not play a major role in deciding whether to take EMI courses; they may have prioritized content learning over language learning as EMI is positioned as a content course in the curriculum. Considering these findings, students' point of view appeared to be in

Table 4. Reasons for Taking EMI (Language)

Expectations of English language learning	N
English learning and use	12
Speaking	5
Group discussion	3
Others (Vocabulary, Listening)	2
No response	3

N.B. Multiple responses were allowed.

Table 5. Summary of Skills to Learn in EMI

Skills	N
Speaking	14
Group discussion	3
Fluency	3
Coherence	3
Vocabulary	5
Affective/Confidence	3
No response	0

N.B. Multiple responses were allowed.

line with Taguchi's (2014a) conceptualization of English development through EMI as a *by-product*[6].

On the other hand, they seemed to have specific prospects regarding the skills they would like to acquire for taking EMI. However, it should be noted that the questionnaire data were collected in the middle of the semester and onwards. Hence, it is plausible that they responded to this question based on their experience of surviving in EMI for several weeks (8 to 15 weeks) rather than their expectation they had before taking EMI (i.e., Table 4). Therefore, thanks to their actual experience of attending the EMI course, they might have elaborated more on their needs, mainly in accordance with their perception of *wants*. As summarized in Table 5, almost all the students (n = 14) mentioned that they had desired to attain speaking skills. Additionally, as for the subcomponents of speaking skills, there seemed some variability among students in the targeted aspects of speaking skills in the EMI course: group discussion (n = 3), fluency (n = 3), and coherence (n = 3). These specified sub-components are possibly interrelated. Since group discussion required students to communicate their opinions and ideas in the online and interactive manner, they may have specified their immediate needs as the efficiency and effectiveness of communication (i.e., fluency and coherence). Plus, these aspects of speech production are commonly associated with functional and/or meaning aspects of speaking rather than formal aspects (e.g., accuracy, pronunciation). This tendency may pertain to the exclusively meaning-oriented nature of EMI.

In addition to practical speaking skills, several students referred to vocabulary (n = 5) as a facet which they wish to develop. This can be possibly explained by the fact that the EMI course dealt with academically specific content. As EMI is conceptualized as academic content courses, students in EMI are required to acquire a wide range of technical terminologies (i.e., content-obligatory language; Lightbown, 2014) to achieve classroom activities such as oral presentations and written quizzes. The acquisition of such subject-specific terminologies, however, cannot be separated from that of content knowledge itself. Therefore, their wants on vocabulary should be further investigated with respect to their attainment of content learning; their wants on vocabulary are possibly derived either purely from

linguistic problems or from the mixed problems with the lack of content knowledge. Another dimension of vocabulary specified by their responses was formulaic expressions (see Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010). This may indicate that as the students had experienced a set of routinized in-class activities, they might have noticed a certain number of frequent expressions that would help them to achieve common functions in those activities efficiently (e.g., defining terms, and contrasting pros and cons; see Dalton-Puffer, 2013; Dalton-Puffer, Bauer-Marschallinger, Brückl-Mackey, Hofmann, & Hopf, 2018). Both aspects of vocabulary competence are directly connected to the primary goal of EMI courses, that is, content learning and achievements of in-class activities. In other words, their perceptions of wants for vocabulary learning may partly indicate their degree of unpreparedness toward EMI courses, which is one of the substantive challenges in EMI implementations (Doiz et al., 2013).

Students' Learning Difficulties in EMI

The final objective of our needs analysis was to understand what learning difficulties students in the EMI course had faced, particularly in relation to their use of L2 English. In order to better understand their learning difficulties, we first clarify which aspects of EMI students were capable enough of achieving over the course of one semester (i.e., 15 weeks) based on their subjective judgments. Furthermore, we also specify students' learning difficulties which they were less likely to solve within one semester. By contrasting the achievements and sustained difficulties, we discuss which aspects of language problems in EMI were likely and unlikely to be solved.

Tables 6 and 7 summarize students' achievements and difficulties respectively. Regarding the overall group tendency, speaking skills were identified as the most achievable aspect of English skills required in EMI (n = 9). Additionally, four students specifically mentioned speaking skills in group discussion. However, nine out of 15 students reported that they had still struggled with fully participating in group discussion due to their language problems, as shown in Table 7. Meanwhile, some students appeared

Table 6. Summary of Students' Self-perceived Achievements in EMI

Self-perceived achievements	N
Speaking	9
Group discussion	4
Confidence	4
Vocabulary	2
Others (Listening, Logical thinking)	2
No response	4

   N.B. Multiple responses were allowed.

Table 7. Summary of Students' Language Difficulties in EMI

Language difficulties in EMI	N
Group discussion	9
Extemporaneous speech	4
Idea/topic development	3
Vocabulary	3
No response	5

   N.B. Multiple responses were allowed.

to have solved affective problems (coded as *confidence* in Table 6) in engaging with activities in the target EMI course (n = 4) whereas no students raised such an affective issue as learning difficulty. This tendency indicated that affective problems can be likely to be solved in a relatively short period of time in L2 immersion contexts as in studying abroad contexts (Allen, 2010). In addition to speaking skills and confidence, vocabulary was also mentioned both as an achievement and as a difficulty, despite a limited number of responses. Taken together, considering the fact that the identical aspects of the target EMI course were simultaneously mentioned as achievements and difficulties, it seems plausible to argue that one semester of EMI participation may have been insufficient for students to optimally solve the learning difficulties related to English use in the EMI, except for the affective issue (i.e., confidence).

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of the current study have several implications for more fine-grained integration of curricula for EMI content courses and formal language courses (i.e., EGP). First, in line with our precursor studies (Kudo et al., 2017; Suzuki et al., 2017), the current study confirmed that students in EMI tend to struggle with group discussion activities. Additionally, their profiles on prior instructional experiences in our Department revealed that extemporaneous and dialogic speaking skills may have been insufficiently covered within the module of formal language instruction. Building on these findings, a certain number of language courses targeting such dialogic speaking skills should be provided with the aim of reducing students' unpreparedness for taking EMI courses (e.g., group discussion). Second, their profile of previous language courses also indicated that a variety of topics and skills (e.g., culture) were targeted by instructors. Although such a diversity can provide students with various options for taking different courses, some guidelines for language learning goals should be established if the entire department attempts to ensure a certain level of English skills among students (see Harada, 2017)[7]. For instance, targeting pre- and in-sessional L2 English speaking university students in multilingual contexts, Isaacs, Trofimovich, and Foote (2017) developed L2 comprehensibility scale for the purpose of diagnostic assessment, since L2 comprehensibility has been regarded as one of the crucial aspects of speech for successful L2 communication (e.g., Derwing & Munro, 2009).

The students' prior instructional experience of formal language courses (i.e., EGP) in the Department also pointed out two major concerns related to their target needs and learning needs. The first issue was that there was individual variability in their target needs; even though they all voluntarily took the target EMI course, an English-medium academic context was not specified as a major target need. Alternatively, English for classroom teaching was identified as the most common target discourse. According to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), English language courses at a secondary educational level are expected to be conducted in English (MEXT,

2009). In response to this, pre-service student-teachers highly possibly wish to attain functional English skills in classroom settings. In the teaching licensure program in the Department, a total of 21 English teaching methodology courses are currently offered. However, according to their syllabi, all of the courses are reported to be conducted in Japanese probably because students' understanding of the course contents is prioritized. Thus, it can be proposed that such courses on English teaching methodology can be provided in the form of EMI. Otherwise, several formal language courses targeting classroom language skills should be offered, especially if instructors would like to avoid the situation where students' understanding levels are lowered by their language problems (i.e., insufficient language proficiency).

Secondly, based on students' responses across the different questionnaire sections, it is plausible to argue that students may have tended to select formal language courses according to their perceived learning needs. For students to choose formal language courses appropriately in line with their learning needs as well as target needs, the Department can employ language learning advisors who have professional expertise in second language acquisition and foreign language learning (e.g., Moriya, 2017; Yasuda, 2018). For instance, graduate students who complete their undergraduate program in the same Department can be potentially suitable candidates as they are already familiar with the curriculum. Although it is desirable that they major in second language acquisition and/or foreign language learning, the Department would be required to employ advisors with systematic training sessions (e.g., Yasuda, 2018). As a result, such advisors can help undergraduate students to select formal language courses purposefully, considering the consistency between their learning needs and course profiles (e.g., lesson structures, course objectives). With this type of advising in language learning in mind, Matsumura, Moriya, Harada, and Sawaki (2017) are in the process of developing a diagnostic assessment of EAP.

Conclusion

The primary objective of the present study was to investigate undergraduate students' needs in terms of both past and future of their English learning and use. In order to address these issues, we returned to the dataset from Kudo et al. (2017) and Suzuki et al. (2017), and then focused on different sections from our precursor studies. The current needs analysis particularly targeted open-ended items from our questionnaire, and followed an inductive approach to coding responses with the aim of quantifying the group tendency. Three major findings can be summarized as follows. First, despite the fact that the present study focused on students in the single Department (English Language and Literature), there was individual variability in target language use domains. The majority of the students identified their target needs as either English for Language Teaching or English for Business Purposes, indicating that

their target needs were closely associated with their future career even in EFL contexts. Second, most of the students had an expectation of linguistic outcomes through attending the target EMI course to some extent (i.e., *by-product*). Regarding the linguistic skills, students wished to attain speaking skills, especially in spontaneous and/or dialogic contexts, probably due to the lack of prior instructional experiences with formal language courses targeting such speaking skills. Additionally, they also appeared to be aware of the importance of vocabulary in EMI contexts. They may have realized that a certain range of vocabulary items such as content-obligatory vocabulary and formulaic expressions can play a crucial role in the efficient accomplishment of routinized in-class activities in the EMI course. Third, students reported that they had difficulty in achieving group discussion activities in the EMI course. This finding was in line with their profile of prior instructional experiences; they were relatively unprepared for spontaneous group discussion with cognitively demanding topics (e.g., academic contents).

While these findings above can offer insights into the possible complementary integration of EMI curricula with the module of formal language instruction, several methodological limitations need to be acknowledged. First, the present study concerns students' subjective judgements on their needs (i.e., *necessity*, *wants*, and *lacks*). According to the existing literature on needs analysis, multiple data resources (e.g., subjective vs. objective, experts vs. non-experts) are necessary for more valid assessments of needs (Serafini, Lake, & Long, 2015). Thus, future needs analysis is expected to collect the objective data as well (e.g., assessment of students' English skills for *lacks*). Second, the data collection was thoroughly conducted via the classroom-based questionnaire, following Chang et al. (2015) and also considering the practicality (see the Methodology section). In order to collect useful information more comprehensively, it is also necessary to entail multiple data resources in terms of stakeholders (e.g., teachers' perspectives) and research methods (e.g., group interviews). Third, in relation to the practicality of data collection, we allowed the students to fill in the questionnaire outside the class. Thus, the timing of collecting the questionnaire varied among them, indicating that the findings may have been affected by the variability in the timing of questionnaire collection. Fourth, it is noteworthy that the target EMI course was student-centered, but EMI can follow lecture-style courses; the lesson structure of EMI varies according to the purpose of content leaning as well as the nature of subjects. Hence, the generalizability of the findings in the present study should be tested with various types of EMI courses. Finally, we would like to emphasize that our findings and pedagogical suggestions above are provisional. Students' needs can dramatically change in response to the societal situations and student populations. Accordingly, further necessary information for curriculum development needs to be continuously collected.

Note（1）　Although they originally use the term CLIL rather than EMI, they conceptualize CLIL as a content course taught by content specialists in their paper. Therefore, their definition of CLIL appears to be optimally equivalent to the typical definition of EMI, in which the language of instruction is English, and content rather than language is more driven (for further discussion about EMI and CLIL, see Brinton & Snow, 2017). Then, for the sake of brevity, we termed it as EMI in our paper.

（2）　For ethical reasons, we intentionally avoided letting them list the course titles and the names of instructors. Therefore, this study focused on students' subjective judgement about targeted skills in the language classes rather than objective documents such as syllabi.

（3）　This whole questionnaire is available on IRIS from https://www.iris-database.org/iris/app/home/detail?id=york%3a929281&ref=search

（4）　Although the variability in the collection time is one of the methodological limitations of the study, we adopted this way of data collection, taking into account that the participation in our research project was voluntary and that securing the classroom time for the course content must be prioritized.

（5）　The Department currently offers what is called several optional skill development courses, such as current affairs in English, and business tutorial English so that they will meet the diversity of students' needs (Harada, 2017).

（6）　At Waseda University we have the Faculty of EMI, called the School of International Liberal Arts, where Murata, Iino, and Konakahara (2017) found that students in the School were more likely to position EMI as content courses than those students in the Department of English Language and Literature. This may imply that EMI in different contexts lead to students' different views of EMI even in the same EFL setting.

（7）　The second author, who was in charge of the curriculum revision, was and is aware of the importance of the integration of EMI with EGP courses, which was actually challenging for the Department with an extremely large number of regular English course (more than 160) offered and taught by around 100 EFL instructors, more than 80% of whom were part-timers. This is one of the most important practical issues to be considered.

References

Allen, H. W. (2010). Langauge learning motivation during short term study abroad: An activity theory perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, *43*(1), 27–49.

Arnó-Macià, E., & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37*(1), 63–73.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice : developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brinton, D. M., & Snow, M. A. (2017). The evolving architecture of content-based instruction. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.). *The content-based classroom: New perspectives on integrating language and content* (2nd ed., pp. 2–20). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Chang, J.-Y., Kim, W., & Lee, H. (2015). A language support program for English-medium instruction courses: Its development and evaluation in an EFL setting. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.

Christison, M. A., & Murray, D. E. (2014). *What English language teachers need to know Volume III: Designing curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 216–253.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Bauer-Marschallinger, S., Brückl-Mackey, K., Hofmann, V., & Hopf, J. (2018). Cognitive discourse functions in Austrian CLIL lessons : Towards an empirical validation of the CDF construct. *European Journal of*

Applied Linguistics, *6*(1), 1–25.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2009). Putting accent in its place: Rethinking obstacles to communication. *Language Teaching*, *42*(4), 476–490.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., Sierra, J. M., Wilkinson, R., Ball, P., & Lindsay, D. (2013). *English-Medium Instruction at Universities*.

Graves, K. (2014). Syllabus design and curriculum design for second language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 46–62). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Harada, T. (2017). Developing a content-based English as a foreign language program: Needs analysis and curriculum design at the university level. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: New perspectives on integrating language and content* (2nd ed., pp. 37–52). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hellekjaer, G. O. (2010). Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education. *Hermes*, *45*, 11–34.

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education*, *67*(5), 551–567.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Hyland: Cambridge University Press.

Isaacs, T., Trofimovich, P., & Foote, J. A. (2017). Developing a user-oriented second language comprehensibility scale for English-medium universities. *Language Testing*.

Kudo, S., Harada, T., Eguchi, M., Moriya, R., & Suzuki, S. (2017). Investigating English speaking anxiety in English-medium instruction. *Essays on English Language and Literature*, *46*, 7–23.

Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2014). Is English-medium instruction effective in improving Chinese undergraduate students' English competence? *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *52*(2), 99–126.

Lightbown, P. M. (2014). *Focus on content-based language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 36–76.

Matsumura, K., Moriya, R., Harada, T., & Sawaki (2017, November) *Preparing first-year students for English-medium instruction(EMI): Assessing English for academic purposes (EAP) and advising in language learning (ALL)*. Paper presented at the ELF/EMI workshop, Waseda University, Tokyo.

MEXT. (2009). *Improvement of academic abilities (course of study) for senior high schools: Foreign languages (English)*. Japanese Government document.

Moriya, R. (2017, December). *Paired advising and interview in English for academic purposes (EAP) settings: An exploratory study of students' group dynamics*. Paper presented at Eigo Eibun Gakkai, Tokyo, Japan.

Murata, K., Iino, M., & Konakahara, M. (2017). An investigation into the use of and attitudes toward ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) in English-medium instruction (EMI) classes and its implications for English language teaching. *Waseda Review of Education, 31*(1), 21–38.

Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge.

Pessoa, S., Miller, R. T., & Kaufer, D. (2014). Students' challenges and development in the transition to academic writing at an English-medium university in Qatar. *IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *52*(2), 127–156.

Serafini, E. J., Lake, J. B., & Long, M. H. (2015). Needs analysis for specialized learner populations: Essential methodological improvements. *English for Specific Purposes*, *40*, 11–26.

Serafini, E. J., & Torres, J. (2015). The utility of needs analysis for nondomain expert instructors in designing task-based Spanish for the professions curricula. *Foreign Language Annals*, *48*(3), 447–472.

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

Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. *AILA Review*, *25*, 1–12.

Suzuki, S. (2018). *Developmental trajectories of second language speech production: The case of English-medium instruction in Japan*. Unpublished MA dissertation, School of Education, Waseda University, Japan.

Suzuki, S., Harada, T., Eguchi, M., Kudo, S., & Moriya, R. (2017). Investigating the relationship between students' attitudes toward English-medium instruction and L2 Speaking. *Essays on English Language and Literature*, *46,* 25–41.

Taguchi, N. (2014a). English-medium education in the global society. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *52*(2), 89–98.

Taguchi, N. (2014b). Pragmatic socialization in an English-medium university in Japan. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *52*(2), 157–181.

Yasuda, T. (2018). Psychological expertise required for advising in language learning: Theories and practical skills for Japanese EFL learners' trait anxiety and perfectionism. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, *9*(1), 11–32.

Yeh, C. C. (2014). Taiwanese students' experiences and attitudes towards English-medium courses in tertiary education. *RELC Journal*, *45*(3), 305–319.

ABSTRACT

Students' Perspectives on the Role of English-Medium Instruction in English Learning:
A Case Study

Shungo SUZUKI, Tetsuo HARADA, Masaki EGUCHI
Shuhei KUDO, Ryo MORIYA

The current study attempts to identify undergraduate students' needs in English-medium instruction (EMI) from the perspectives of both past and future of their English learning and use. Selecting one elective EMI course in the Department of English Language and Literature at Waseda University, 15 undergraduate students completed a set of questionnaires covering their prior experiences with formal language instruction and their perceptions of achievements and difficulties in the target EMI course. The study revealed three major findings. First, there was individual variability in target language use domains (e.g., English for Language Teaching, English for Business Purposes). Second, most of them had an expectation of linguistic outcomes through attending the target EMI course (i.e., *by-product*; Taguchi, 2014a). Third, students had difficulty particularly with group discussion activities in the EMI course. These findings lead to propose several pedagogical implications for more fine-grained integration of curricula for EMI content courses and regular English language courses.