



Title of Project:

Korean University Professors' Pedagogical Knowledge and Professional Development Needs for English-medium Instruction

Researcher:

Jaehan Park
Indiana University
jhpark@psu.edu



Jaehan Park

Research Supervisor:

Dr. Faridah Pawan
Indiana University
fpawan@indiana.edu

Project Summary:

Importance of Research

Korea's educational policy makers have set a course toward achieving full English immersion in teaching and learning at all levels, kindergarten through college, and are moving rapidly ahead. As a result, English-medium instruction (EMI) soon appeared as an important criterion in the national university ranking system published by a major newspaper company of Korea, under the category of "globalization." Almost immediately the demand for more English-medium university courses, and the pressure on professors to teach them, increased. This development reflects aspirations for Korean higher education to achieve world status and attract foreign students, whose numbers are indeed growing (Hong, 2012) in response to promises that instruction will be provided in English. This sudden call for EMI in Korean colleges and university has created challenges for professors, instructors, and students, making it an urgent topic for investigation.

Research Problem

The rapid and massive adoption of EMI in Korean universities has occurred without regard for both instructors' and students' needs for a support system as they transition into the new plan and attempt to deal with its inevitable challenges (Shin & Choi, 2012). Previous studies in Korean context were conducted outside of classrooms and provided little insight into the realities of teaching and learning subjects in a foreign language and the specific kinds of support and training necessary for successful EMI implementation. This lack of classroom-based research on instructors' practices, knowledge bases, and support needed to implement EMI indicates a major gap in the research literature (Tedick & Cammarata, 2012) and calls for in-depth classroom-



based research that elicits instructors’ lived experiences and constructed knowledge for teaching subjects in English to students who are mostly non-native speakers of English.

To address the research problems discussed above, this study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the teaching approaches and methods used by the Korean professors to teach English-medium courses?
2. What scaffolding/sheltered elements do the teachers incorporate into their instruction? How do these approaches converge or differ from Echevarría et al.’s (2012) Sheltered Instruction (SI).
3. What kinds of support and professional development (PD) do EMI teachers say they need? What kinds of further support and PD needs emerge through observations of EMI practices?

Data Collection

A total of six Korean university professors who were experienced in EMI and currently teaching courses in English were recruited for participation in this study. All except one professor, Prof. B, received their academic degrees in English-speaking countries in North America. Data collection consisted of two phases and three data sources: teaching observations, pre- and post-observation interviews, and documents. The goal of the first phase was to understand the research participants’ life histories with particular focus on their preparation for teaching English-medium courses. During the second phase, data were collected from classroom observations, using the SIOP to guide the observations and subsequent discussions. Document analyses triangulated information gained from the pre- and post- observation interviews, and classroom observations. The majority of the data in this study came from interviews translated from Korean into English.

Important Findings

For first research question, the study used Freeman and Johnson’s (1998) categories of teacher knowledge base, namely, teachers’ knowledge of themselves, of their disciplines, of the contexts in which they teach, and of the unique aspects of teaching and learning in their classrooms. The findings that emerged from applying this framework demonstrated that teachers drew their knowledge from all three sources, as summarized in Table 1.

<p>First Category: In- Classroom Instructional Approaches (derived from personal, experiential and disciplinary knowledge)</p>	<p>Second Category: Beyond and Out of the Classroom Efforts (derived from knowledge about contextual possibilities)</p>	<p>Third Category: Language Specific Approaches (derived from understanding specific language struggles in the classroom and disciplinary knowledge)</p>
---	--	---



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Making content comprehensible through unpacking complex ideas · Using visual images · Increasing students' readiness prior to classroom meetings · Using homework assignments and projects to have students cognitively engaged outside classroom · Providing handouts · Reviewing · Amplifying but not simplifying · Using templates to support student presentations · Teaching other cultures · Co-constructing knowledge through interaction and collaboration · Teaching with materials from publishers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · English camp for students' language learning · English expression books for specific majors · Content-based instruction using joint sources · Extended office hours · Weekend tutorial sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Classroom-level micro language planning · Translanguaging (using L1 and L2 linguistic and nonlinguistic features e.g. tone, gestures) · Codeswitching (going back and forth between L1 and L2) · Composing secret language agreement · Compiling English expression books for specific majors · Teaching vocabulary
--	---	--

Table 1: Analyses Based on Categories of Teacher Knowledge

While Freeman and Johnson's 1998 framework helped us understand the professors' knowledge bases and how they used this knowledge in their practice, The Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarría et al., 2012) helped us identify the types of support the professors needed. The SIOP is an observational protocol and instructional tool developed to assist instructors of content-based instruction with curriculum design and lesson planning (Echevarría et al., 2012). SIOP-based observations and post-observation discussions yielded information that helped us identify some areas in which the professors needed additional support. The five main categories in SIOP are the following: Lesson Preparation, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Practice/Application, and Lesson Delivery. The specific teacher indicators appear in Table 2.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Developing foundations to prepare students to take on for English-medium classes. · Moderating English language use according to students' proficiency · Distinguishing between content obligatory and content compatible vocabulary · Distinguishing language and content objectives · Teaching explicitly language learning strategies · Creating opportunities for students to use English verbally. · Explaining concepts extensively in English · Developing opportunities for use of interaction and discussion for learning · Grouping students in configurations that will provide opportunities for experiential learning · Balancing the use of informal and formal feedback in English · Collaborating and learning with language specialists
--



Table 2: SIOP Teacher Indicators for Korean EMI Teachers

The research found that all instructors needed pedagogical support in undertaking EMI. However, the opportunities for such support, including collaboration with colleagues, particularly those who are language specialists were limited.

Implications

The most obvious implication of the research is that administrative mandates can be detrimental to effective practice, unless they are carefully planned with input from the main stakeholders and are accompanied by funding to support programs that can assist teachers and students as they adjust gradually to the changes that are brought about by the mandate. Otherwise, both instructors and students are caught in the middle of a chaotic situation with consequences that are not solely academic. One of the main reasons the researcher became drawn to the topic –was because of the high instructor- and student-suicide rates that he was reading about in the newspapers and that involved teachers who found EMI overly burdensome and students who found themselves defeated by failure due to struggles with the English language (Evans, Lee & Kim, 2014). While these are particularly dramatic situations, they attest to the dire exigencies that an ill-planned policy can produce.

Finally, the study points directly to the need for a coordinated effort by university officials to fund and support truly relevant EMI and PD programs. One immediate outcome of such an institutionalized effort could be elimination of the need for instructors and students to construct “secret pacts” (i.e., allowing use of some Korean language to enable communication among them) as EMI practices became more open and flexible. The long term outcome of such PD programs could be a repository of expertise and best practices that are both EMI- and Korea-specific. Such outcomes can be achieved through multiple efforts, including PD that focuses on both English and subject area teacher collaboration in which each individual can benefit from the expertise of the other to teach content through the English language. The content of the PD programs could also include specific content-based language teaching approaches such as Sheltered Instruction and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) (Chamot & O’Malley, 1987). Nevertheless, the best form of PD programs are those informed by the EMI instructors themselves such as the six in this study as, “[e]ducators are at the epicenter of this dynamic process, acting on their agency to change the various language education policies they must translate into practice” (Menken & Garcia, 2010, p. 1).



References

- Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Garrison, D.R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in a computer conferencing context. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 5(2), 1–17.
- Airey, J. (2009). *Science, language and literacy: Case studies of learning in Swedish university physics* (Unpublished Dissertation). Uppsala University. Uppsala, Sweden.
- Airey, J. (2012). “I don’t teach language”: The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden. *AILA Review*, 25, 64–79.
- Bailey, K. M. (1982). *Teaching in a second language: The communicative competence of non-native speaking teaching assistants* (Unpublished dissertation). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2–3), 147–170.
- Ball, P., & Lindsay, D. (2013). Language demands and support for English-medium instruction in tertiary education. Learning from a specific context. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra, (Eds.). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 44–61). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Barwell, R. (2005a). Critical issues for language and content in mainstream classrooms: Introduction. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 143–150.
- Barwell, R. (2005b). Integrating language and content: Issues from the mathematics classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 205–218.
- Baurain, B. (2012). Beliefs into practice: A religious inquiry into teacher knowledge. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 11, 312–332.
- Bianco, J. L. (2010). Globalization of universities and institutions. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*. (Vol. 4, pp. 201–208). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. New York: Continuum.
- Brinton, D. (2007). Two for one—Language-enhanced content instruction in English for academic purposes. In *Teaching English for specific purposes: Meeting our learners’ needs* (pp. 1–16). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Brinton, D. (2009). *Content-based Instruction and SIOP*. Research presentation at an annual conference of the Korean Association of Teachers of English.



- Brinton, D. M., Wesche, D., & Snow, A. (2003). *Content-based language instruction: Michigan classics edition*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Butler, Y. G. (2005). Content-based instruction in EFL contexts: Considerations for effective implementation. *JALT Journal*, 27(2), 227–242.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 1–21.
- Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use (n.d.). About the Centre. Retrieved from http://cip.ku.dk/english/about_cip/
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(2), 227–249.
- Choi, S. J. (2013). Issues and challenges in offering English-medium instruction: A close examination of the classroom experiences of professors. *영어영문학연구 [Studies in English Language & Literature]*, 39(2), 275–306.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 15(4), 361–385.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, M. F. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as personal' in studies of the personal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(6), 487–500.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, M. F. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coleman, J. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39(1), 1–14.
- Costa, F. (2012). Focus on form in ICLHE lectures in Italy: Evidence from English-medium science lectures by native speakers of Italian. *AILA Review*, 25, 30–47.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.



- Crandall, J., & Kaufman, D. (2002). *Content-based instruction in higher education settings*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Immersion education for the millennium: What have we learned from 30 years of research on second language immersion? In M. R. Childs & R. M. Bostwick (Eds.), *Learning through two languages: Research and practice: Second Katoh Gakuen International Symposium on Immersion and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 34-47). Katoh Gakuen, Japan.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2012). A postscript on institutional motivations, research concerns and professional implications. *AILA Review*, 25, 101–103.
- Doiz, A. Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (Eds.). (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Doiz, A. Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). Future challenges for English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra, (Eds.). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 213–221). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Drake, K. N., & Long, D. (2009). Rebecca's in the dark: A comparative study of problem-based learning and direct instruction/experiential learning in two 4th-grade classrooms. *Journal of Elementary Science Education*, 21(1), 1–16.
- Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2012). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP Model* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 407–432.
- Eun, H.-Y. (2009). Application of CBI in English writing class at a college level. *New Studies of English Language & Literature [신영어영문학]*, 44, 211–237.
- Evans, M. S., Lee, H.-R., & Lee, H.-J. (2014). Codeswitching by Korean students in New Zealand and lecturers in Korea. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in*



- university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 186–213). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London, UK: Longman.
- Farrell, P. (1990). *Vocabulary in ESP: A lexical analysis of the English of electronics and a study of semi-technical vocabulary* (Vol. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 25). Dublin, Ireland: Trinity College.
- Flowerdew, J. (Ed.) (1994). *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Flowerdew, J., Miller, L., & Li, D. C. S. (2000). Chinese lecturers' perceptions, problems and strategies in lecturing in English to Chinese-speaking students. *RELC Journal*, 31(1), 116–138.
- Fortanet, I. (2008). Questions for debate in English medium lecturing in Spain. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.). *Realizing content and language integration in higher education* (pp. 21–31). Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- Fortanet-Gomez, I. (2013). *CLIL in higher education: Towards a multilingual language policy*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. A perspective from North American educational research on teacher education in English language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 35(1), 1–13.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 397–417.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Comments on Robert Yates and Dennis Muchisky's "On reconceptualizing teacher education". Readers react... Common misconceptions about the quiet revolution. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 119–127.
- Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 305–327.



- Genesee, F. (2008). Dual language in the global village. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.). *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 22–45). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. West Port, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 447–464.
- Golombek, P. R., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: Examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second language teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching*, 10(3), 307–327.
- Graaff, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 603–624.
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 247–254.
- Guarino, A.J., Echevarría, J., Short, D., Schick, J., Forbes, S., & Rueda, R. (2001). The sheltered instruction observation protocol. *Journal of Research in Education*, 11, 138–140.
- Haberland, H., & Mortensen, J. (2012). Language variety, language hierarchy and language choice in the international university. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 1–6.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1998). Things and relations. In J. R. Martin & V. Robert (Eds.). *Reading science: Critical and functional perspectives on discourse of science* (pp. 185–235). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2006). *Linguistic studies of text and discourse*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Han, K. H., Heo, J. H., & Yun, I. (2010). 글로벌 공학인재 양성을 위한 영어강의의 역할과 과제 [The role and task of English medium instruction (EMI) for educating global engineers. *한국공학대학교학회*, 13(3), 53–60.
- Haneda, M. (2014). From academic language to academic communication: Building on English learners' resources. *Linguistics and Education*, 26, 126–135.
- Hellekjær, G. O. (2010). Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education, *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 45, 11–34.



- Hill, K., & McNamara, T. (2012). Developing a comprehensive, empirically based research framework for classroom-based assessment. *Language Testing*, 20(3), 395–420.
- Hong, S. (2012). Effectiveness of English-medium courses... "I am not sure", Online Article, Newsis. Retrieved on February 27th, 2012 from <http://media.paran.com/news/view.kth?dirnews=609504&year=2012&pg=1&date=20120227&dir=1>
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93–105.
- Hu, G. (2005). English language education in China: Policies, progress, and problems. *Language Policy*, 4, 5–24.
- Hwang, J.-B., & Ahn, H.-D. (2011). The effects of college-level English-mediated instruction on students' acquisition of content knowledge and English competence. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 11(1), 77–97.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (1998). Dimensions of dialogue: Large classes in China. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 739–761.
- Joe, Y.J., & Lee, H.-K. (2013). Does English-medium instruction benefit students in EFL contexts?: A case study of medical students in Korea. *The Asia-Pacific Educational Researcher*, 22(2), 201–207.
- Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 235–257.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2003). “Seeing” teacher learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 729–737.
- Kang, J.-S. (2008). Social implications of English immersion education. *Journal of Scholars for English Studies in Korea*, 25, 45–64.
- Kang, Y. S. (2009). *A study of suitability and effectiveness of content-language integrated English learning* (Government research report for Seoul Metropolitan Ministry of Education). Seoul, Korea: Seoul Metropolitan Ministry of Education.
- Kessels, J. P. A. M., & Korthagen, F. A. J. (1996). The relationship between theory and practice: Back to the classics. *Educational Researcher*, 25(3), 17–22.



- Kim, J.-r. (2005). Toward Korean immersion of English education. *The Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 10, 23–40.
- Kim, M. (2007). 대학의 영어강의에 대한 비판적 성찰 [Critical reflection on university's English-medium instruction]. *영미문학연구 안과밖*, 22, 243–259.
- Kim, M.-h. (2008). How to improve quality of college English education in Korea?: A clue to addressing 'the English Question' in Korea. *Journal of Scholars for English Studies in Korea*, 25, 65–89.
- Kim, M.-H., & Rha, K.-H. (2010). 초등 영어교육의 교과교차적 내용중심수업 (CBI) 프로그램에 대한 실효성 분석 [Analyzing effectiveness of content-based interdisciplinary instruction in elementary English class]. *Studies in Linguistics*, 16, 27–45.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian Lingua Franca: The 'Lingua Franca Approach' and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1–1, 121–139.
- Klaassen, R. G. (2008). Preparing Lecturers for English-Medium Instruction. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education* (pp. 32–42). Maastricht, Netherlands: Maastricht University. Retrieved from <http://arno.unimaas.nl/show.cgi?fid=12521>
- Klaassen, R. G., & De Graaff, E. (2001). Facing innovation: Preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction in a non-native context. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(3), 281–289.
- Klee, C. A., & Tedick, D. J. (1997). The undergraduate foreign language immersion program in Spanish at the University of Minnesota. In S. B. Stryker & B. L. Leaver (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods* (pp. 140–173). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Kling-Soren, J. M. (2014). The challenges of learning and teaching in English. Keynote presentation presented at the NTNU's Diversity Conference, Trondheim, Norway.
- Kling, J., & MacDonald, K. (2009). *Improving English-medium instruction on EFL university campuses, from the bottom-up & top-down*. TESOL Online virtual seminar.
- Kong, S. (2008). Late immersion in Hong Kong: A pedagogical framework integrating content-language teaching and learning. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 5(3), 107-132.



- Kong, S. (2014). Collaboration between content and language specialists in late immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 70(1), 103–122.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Kurt´an, Z. (2004). Foreign-language-medium instruction in Hungarian higher education. In Wilkinson (Ed.), 126–136.
- Kwon, O.-r. (2009). Lecturing in English. *Engineering Education*, 16(3), 76–79.
- Lee, B. H. (2010). A study on the teaching method for an efficient EMI education of engineering major subjects. *Journal of Korea Instructional Technology*, 13(6), 188–194.
- Lee, C. (2011). Not really English-medium instruction... Professors, students all struggle. *The Ewha Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://m.inews.ewha.ac.kr/articleView.html?idxno=16466&menu=1>
- Lee, M. H. (2009). What do we have EMI for? Retrieved on March 13th, 2012 from <http://www.kwunion.net/zbxe/free/246910/13>.
- Lee, Y. (2005). 기획논단2: 정치학 영어 강의, 국내 학생들의 영어수업 [Teaching politics in English: English-medium instruction for Korean students]. *한국정치학회소식* 29, 5–6.
- Lin, A. (2012). Multilingual and multimodal resources in genre-based pedagogical approaches to L2 English content classrooms. In C. Leung & B. V. Street. (Eds.). *English: A changing medium for education* (pp. 79–103). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lo, Y.-H. G. (2005). Relevance of Knowledge of Second Language Acquisition. In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education* (Vol. 4, pp. 135–157). New York: Springer.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Lyster, R., & Ballinger, S. (2011). Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns over divergent contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 279–288.
- MacDonald, K. (2009). Korean higher education striving for international competitiveness: The role of English-medium instruction and micro-level policy makers. *TESOL Review*, 51–76.



- Marsh, D. (2005). Adding language without taking away. *Guardian Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/guardianweekly/story/0,12674,1464367,00.html>
- Maynes, M. J., Pierce, J. L., & Laslett, B. (2008). *Telling stories: The use of personal narratives in the social sciences and history*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- McKeachie, W. (1994). *Teaching tips* (9th ed.), Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co.
- Menken, K., & Garcia, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.). *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Moon, Y. I. (2004). A study on college English reading using TETE. *English Education Research*, 16(1), 109–130.
- Mulligan, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2000). How much do they understand? Lectures, students and comprehension. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(3), 311–335.
- Nam, K-S., & Cho, Y.-k. (2011). Content-based instruction at primary school: Perspectives from students. *인문학논총*, 26, 25–46.
- Northedge, A. (2003). Enabling participation in academic discourse, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(2), 169–180.
- Northedge, A., & McArthur, J. (2009). Guiding students into a discipline: The significance of the teacher. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *The university and its disciplines* (pp. 107–118). New York, NY: Routledge.



- Oh, H. J., & Lee, H. (2010). 효과적인 영어강의의 특성과 지원 방안 탐색 [Characteristics of effective English medium instruction and support measures]. *Modern English Education*, 11(1), 191–212.
- Park, H.-S. (2006). The effectiveness of English-mediated courses with engineering students. *Journal of English Education Research*, 33, 86–119.
- Park, M. S. (2013). Code-switching and translanguaging: Potential functions in multilingual classrooms. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 50–52.
- Pawan, F. (2008). Content-area teachers and scaffolded instruction for English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(6), 1450–1462.
- Pawan, F., & Craig, D. A. (2011). ESL and content area teacher responses to discussions on English language learner instruction. *TESOL Journal*, 2(3), 293–311.
- Pawan, F., & Ortloff, J. H. (2011). Sustaining collaboration: English-as-a-second-language, and content-area teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 463–471.
- Pawan, F., & Ward, B. (2007). Integrated curriculum: Integrated curriculum development through interdisciplinary collaboration. In F. Pawan & G. B. Sietman (Eds.), *Helping English language learners succeed in middle and high schools*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Pearson, P. D., Moje, E., & Greenleaf, C. (2010). Literacy and science: Each in the service of the other. *Science*, 328, 459–463.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329–348.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Pu, H. (2009). *Global pedagogy, local meanings: Toward the glocalization of communicative language teaching in the classrooms of Western-trained Chinese EFL teachers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University. Bloomington, IN.
- Ruiz, R. (1993/1994). Language policy and planning in the United States. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 111–125.
- Salager, F. (1983). The lexis of fundamental medical English: Classificatory framework and rhetorical function (a statistical approach). *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 1(1), 54–64.



- Saye, J., & Brush, T. (2002). Scaffolding critical reasoning about history and social issues in multimedia-supported learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 50(3), 77–96.
- Schleppegrell, M. (2003). Learning language and learning history: A functional linguistics approach. *TESOL Journal*, 12(2), 21–27.
- Schleppegrell, M., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2006). An integrated language and content approach for history teachers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5, 254–268.
- Schleppegrell, M., & Achugar, M. (2003). Learning language and learning history: A functional linguistics approach. *TESOL Journal*, 12(2), 21–27.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sharkey, J. (2004). ESOL teachers' knowledge of context as critical mediator in curriculum development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 279–299.
- Shin, S. Y., & Choi, S. J. (2012). 전공강의에 대한 교수들의 인식 및 운영방안 탐구 [Korean professor's perception of English-medium instruction: Implications for future implementation]. *현대영미어문학* [The Journal of Modern British & American Language & Literature], 30(2), 1–25.
- Short, D. J. (2002). Language learning in sheltered social studies classes. *TESOL Journal*, 11, 18–24.
- Short, D. J., Echevarría, J., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2011). Research on academic literacy development in sheltered instruction classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 363–380.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Sietman, G. B. (2009). *Content-based English instruction in China: An ethnographic exploration of content-based English teachers' challenges, knowledge, and mediated learning* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University Bloomington, IN.
- Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.



- 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.
- Snow, C. E. (2010). Academic language and the challenge of reading for learning about science. *Science*, 328, 450–452.
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2), 201–217.
- Stoller, F. L. (2004). Content-based instruction: Perspectives on curriculum planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 261–283.
- Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 325–342.
- Tedick, D. J., & Cammarata, L. (2012). Content and language integration in K–12 contexts: Student outcomes, teacher practices, and stakeholder perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1), 528–553.
- Thøgersen, J. (2013). Stylistic and pedagogical consequences of university teaching in English in Europe. In H. Haberland, D. Lønsmann, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 181–199). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Thøgersen, J., & Airey, J. (2011). Lecturing undergraduate science in Danish and in English: A comparison of speaking rate and rhetorical style. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30, 209–221.
- Unterberger, B., & Wilhelmer, N. (2011). English-medium education in economics and business studies: Capturing the status quo at Austrian universities. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 161, 90–110.
- Van der Walt, C. (2006). University students' attitudes towards and experiences of bilingual classrooms. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2–3), 359–376.
- Van der Walt, C. (2013). *Multilingual higher education: Beyond English medium orientations*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky* (Vol. 1, pp. 39–285). New York, NY: Plenum Press.



- Ward, J. (1999). How large a vocabulary do EAP engineering students need? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12(2), 309–323.
- Webster, L., & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method: An introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching*. New York: Routledge.
- Weinberg, A. (2012). *Immersion at the tertiary level: Models, challenges and prospects*. Research paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Language Immersion Education, St. Paul, MN.
- Wells, G. (1999). Language and education: Reconceptualizing education as dialogue. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 135–155.
- Wilkinson, R. (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. Learning from a specific context. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra, (Eds.). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 3–24). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Youn, J.-w. (2008). 영문학 전공과목 영어 강의 난제들 [Difficult issues around teaching English literature in English], *영미문학연구 안과뷰*, 25, 90–110.