

Lecturers' Perceptions of English Medium Instruction (EMI) Practice at a University in Indonesia

Nurmala Elmin Simbolon^{1*}, Rhonda Oliver² and Paul Mercieca²

¹*Department of Marine and Fisheries, Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, 78124 Pontianak, Indonesia*

²*School of Education, Curtin University, Perth, 6102, Australia*

ABSTRACT

The internationalisation of higher education has contributed to the increasing number of English medium instruction (EMI) implementation in a variety of global teaching contexts, including in Indonesia. One approach used to practice EMI is content and language integrated learning (CLIL). This responsive practice, however, is not without challenges. One main issue is that teachers have limited English language skills to practice EMI. The study reported here investigates lecturers' perceptions of EMI practice in a university in Indonesia. Qualitative research methods, specifically incorporating five focus groups and five individual interviews were used to collect the data. Interview transcripts were then analysed thematically. Findings indicate that the teachers lack a clear understanding of EMI practice in a number of key areas including the selection of learning materials for and ways to conduct students' learning assessment in EMI classrooms. Pedagogical implications include how to approach code-switching and how to incorporate ICT into EMI learning materials. Recommendations for strategies to support future EMI implementation are also outlined.

Keywords: CLIL, code-switching, EMI

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 13 April 2018

Accepted: 13 January 2019

Published: 26 June 2020

E-mail addresses:

simbolon73@gmail.com (Nurmala Elmin Simbolon)

rhonda.oliver@curtin.edu.au (Rhonda Oliver)

p.mercieca@exchange.curtin.edu.au (Paul Mercieca)

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

In many global contexts, English Medium Instruction (EMI) is the model used for bilingual teaching (Baker, 2011) where some of the curriculum content is taught through the students' second or foreign language (Aguilar, 2017; Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013; Zacharias, 2013). However, in other contexts, including this study, content

and language integrated learning (CLIL) is used to reference EMI (Aguilar, 2017; Floris, 2014). This is because several EMI practices adopt a CLIL approach, namely various teaching strategies are used so that dual-learning objectives - language and the content – can be achieved (Coyle et al., 2010).

According to Dale and Tanner (2012), CLIL can be categorised into two main types, subject and language-focused courses. Subject courses, or what Massler et al. (2014) termed as ‘L2 medium subjects’ are presented by the content teachers, whereas in the second CLIL, or ‘L2 classes’ (Massler et al., 2014) is delivered by language specialists, although in a slightly different way from content-based language teaching (CBLT) where the focus is the development of target language while using the content materials.

Unlike language teachers, content specialists generally use the term EMI to describe CLIL type teaching. Because of the context of the current study (which is an examination of content teachers’ perceptions), the term EMI is adopted. Furthermore, as is common practice with EMI language teaching, in the current context English is not commonly spoken in the wider community (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). Even so, although the term EMI is used, it should be noted that in practice many of the strategies that are used manifest as CLIL teaching.

Three models for EMI practice are suggested by Coyle et al. (2010). The first model is “plurilingual education”, which

means that more than one language is used in EMI programs. The students are expected to be skilled in both the subject matter and the new language(s) skills. Within this model, the students are required to have sufficient proficiency in the vehicular language (for example English). The rationale for this is that students would be expected to code-switch between languages in EMI classrooms. The second model is “language-embedded content courses”, in which teaching is presented by content and language teachers. Also, discipline programs are designed with the explicit objective of language focus. The final model is called “adjunct CLIL”. This model is a type of EMI where the language and the content teaching are parallel. Accordingly, the teaching of target language uses a content-based instruction (CBI) approach (Stoller, 2008) where the content courses are used as learning materials for the target language learning. This model is the one used in English courses in Indonesian higher education, especially in the target university (Simbolon, 2015).

English Medium Instruction (EMI) in Indonesia

In Indonesia, EMI programs were first introduced into schools by teaching some courses such as Mathematics and Science using English as the language of instruction. It was expected that through these programs the students’ English skills would improve (Zacharias, 2013). In particular, it was believed that students would have more opportunities to practise and, therefore, to

develop their English language proficiency (Bax, 2010). Other perceived benefits of EMI include improved English proficiency (Aguilar, 2017; Floris, 2014) and the chance to obtain employment after study (Aguilar, 2017). However, teachers do encounter a number of challenges when using EMI. The most commonly reported issue is the teachers' low level of English proficiency, which in turn contributes to their lack of confidence when using such an approach. It has also been reported that many teachers lack the background and training to scaffold the students' language learning, leading to poor teaching performance and learning outcomes (Bax, 2010). These perceptions were also reflected in Indonesia and as a consequence, this program only ran for a short time and after seven years, especially in most government schools in Indonesia, it was officially abandoned.

In spite of this failure in schools, EMI is increasingly being used in state universities in Indonesia. Global competition between higher education institutions, particularly to attract more international students (Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013; Nasir, 2015), seems to be the trigger for this practice. For instance, the University of Padjajaran recently advertised a medical degree that is taught fully in the English language (Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013). Many other big universities, such as Universitas Gadjah Mada and Universitas Indonesia, have followed suit. To achieve this, these universities have used a system of stakeholder management boards. These boards promote autonomy for university administrators, thereby

providing government universities with greater flexibility in designing their curricula (including the use of EMI) to meet the different needs of a more diverse student body and as a way to attract international students. Despite the clear reasons for using EMI, whether or not it can be successfully implemented is yet to be empirically tested. Following previous research (Bax, 2010; Zacharias, 2013) the current study focuses on lecturers' perspectives using a case study approach to examine EMI practice at Pondasi University. Further, other factors that may affect EMI instruction are also explored in the current study. In particular, the discourse of faculty members is interrogated to explore the perceptions of those required to implement EMI.

Studies on Teachers' Perspectives on EMI

To date, only a few studies have examined teachers' perspectives on EMI. Of those that have been undertaken, there have been investigations about the terminology used to describe EMI practice and the theoretical and practical approaches applied when implementing an EMI approach. Aguilar's (2017) study, for example, sought to understand the lecturers' views on and their preferences for the terms CLIL and EMI in a university in Spain. Surveys and interviews were used to collect information and she found that the lecturers perceived EMI to be less demanding than CLIL, hence EMI was preferred. In comparison to CLIL, the teachers also considered that language support was unnecessary for students

and CLIL was seen to be more suitable for students who have limited English proficiency. Together these findings suggest that the lecturers' level of understanding and familiarity with methodological skills strongly influence their practices.

Another study was conducted by Dewi (2017) who examined lecturers' perceptions of EMI in several public and private universities in Indonesia. Out of 36 lecturers who completed the questionnaires, six were invited for individual interviews. There were 16 English lecturers and 20 other subject lecturers who participated in the survey and three lecturers from each group participated in the individual interviews. The findings of the study showed that the participants positively viewed the use of the English language at the universities. One of the reasons for this positivity was that the English language facilitates the accessibility and understanding of (English) textbooks. However, some lecturers still opted to use Indonesian as the medium of instruction. The reasons for this preference were complex, although for many of the participants this was strongly related to their own English language skills.

Lecturers' perceptions appear to reflect the complex situation that exists in the broader context. For example, Hung and Lan's (2017) study focused on the challenges faced by 28 content lecturers when implementing EMI at a public university in Vietnam. Their study found that generally, teachers were supportive of the program. In spite of their satisfaction with available teaching resources, they did

indicate that they encountered difficulties when explaining terminology and abstract concepts in English in a way that helped the students.

Other studies have focused on teachers' knowledge of EMI approaches. For example, the study by Aguilar (2017) found that lecturers viewed EMI as an approach that simply focused on content with little or no attention given to English language learning, particularly to assessment. Another study conducted by Hu and Li (2017) did indicate lecturers' use of English when assessing students' learning in the EMI classroom, but they suggested that this occurred only in a limited way. Their study was based on the perception of ten professors who used EMI instruction in their classes in two big universities in China. They specifically examined the types of questions used by the lecturers and compared teacher-student interactions in classes where English only, Chinese only, and a mixture of both languages were used. They found that EMI appeared to hinder the students from developing an in-depth mastery of the content. This failure was caused by lecturers' frequent use of questions that encompassed lower-order cognitive processes (as per Bloom's taxonomy), targeting such things as 'remembering' facts and 'understanding' basic concepts. Therefore, the problem with the approach is probably related to the lecturers' limited teaching strategies rather than with the principles of the pedagogy (Hu & Li, 2017).

This was also reflected in another study undertaken by Briggs et al. (2018). They used an online global survey to examine the

perspectives of 167 school and university teaching staff from 27 countries. One of the key findings of their study was that the lecturers found it challenging to prepare their lessons and learning materials when using EMI. Thus it seems that teachers need professional training to support their teaching in EMI classrooms.

In summary, therefore, previous research has found considerable variability in teacher perceptions of EMI practice. This is particularly the case with regards to the terms used for EMI and those issues surrounding the use of EMI in classrooms, such as language use, strategies in assessing students' learning and learning resources and materials.

Accordingly, the study reported here has sought to answer the research questions as follows:

- (i) What are lecturers' perceptions of the term 'EMI' in an Indonesian university?
- (ii) What are lecturers' perceptions of EMI including what it should be called, what language should be used, the preparation and use of learning materials, and the ways students' learning in EMI classrooms should be assessed?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was undertaken at Pondasi University, a state university in Indonesia. Data were collected by way of focus groups and individual interviews. This qualitative study was intended to seek rich and relevant information about EMI.

Research Context

There were several reasons for selecting Pondasi University as a research setting. First, the researcher has been one of the faculty members of the University for a considerable length of time so it allowed for access to the research context and helped increase the feasibility of the study. In addition, some programs, such as Administration Business, Accounting, Information Technology, at the University have practised EMI as a way to obtaining international recognition and therefore, there is a university imperative underpinning this research.

Participants

Purposive sampling (Bryman, 2008) was used to identify key participants for both the focus group and individual interviews. There were 21 lecturers participating in this study. There were five focus groups with three to six participants in each group. Purposive sampling (Bryman, 2008) was used to identify key participants for both the focus group and individual interviews. There were 21 lecturers participating in this study. There were five focus groups with three to six participants in each group. The formation of the focus groups was based on several criteria such as lecturers' length of teaching experience, English proficiency, and experience of EMI in their teaching. These criteria are believed to contribute to their perception of EMI. Table 1 below illustrates the make-up of these focus groups with the range of length of lecturers' teaching experience. As can be seen, four

groups consisting of three to five lecturers had no or less than one-year experience with EMI practice. The consideration for categorising this particular length of EMI teaching experience was based on observations and informal conversations. A few lecturers in the four groups considered themselves to have EMI teaching experience by using English in their classes in the year the interviews were done. The final group (Group Five) consisted of six lecturers, who had considerable experience with EMI teaching (ranging from two-four years of full-time practice). From these focus groups, five lecturers agreed to participate in further in-depth individual interviews. The invitation for the individual interviews was based on several issues they raised during the focus group interviews. One of

the issues which needed further examination was the language used in EMI practice. The participants of the individual interviews were from different faculties. Table 2 provides the profile of the participants in individual interviews.

Data Collection

Instrumentation and Tools. Key questions included those seeking to determine the lecturers' perceptions about the term EMI and the strategies which could be used in EMI classrooms. Further, those key issues emerging from participants' responses in the focus groups were used as the guidelines for the development of questions for individual interviews. Key questions of both interviews are provided in Appendices 1 and 2.

Table 1
Focus groups participants (All mentioned names are pseudonyms)

Group	Number of participants	Faculty	English proficiency* (Higher/ Lower)	Teaching experience**	EMI teaching experience
One (FG1)	4	Mechanical Engineering, Agricultural Technology, Architecture	Higher	14	No
Two (FG2)	4	Mechanical Engineering, Agricultural Technology, Architecture, Marine and Fisheries Science	Higher	8.5	No
Three (FG3)	3	Mechanical Engineering, Business Administration, Accounting	Lower	16.7	No
Four (FG4)	4	Business Administration, Accounting, Architecture, Marine and Fisheries Science	Lower	8.3	No
Five (FG5)	6	Business Administration, Accounting, Agricultural Technology, Electronic Engineering	Higher	9.7	Two-four years

* measured by their 450+ scores on Test of English as a Foreign English (TOEFL)

** the mean value of all participants' length of teaching experience

Table 2
The profile of lecturers in the individual interviews

Name (pseudonyms)	Faculty	Course taught	EMI teaching experience	EMI teaching method training
Dina	Agricultural Technology	Entrepreneurship	Less than one year	Yes
Tari	Electronic Engineering	Programming 1 and 2	Two to four years	No
Satrio	Mechanical Engineering	Mechanics	No	No
Agung	Electronic Engineering	Mathematics	Two to four years	No
Susi	Business Administration	Quality Management Systems (QMS)	Two to four years	Yes

Procedure. After permission was obtained from the University leader, a document review of staff job assignment at Pondasi University was done. Participants were purposively selected and recruited based on the criteria presented in Table 2. After this, several names were obtained and these individuals were called and asked about their willingness to participate in this study. Twenty-one (21) teaching staff agreed to take part in this research. For the individual interviews, participants were selected based on the topic relevance and quality of their responses in the focus group interviews. The duration of the focus group interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 45 minutes. Individual interviews were conducted in about three hours in total with each mostly being of 30 minutes duration.

This researcher (the first author of this article) acted as the moderator and the interviewer in both focus group and individual interviews. Prior to the interviews (both focus group and individual), one of the researchers (Author 1) undertook training related to these research techniques (and

gathering knowledge about the theoretical constructs underpinning these) in order that she could interview the participants in an appropriate way.

Data Analysis

The interview data were analysed thematically (Bryman, 2008). This method included the interpretation of the meaning from the content of the texts, i.e. interview transcripts. The review of the literature encapsulated the themes, which were the focus of this study. All the interview data were transcribed and then checked by the participants to ensure the trustworthiness of the transcripts (Silverman, 2001). This process was found to be useful especially to clarify the intent of the participants. To further ensure the trustworthiness of the themes identified from the data, peer debriefing was undertaken with eight university teaching staff (separate to the participants). They were selected to represent a diverse profile and came from a similar range of disciplines to the

interview participants. They examined the transcriptions and identified themes in an iterative way to ensure the veracity of the findings. The profile of each of these lecturers appears in Appendix 3.

RESULTS

Four key issues emerged from the analysis, namely: the lecturer's use of different terms for EMI, practical issues surrounding the use of EMI in classrooms including language use, learning materials, and the assessment of students' learning in EMI.

Terms Used as a Reference to EMI

Lecturer-participants used the terms "bilingual classes" and "international classes" when they were asked about their understanding of EMI. It must be acknowledged that the understanding of this terminology was often co-constructed with the participants, for example with respect to bilingual classes:

As far as you have heard, what do you know about the bilingual class or the bilingual teaching at the university level? (Moderator).

....

The thing which is clear to me is that some of the teachings is in Indonesian, and partly in the foreign language, but if it is a bilingual class with English, partly the teaching is in English. That is what I have learned (Satrio, a participant in FG1).

And,

So, what do you know about bilingual classes? (Moderator).

....

In my opinion, a bilingual class is a class which uses two languages, Indonesian and the foreign language. The foreign language we introduce here is English. (Karina, a participant in FG4).

Interestingly, the "international classes" term was used by most of the participants who participated in the focus groups, for examples, a lecturer in FG4 said, "Therefore, it is like this, if there is one student from abroad, in the class it is compulsory to use the international language, English" (Anwar). Another lecturer in FG2 expressed this way "It's a kind of international class, right?" (Dina).

Although the term "international classes" seemed to encapsulate the notion of EMI, it is worth noting that there was also a degree of ambiguity. In this regard, the lack of clarity surrounding the terminology appears to reflect the range of EMI practices that are being used by lecturers at this University. These are the practices described next.

The Use of Language in EMI Classroom

Regarding language use, some lecturers expressed the idea that they practised only partial English instruction. A lecturer in FG2 explained this way "As I teach Basic

Physics, if it is going to be implemented, I might insert some technical terms. The English technical terms". Another lecturer in FG5 said "I started to include elements associated with accounting terminology in particular, in the English language. We also presented the exercises in English".

As can be seen, the previous example is very similar to the one above and yet the lecturers were from different groups. Specifically, the lecturer from FG2 was from a group who had no experience in EMI teaching, while the lecturer from FG5 was EMI-experienced. Thus, this finding raises questions about whether EMI teaching experience has any effect on the lecturers' views on the use of English language in the EMI classes (this particular issue is explored further later in this section).

One reason given by the lecturers for mixing L1 and English in their EMI practice was the students' low level of English skills. One lecturer in the individual interview said this way "But when it comes to the very important points of the lesson, besides English, we need to use Indonesian in order that the students won't be mistaken in their understanding" (Dina).

On this basis, some lecturers with experience in EMI teaching suggested that, in order to support students' learning, key learning points in their lessons were delivered in L1. During the individual interview, one lecturer from this group expressed "When the materials get..., like Algorithms, I teach Algorithms, when it gets confusing, it relates to logical thinking, I use Indonesian" (Erni). Her fellow lecturer, who

used EMI extensively described a specific way she used L1 in her classes "I explain it in Indonesian, as it might be easier to understand, for example in the lesson on logics, I gave a review of logics, 'for', 'to', 'do', 'For' means this, 'to' this, and 'do' that. When I explain it in Indonesian, the students can actually understand it" (Tari).

Explaining the key technical terms was the main reason for lecturers switching to Indonesian (i.e. the students' L1) during EMI practice. In addition, students' limited English appears to prompt these university teachers to use the students' L1. At the same time, it was not clear if this code-switching practice was affected by lecturers' EMI teaching experience. To explore this further the responses of lecturers from both groups were compared.

It was found that those lecturers who had no EMI teaching experience felt a general need to use both languages in the EMI classrooms. In contrast, all lecturer-participants with experience in EMI teaching reported that the Indonesian language was required only during the delivery of key information. Furthermore, these lecturers gave a more detailed description of the way in which they used English in their teaching practice. Specifically, they described how they used the English language for the student worksheets, which was developed by these lecturers, in examination materials, during question and answer sessions, and in the presentation of PowerPoint slides. For examples, two lecturers in FG5 explained the case "The modules and the worksheets were prepared in English." (Hidayat) and

“So, the rest (of the lesson) such as asking the questions, was in English” (Tari). It is worth noting that what Tari meant by ‘asking questions’ in English referred to teaching in her EMI classroom where the section of content delivery was in the Indonesian language. Hence, experience in EMI practice did seem to influence the perspectives of several lecturers about the practical use of the two languages when teaching using an EMI approach. In fact, in the individual interview one of the participants from the group with EMI-teaching-experienced group appeared to describe a translation teaching model “If I say something in English, I will follow it in Indonesian...It’s always like that” (Agung).

Thus, lecturers’ views on both L1 and L2 use in EMI classrooms may suggest two main types of practices, namely functional code-switching and translation practice. However, a few lecturers (Groups One and Four) argued for fuller use of English in instruction. For example Anwar in FG4 said that the instruction should be in English when there was a student from abroad in either a bilingual class or an international class.

It is important to understand that this lecturer’s perception of a fully-English instructed practice was linked with the terminology of ‘international classes’. His understanding may reflect his previous study experience, specifically that he had a Master degree in a university where there were several international students and English-only was used for instruction purposes.

Learning Resources for EMI Practice

The lecturers described a number of aspects regarding learning resources necessary for EMI practice, such as the nomination of languages used for presenting the materials (English or Indonesian, or both) and the inclusion of multimedia learning resources. Some lecturers described how they used English language textbooks in their classrooms:

The newness of knowledge or theory derives from English. As Mr. Karyono mentioned before if we depend on our textbooks, they are old, they were (published in) 1992 or some years like that. So, I want to motivate them that in the future the newness of knowledge, scientific journals will be in English, [for instance] when I teach them a course such as Human Resources, fortunately, I have a collection of e-books (Syafiril, a lecturer in FG3).

Also, it was evident that other lecturer-participants were comfortable using English-presented-learning materials. Another lecturer indicated that as there are already many resources available in English and that these could be used as they can support her students’ second language learning. A participant in FG1 expressed this “Therefore, the field of study, particularly our study in Gangga (a type of moss) has much literature which is presented in English” (Joko).

However, others suggested the need to adapt learning materials that are written

in English to be used in the EMI practice: "Some materials, yes, but I do make some adaptation ... to the curriculum, especially for the Indonesian curriculum" (Agung). Thus, this lecturer seems to suggest he was concerned with curriculum adaptation for the context of the local curriculum, even when an EMI approach was being used.

Another issue that the participants did consider to be important for practising EMI was the inclusion of multimedia. For instance, one lecturer in the individual interview described this as follows "In Indonesian medium instruction, visual media might not be necessary, but if it's in English the students learn twice, besides the materials, they learn to understand the language. So, using the visual media is a plus" (Satrio).

The Assessment of Students' Learning in EMI Classrooms

A few lecturers supported a clear distinction between content and language in EMI classroom. They specifically focused on assessing students in the content knowledge by expressing this following "For a lecturer like me, it is easier to assess the content than the language because we are not the language lecturers" (Satrio). It is important to note that this particular perception may be caused by his proficiency in English, which appeared to be insufficient to enable him to set the assessment in the target language. This lecturer, along with others, suggested that the assessment of subject matter understanding was most appropriately done in the Indonesian language. Similar

comments from other participants were observed in other individual interviews. They said this way: "What I want to see when in evaluating students' learning is if they apply a concept to a given problem" (Satrio), "I would ask the points I have presented, or I ask them to give a summary of the lesson ... They are given freedom, they can use English or Indonesian" (Dina). This particular perception might be due to the lecturers' own limited English proficiency which makes it difficult for them to assess students' English learning.

DISCUSSION

EMI Terms

The main goal of the research was to investigate the lecturers' perceptions of EMI practice in one Indonesian university. The findings show the lecturer-participants used two types of terminology to refer to EMI - "bilingual classes" and "international classes". As the term suggests "bilingual classes" implies the use of two languages concurrently in EMI classrooms. Nevertheless, in the present research "international classes" was also used to refer to an EMI practice where instruction was mainly presented in the English language (in some contexts it also could be done partially). It was the latter term that was the most consistently used by the lecturers as a reference to EMI. This may be due to the fact that a number of local educational institutions used this term (Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013). These participants' perceptions may also reflect the internationalisation process of global higher

education and trend towards prioritising English language use (Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013). Therefore, in this study context “international classes” are conflated with the practice of English language instruction in particular disciplines, and especially with catering for international students in the local universities.

In some Indonesian universities, including in the university in this study, one of the reasons for implementing EMI is to improve the students’ English skills. This drive is similar to what has been reported in other studies, that is, improving local students’ English proficiency in content-based professional expertise (Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013). In this way, the purpose of using English instruction within “bilingual classes” in the present context seems to have a similar foundational pedagogy to CLIL (Coyle et al., 2010).

Even so, the meaning of EMI does seem to lead to confusion. Some scholars consider that it is an approach of bilingual use, which has a dual focus of content and language learning (Coyle et al., 2010). On the other hand, in responding to the global phenomenon of attracting international students in certain local universities, EMI is considered to involve the practice of English instruction only. This particular understanding is practised without considering a need for assessing students’ language learning and hence it is not related to CLIL pedagogy at all. Both of these contrasting results support Dalton-Puffer’s (2011) assertion that varieties of bilingual education programs frequently depend as

much on the cultural and political frame of reference as on the actual characteristics of the programs. This is highlighted by the way in the current findings to the use of EMI terms contrast considerably to that of Aguilar (2017). In her study, conducted in universities in Spain, the participants in her study made a clear distinction between the terms CLIL and EMI. However, it was worth noting that this study was based in Europe, where EMI had been used for quite some time, so university teaching staff in that context might be more familiar with EMI. In contrast, the lecturers in the present study might not have received sufficient information about EMI and how it practised than have their counterparts in Europe. Even so, similar to Aguilar’s participants, some in the present study considered EMI as a way to support students with limited English skills. Even though they may have used the “bilingual classes” term, the focus of lecturers in the present study was mainly to help improve their students limited English. Based on these findings, it does seem that teaching staff need a clear understanding of the reason for adopting a certain term and how the approach should be put into practice. This particular issue is necessary to be clearly understood by the university authorities. Clearer guidance would allow for the commonality of understanding about EMI in the present study context in particular and in Indonesia in general.

Language Use for EMI Classroom

Based on evidence emerging from the interviews, the practice of code-switching

between Indonesian and English was viewed to be essential in EMI practice. The lecturers described two main strategies for the use of code-switching. Firstly, it was through the use of translation, that is, translating each statement from English into Indonesian. The second way was by using both English and Indonesian, but in specific teaching situations. For example, English can be used during the lesson introduction, meanwhile, during the delivery of key lesson content, L1 is suggested to be used. However, such a narrow range of responses suggests that there was a limited understanding of the role of two languages in EMI. This is line with the findings of Hung and Lan's (2017) study where it was evident that the lecturers in their study used less English than Vietnamese and claimed this practice was due to their concerns about students' ability to grasp content when delivered in English. As with the study reported here, the lecturers appeared to need some professional development training about EMI practices, especially in the area of language use in EMI classrooms. Although possible, there is a need for careful consideration in the arrangement of EMI practice regarding code-switching. It may be that policy guidelines need to be provided, such as following Lin's (2015) proposal about L1 and L2 use in different stages and phases of the institution curriculum. If this gradual introduction and practice of English were done at the target university, students' English language development could be supported which would, in turn, help students' learning in both content and

language. In this way, the dual-focus (Coyle et al., 2010) within EMI practice could be achieved. However, this particular issue needs further exploration, especially in the context of the present study.

Learning Resources for EMI Practice

The lecturers raised a number of issues regarding which learning materials should be used for EMI practice. Several lecturers indicated that they like to use learning multimodal teaching resources. Perhaps, this view reflects their understanding of the range and complexity of media which may be encountered in an EMI learning environment.

The importance of using multiple sources for learning also corresponds to the findings of Hung and Lan (2017). In their study, the lecturers seemed well-informed about online reference materials even though they also indicated this process was time-consuming. However, many indicated that predominantly only use PowerPoint slides, appearing to lack confidence in using other learning materials for EMI. The early stage of EMI practice in the current context might have contributed to their lack of familiarity with such materials. This limitation was also described by the lecturers in Briggs et al.'s (2018) study. Once again, this finding highlights the need for further professional development training in this area.

The Assessment of Students' Learning in EMI Classrooms

There seemed to be mixed perceptions among the lecturers in the present context

with regard to assessment, and the way to measure their progress in the EMI classrooms. A few of the participants did indicate that assessment should be conducted in L1 due to their limited English. Furthermore, because of this limited English proficiency, the teaching staff described how they only assessed their students' content learning, which in turn reflects the common practice of the target university of dividing language from the content. This type of separation for the purposes of students' learning assessment has also been found in other studies (Aguilar, 2017). In Hu and Li's (2017) study, for instance, the lecturers did assess their students' learning in English but only used questions from Bloom taxonomy's lower-order cognitive process categories which resulted in students' lack of in-depth understanding of the content knowledge. The finding of the current research along other studies (Aguilar, 2017; Hu & Li, 2017) suggests there is a need to support lecturers to be able to assess in ways that reflect the principles of EMI. This may require not only the development of stronger policy guidelines but also professional development for teaching staff so that they may acquire the skills necessary to achieve this end.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the lecturers seem to lack sufficient knowledge of EMI and this condition appears to have resulted in their limited understanding of EMI practice and the pedagogical approaches to be used. The most problematic issues in their

understanding included the terms used to refer to EMI, the strategy of code-switching practices in the classrooms, and questions about which language to be used for conducting an assessment. When EMI is required by content lecturers, some practical arrangement is necessary so that staff can be supported to use EMI in effective ways. Clear direction was considered to be necessary, especially in the use of two languages for instruction, in conducting an assessment, and in learning materials. In this way the findings of the current support those of previous research showing that the use of EMI by teaching staff requires much further development in Indonesia (Bax, 2010).

From the current study, there are implications for the implementation of EMI, particularly at Pondasi University. To ensure EMI practice at the University is implemented successfully, there is a clear need for revising the curriculum, optimising the number of hours available for the English course, developing appropriate policy guidelines, and providing professional development for teaching staff. However, as the study was based on a small corpus, with input from a small number of content lecturers in a government university, more studies are necessary in order to more confidently make generalisations applicable to other universities in Indonesia, in both private and state institutions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to the Indonesian government (The Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher

Education, which is now called The Ministry of Education and Culture) for granting me a scholarship to complete my Doctoral study at Curtin University, Australia. I also would like to acknowledge that the study reported in this article resulted from one phase of the research of my Doctoral thesis at Curtin University. The complete document of the thesis can be found at Curtin institutional repository.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, M. (2017). Engineering lecturers' views on CLIL and EMI. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(6), 722-735. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2015.1073664
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bax, S. (2010). *Researching English bilingual education in Thailand, Indonesia and South Korea*. Retrieved February 1, 2015, from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/publication_2_-_researching_english_bilingual_education.pdf
- Briggs, J. G., Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2018). English medium instruction: Comparing teacher beliefs in secondary and tertiary education. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(3), 673-696.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed.). New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dale, L., & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182-204. doi: 10.1017/S0267190511000092
- Dewi, A. (2017). English as a medium of instruction in Indonesian higher education: A study of lecturers' perceptions. In B. Fenton-Smith, H. Pamela, & W. Ian (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific* (pp. 241-259). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Floris, F. D. (2014). Learning subject matter through English as the medium of instruction: Students' and teachers' perspectives. *Asian Englishes*, 16(1), 47-59. doi: 10.1080/13488678.2014.884879
- Gill, S. K., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2013). *English in Asian and European higher education*. Retrieved July 2, 2014, from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1002/9781405198431/asset/homepages/3_English_in_Asian_and_European_Higher_Education.pdf?v=1&s=4c49dc8642113e36a4e3bf192876688ba8addaa2
- Hu, G., & Li, X. (2017). Asking and answering questions in English-medium instruction classrooms: What is the cognitive and syntactic complexity level? In J. Zhao & L. Q. Dixon (Eds.), *English medium instruction in Chinese universities: Perspectives, discourse and evaluation* (pp. 184-203). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Hung, D. M., & Lan, L. T. D. (2017). Content lecturers' challenges in EMI classroom. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 1-21.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J., M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities. *ELT Journal*, 64(4), 367-375. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccp082

- Lin, A. M. Y. (2015). Conceptualising the potential role of L1 in CLIL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 74-89. doi: 10.1080/07908318.2014.1000926
- Massler, U. Stotz, D., & Queisser, C. (2014). Assessment instruments for primary CLIL: The conceptualisation and evaluation of test tasks. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 137-150. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2014.891371
- Nasir, M. (2015). *Bilingual curriculum to be compulsory in universities starting from 2016*. Retrieved January 10, 2016, from <http://m.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/11/30/bilingual-curriculum-be-compulsory-universities-starting-2016.html>
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Simbolon, N. E. (2015). Using the CBI method in teaching English in an Indonesian university. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 23(4), 1211-1224.
- Stoller, F. L. (2008). Content-based instruction. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 59-70). New York, USA: Springer.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2013). Navigating through the English-medium-of-instruction policy: Voices from the field. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 93-108. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2013.782797

APPENDIX 1**KEY QUESTIONS OF FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW**

No.	Questions
Groups 1, 2, 3, 4	
1.	What do you know about EMI? (Who practises, the reasons for practising it)
2.	How would EMI practice be like in the classroom?
3.	How are the learning materials for EMI classroom prepared?
4.	What do you think about some ways to assessing the students learning in EMI practice?
Group 5	
1.	How do you teach with EMI?
2.	How do you prepare the learning materials?
3.	How did you assess students' performance/learning? Why?

APPENDIX 2**KEY QUESTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW**

No.	Questions
1.	How would practice EMI in the classroom?
2.	What and how would you assess the students in the EMI classroom?

APPENDIX 3**THE PROFILE OF MEMBERS OF PEER DEBRIEFING**

No.	Area of Institution	Course taught
1.	Riau (Sumatera island)	Mechanics
2.	Banten (Java island)	Socio-politics
3.	Riau (Sumatera island)	English
4.	Surabaya (Java island)	Islam
5.	Padang (Sumatera island)	English
6.	Yogyakarta (Java island)	English Literature
7.	Gorontalo (Sulawesi island)	English
8.	Pontianak (Borneo island)	Accounting

