Title	Use of the First Language in an Undergraduate English-Medium Seminar Class : An EMI Case in a Japanese Context
Author(s)	湯川, 笑子
Citation	母語・継承語・バイリンガル教育（MHB）研究. 2016, 12, p. 40-76
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/62208
rights	
Note	

≪ 招待論文 ≫

Use of the First Language in an Undergraduate English-Medium Seminar Class
An EMI Case in a Japanese Context[1]

YUKAWA Emiko (Ritsumeikan University))

eyt24310@lt.ritsumei.ac.jp

大学における英語開講ゼミクラスの第一言語使用
―日本のコンテクストにおけるEMIの一事例―

湯川 笑子

Abstract

English-medium instruction (EMI) has been implemented at universities widely in the world. This paper reports the case of a seminar class (a class whose main purpose is to conduct graduation thesis research) for Japanese undergraduate third and fourth year students which is taught in English with occasional use of Japanese, i.e., a variation of the method known as translanguaging. The study investigated: (1) functions of the Japanese (students' L1) used in class, (2) the relationship between L1 use and students' existing academic knowledge in the field, and (3) students' attitude toward EMI and translanguaging. The following results were found: (1) there were eight types of L1 use, (2) there were differences in L1 use between seniors' presentation sessions and juniors' presentation sessions, which implies that L1 use was related to students' academic and English levels, and (3) students' attitudes were positive especially because graduation theses needed to be written in English. Lastly, the limitations of the study will be discussed.

要　旨

大学で授業を英語で開講する試み（EMI）は世界各地で起こっている。本稿では、日本の学部3、4年生を対象としたゼミクラス（主に卒業論文研究を進める）を英語で開講し、かつ適宜日本語をとり混ぜたトランス・ランゲージングの手法で教えた事例をとりあげる。本研究は（1）クラス内で使用された（学生にとっての母語である）日本語使用

の機能、（2）母語使用と学生の専門分野での学術的知識のレベルとの関係、（3）学生の EMI やトランス・ランゲージングの受け止め方について探った。その結果、（1）母語使用には8つのタイプがあり、（2）4回生の発表時と3回生の発表時とで母語使用に差があることから母語使用と学生の学術的知識・英語に関係があること、（3）特に卒業論文は英語で執筆することから、学生の受けとめは肯定的であることが分かった。最後に本研究の限界に触れる。

Keywords: English-medium instruction, translanguaging, L1 use,
            code-switching,

1. Introduction

English-medium instruction (EMI hereafter) has been widely implemented at universities around the world.　Although the practice of some cases dates back to the 1980's (a university in the Netherlands reported by Wilkinson, 2013, p.4), many institutions/programs seem to have started EMI fairly recently. Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2015, p. xvii) report a 340% increase from 2002 to 2007 in European programs taught in English. The implementation of EMI is not limited to Europe. Higher education institutions in Asian countries have also been practicing EMI (Chang, 2010; Hu, Li, & Lei, 2014; Kim, 2015; Kojima, Sato, & Hamiciuc, 2013; Manakul, 2007; Yip & Tsang, 2007). The reasons most commonly stated in reports/studies for starting EMI programs are (1) internationalization of higher education institution(s) by attracting students from foreign countries and (2) improving the English proficiency of domestic students. However, reports on the effects of EMI are not necessarily all positive and EMI's overall evaluation seems controversial so far; issues often focused on in such discussions include the English proficiency of the students as well as the professors, academic achievement, and satisfaction with the course.

EMI, by definition, uses English to teach, assuming that all the EMI course takers have academic English sufficient for learning content courses in English. However, that is not necessarily the case with all the participants involved. Therefore, use of students' first language (L1) has been suggested as one of the solutions for better implementation of EMI.　Furthermore, in the field of second/foreign language education as well,

researchers reevaluate the importance of using the first language along with the target language (Cook, 2001; Cummins, 2007, 2008, Turnbull, 2001). In addition, this use of bilinguals' (multilinguals') plural language resources has been theorized with the concept of translanguaging in the field of bilingual education (García & Wei, 2014; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a, 2012b). The theory of translanguaging and its application in education have much relevance to the issue of how to conduct EMI courses in the most efficient ways.

This paper, therefore, takes up the issue of L1 use in the context of an EMI course in Japan. Although use of L1 in EMI courses is recommended in some studies, as was mentioned above, L1 use has rarely been investigated as the main focus of studies on EMI before. To fill the gap, the present paper reports a case study of using English as the main medium of instruction incorporating L1 Japanese to some extent to teach L1 Japanese and L2 English students in a Japanese undergraduate program instructed by a Japanese-English bilingual. The paper focuses on the functions of the students' and the instructor's L1 Japanese use, the relationship between L1 use and students' academic knowledge, and the students' views of the EMI class conducted with this bilingual approach. To that end, the paper first reviews relevant literature on EMI in higher education, previous work on L1 use in language teaching, and the concept of translanguaging. After that the case study is reported in order of the background of the course, the research questions, the participants, the data and the results. Lastly, the paper discusses the limitations and the value of the present study and its pedagogical implications.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Overview of EMI

Due to the diverse social contexts of EMI implementation in the world, a large number of reports and studies on varied practices and their outcomes have been accumulated so far. For example, Wilkinson (2013) presents a historical overview of the development of the stance taken for EMI by one Dutch university (see its EMI expansion and the reasons for it on p.9). The information is useful in order to grasp a historic overview, albeit in one region, of EMI practice. He cites Wächter and Maiworm (2008) to summarize the reasons for the introduction of EMI (pp.7-8). Out of nine reasons

mentioned by Wächter and Maiworm (2008), the following two are the most frequently cited in published studies as the reasons to implement EMI; that is, internationalization of the institution(s) at hand and improvement of English of the domestic students.

European countries have been trying to exchange/share resources in higher education within Europe especially since the Bologna Declaration (Declaration, 1999). The Bologna Declaration is a pledge signed by 29 countries and it agreed to establish a system of higher education which facilitates the mobility of students within the member countries in Europe. In such a context EMI is a natural outcome. Research studies on European contexts can be found in many reports: Wilkinson (2013, the Netherlands), Cots (2013, Spain), Ball and Lindsay (2013, Basque Country), Saarinen and Nikula (2013, Finland), Björkman (2010, Sweden), Hellekjær, (2010, Norway) and Coleman (2006, European practice in general). A case concerning the South African situation can be seen in a study of the influence of the regional language (Afrikaans in this case) on the comprehension of texts written in English (van der Walt & Kidd, 2013). The case of an initial trial within teachers' colleges in Israel is reported by Inbar-Lourie and Donitsa-Schmidt (2013).

There are a number of reports on Asian contexts. Many studies are available regarding Korean situations (Cho, 2012; Byun, Chu, Kim, Park, Kim, & Jung, 2011; Kang & Park, 2005; Kim, 2015). These studies commonly point out not only the benefits but also the challenges of the current government-initiated implementation of EMI. An EMI case in a relatively early stage in Taiwan is reported by Chang (2010), and both the policy and practice in China are critically reviewed by Hu, Li, and Lei (2014). Reflecting the still primitive stage of EMI implementation, not so many reports can be found in the Japanese context. Teshigawara and Ueda (2008) report the practice and the effects of three special lecture sessions (out of the 14 total sessions in the semester) they inserted to develop participants' learning strategies in an EMI graduate course. Manakul (2007) describes the effects of two EMI programs in the Graduate School of Engineering. Kojima, Sato, and Hamiciuc (2013) report English and content professors' joint efforts to aid undergraduate EMI course takers.

2.2 Benefits, Challenges, and Recommendations for Further Development of EMI

Manakul (2007) reports how the EMI graduate programs in the university he works

for gradually expanded, and as of 2007 they amounted to four different disciplines: agriculture, engineering, veterinary medicine and science. Although numerical data are not provided, Manakul (2007) says that the implementation of EMI produced a number of positive changes: e.g., an increase of diversity in the student bodies of those programs, increase of the students' and the teachers' international mobility, and more publications in English. The paper mentions that these programs required their foreign students to have a good command of English (p. 160), which was part of the reason for the success of EMI in this case. Since it takes a long time for foreign students to develop the language of their host country, EMI does offer the potential for swifter internationalization of academic institutions.

Chang (2010) conducted an evaluation study of the EMI practice in a Taiwanese university with 370 undergraduate students and six professors from six departments. Chang's data show that "for most of the students (about 40%) the comprehension level was about 50-70%" (p. 64), about 80% of the students were either satisfied or neutral with EMI (p. 66), and over 60% of the students thought that EMI improved their English (p. 68). Chang points out the difficulties of EMI as well in this educational context, which include the students' low degree of lecture comprehension and a lack of textbook reading by the students.

Ball and Lindsay (2013) report that EMI instructors (or future EMI instructors) of the University of the Basque Country were offered some support sessions (a 3-day course, an 8-week course, or a 10-week course). Those sessions were to improve both English language skills and pedagogical skills. The portion of the sessions focusing on pedagogy "alternate (d) between input from the tutors and on-going feedback on the progress of the project from the participating teachers" (p. 49). The participants needed to present a sample teaching material with "the results, observations and reflections" of their experience at the end of the sessions. According to Ball and Lindsay's study, the participating professors in these sessions judged them to be beneficial. It is possible to infer that after these sessions a larger scale and more successful EMI became possible owing to this support.

However, when EMI practice is enforced on a larger population (and/or too hastily), its challenges tend to become noticeable. The doubts which researchers have put into empirical scrutiny include EMI's contribution to the development of English proficiency

and course takers' content understanding. Study reports do not necessarily conclude positively with regard to the effectiveness of EMI courses on English development. A lack of focus or feedback on linguistic form during EMI courses is said to be one possible reason for limited improvement in English (Chang, 2010, p.69; Kang & Park, 2005). Furthermore, some studies point out the fact that EMI may be causing some impediment to delivery and understanding of academic content (Cho, 2012; Hellekjær, 2010, p.23; Im & Kim, 2015). Still others mention/imply that in reality some EMI courses do incorporate use of the local language to some degree (Chang, 2010, pp.82-83; Kim, 2015). Some researchers point out a much longer-term consequence that EMI may bring forth; that is, possible loss of L1 in the domain of higher education, resulting in the universal diglossia situation (Coleman, 2006; Shohamy, 2013; Wilkinson, 2013).

Being aware of the problems of EMI, some solutions have been suggested. These suggestions are varied depending on whether use of the local language is possible/allowed and how large the number of courses offered as EMI is. (For example, if foreign students in class are recruited with the promise that everything will be done solely in English and thus they do not have to learn the local language, there is little room for using the local language in class.) The ideas include flexible implementation of EMI considering students' English ability, goals, and disciplines (Byun, Chu, Kim, Park, Kim, & Jung, 2011); voluntary registration of EMI courses and screening based on students' English ability (Chang, 2010); use of plural instructional modes such as "blended learning", i.e., use of the materials delivered on-line combined with off-line instruction (Kim, 2015); and use of the local language and/or course takers' first language(s). [2]

2.3 Use of L1 in Additional Language Teaching

In the field of additional language (L2 hereafter [3]) teaching, maximum use of the target language in class is desired for ensuring the provision of sufficient input, output, and interaction opportunities for learners. Therefore, teaching English in English, immersion, CLIL, and content-based language teaching of various types have been practiced/explored, all of which try to use the target language as much as possible. However, research evidence has shown that L1 has some valuable roles to play in language teaching (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Barnard & McLellan, 2014; Behan, Turnbull, & Spec, 1997; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Cook, 2001; Kang, 2008; Liu, 2008; Storch &

Wiggleworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

For example, Cook (2001) lists the following uses of L1 by teachers: conveying the meaning of words and sentences, explaining grammar, organizing tasks, disciplining, individualized guiding, and testing. Kang (2008) found that Korean elementary school English teachers used Korean primarily to keep students' attention rather than due to a lack of their English proficiency. Ahmad and Jussof (2009) revealed that teachers' code-switching was significantly related to their students' perception of psychological support given by their teachers as well as the students' view of learning success.

Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) found that six ESL university student pairs used their L1 for task management, clarification of the task, discussion of vocabulary items and their meanings, and grammar. Storch and Wigglesworth claim that the learners' use of L1 aided their control of the task and enabled them to "work at a higher cognitive level than might have been possible" (p. 768). Similar values of L1 use (i.e., better control and learning, increased sense of confidence and achievement, as well as continuity with knowledge gained through L1) in university EFL classrooms are reported by Brooks-Lewis (2009). She claims that L1 use in adults' language classrooms means "meeting the learner half-way" (p. 234). She points out that allowing the adult learners to use their L1 and thus their already well-developed knowledge of language and learning skills is nothing but a learner-centered methodology. Swain and Lapkin (2000) analyzed 22 pairs of eighth-grade French immersion students' task completion and identified three purposes for their use of L1: "(1) moving the task along, (2) focusing attention, and (3) interpersonal interaction" (p. 257). The pairs used one quarter of their turns in L1 and most of them (88%) were talks on task. Therefore, Swain and Lapkin conclude "(w)ithout their L1 use, the task presented to them may not have been accomplished as effectively, or perhaps it might not have been accomplished at all" (p. 268).

So far, previous studies which point out the functions and values of L1 have been reviewed. Even though these studies stress the usefulness of L1, the education of L2 and teaching in L2 assume the target language as the default and desired code to use; in other words, L1 is 'permitted' when necessary. In a recent book on L1 use in various L2 educational contexts edited by Barnard and McLellan (2014), Kirkpatrick (2014) says that teachers have a "feeling of guilt" (p.216) for using L1 in a foreign language classroom and EMI. This indicates that not only EMI but also the educational practice of

language teaching and content-based instruction lacks the concept of flexible use of plural languages in the classroom. Thus, Macro (2014) says that "(c) lassroom codeswitching (CS) is in desperate need of some theorizing" (p.10).

2.4 Concept of translanguaging

The use of plural languages, however, has been theorized recently. One such theorization is the concept of translanguaging. Translanguaging means "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, understandings and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, p. 288). This concept reflects bilinguals' linguistic life of using plural languages freely and spontaneously as their resources. Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012a) say "both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning" (p. 641). Baker also adds "(w)e have recently been emancipated from strict language separation ideas to concepts about bilingualism that are holistic rather than fractional" (Baker, 2011, p. 288).

The same recommendation of plural language use in the language/immersion classrooms is made by Cummins (2008) in the paper titled, "Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education". (Also see Cummins, 2007.) Thus, rather than resorting to learners' L1 in an "emergency" with some guilty feeling, using both (or multiple) languages as legitimate tools at every aspect of teaching/learning in the most appropriate and effective manner seems to be a better articulated principle for education in which plural languages are involved.[4] The concept of translanguaging has provided educational sites with a rationale of, and educational suggestions for, how to incorporate plural languages (Celic & Seltzer, 2013; García & Kano, 2014; García & Wei, 2014; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012b; Wei, 2011).

2.5 Summary of the Literature Review and Research Questions

In this section, the current practices of EMI were reviewed. Academic, social, and economic reasons have been the driving force for the drastic increase of EMI. However, EMI is facing its challenges (students' content understanding, English improvement, the issue of the universal diglossia, etc.). One solution for the problems of EMI suggested by

some researchers is the use of students' first language.

The use of L1 has been recommended in the field of foreign/second language education and immersion/CLIL. The frequently reported functions for L1 use include managerial, affective, and cognitive support. Some researchers even claim that use of L1 as a scaffolding tool is indispensable to complete cognitively demanding tasks.

Even though the value of L1 is admitted to some degree, the assumption in EMI, language teaching, and immersion/CLIL is that L1 is an undesirable emergency tool that one wants to avoid. However, the concept of translanguaging theorizes bilinguals' linguistic life very differently. It expects from the outset that plural languages should be used at every aspect of learning/teaching in the most effective manners.

Motivated by the empirical evidence, the value of L1, and theorization of translanguaging, this paper examines use of the first language in a seminar class of one Japanese university which is conducted bilingually. More specifically, the present study addresses the following research questions:

1. For what purposes do the instructor and the students use their L1?

2. How is L1 use in class similar or different between the class sessions when third year students' research studies are being discussed and those when fourth year students' research studies are being discussed? In other words, what is the relationship between L1 use and students' academic knowledge/experience levels in the field of study?

3. How do the students engage in the class and how do they view the course that is conducted basically in English with some translanguaging devices?

The present study is a case study of a single class, and it consists of all (except for one) Japanese students whose L1 is Japanese and whose L2 is English. Thus, the findings of this case study cannot be generalized to other EMI situations. In addition, the context differs from many EMI courses which include foreign students who do not know much of the local language of the instruction site. However, the calls for translanguaging seen in the literature by EMI researchers suggest a detailed case study on translanguaging phenomena has a possibility to be of some use for better EMI in the future.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The participants of the present study are the members of one seminar course focusing on English education and bilingualism instructed by the author at a university located in the western part of Japan. The class consisted of ten third year students (juniors), nine fourth year students (seniors), and two graduate students (a TA and a guest participant, specializing in English education) in Academic Year 2014 when the data were collected. The undergraduate students were either students of the International Studies in English Speaking Countries and English Communication (ISEC) major (all juniors) or its preceding programs (Language Communication major and International Studies major, all seniors) in the College of Letters (i.e., Humanities). All the participants in this study except for one were born and grew up in Japan with Japanese as their L1 and have been learning English as their L2[5]. One participant was born and grew up in China. When she became a third-grader, she moved to Japan and had been educated in the Japanese educational system ever since. At the time of the data collection, her strongest language (especially in the academic domain) was Japanese, keeping Chinese for use mostly in the home domain, and she was learning English as an additional language. As her Japanese was indistinguishable from that of her Japanese peers, the present paper will regard her as linguistically identical to the rest of the students in the context of this study and make no further mention of her.

Table 1 shows their English levels in detail, i.e., how many students belong to each of the TOEIC score ranges. The number in parentheses shows the number of students who studied in an English speaking environment for nine months or more. (For example, six juniors belong to the TOEIC range of 600 to 699. Out of those six, two studied abroad for 9 months or more.) Their English abilities varied. The seniors' TOEIC scores ranged from 685 to 875 (with the mean score of 757), the juniors' TOEIC scores ranged from 530 to 800 (with the mean of 636), and the graduate students' TOEIC scores were both above 900. (The graduate students joined the class discussions mainly for the purpose of stimulating active discussions. They consciously tried to let the undergraduate students speak up.) The numbers of the students who studied in English speaking environments showed that there were more such students among the seniors (5 out of 9) than the juniors

Table 1　*Participants' TOEIC Scores and Their Experience overseas*

TOEIC	Juniors n=10	Seniors n =9	Graduate Ss n=2	All N=21
500-599	3	-	-	3
600-699	6(2)[a]	2	-	8
700-799	-	4(2)	-	4
800-899	1(1)	3(3)	-	4
900-990	-	-	2(2)	2
Mean	636	757.22	922.5	715
SD	82.05	70.05	17.68	115.05

Note: [a]The number in the parenthesis indicates the number of students who studied in one or more English speaking environments for 9 months or more.

(3 out of 10) .

The juniors and seniors differed in terms of their academic knowledge regarding how to conduct research in the field of English education and bilingualism, how to present their research plans orally, how to discuss them as a group as well as how to write them. The seniors knew better because they had one year more experience of studying in this seminar than the juniors. The students read different books/papers in each year and the studies they conducted were different each year, too. However, the academic practice such as how to search and critically review relevant previous studies for a given research topic, inding good research questions which genuinely interest them, and deciding on a suitable data set to answer the research questions remain the same each year. Thus, when Research Question 2 addresses the relationship between L1 use and the students' academic knowledge / experience, the contrast of academic knowledge/experience is operationalized as the difference between these year groups.

The participants in the two year groups, however, had substantial differences not only in academic knowledge and experience in the field but also in their TOEIC scores. With the case study nature of the present research design it is not possible to separate these two factors; therefore, RQ 2 is meant to reveal the difference between these two year groups which hold both of these differences within each group.

The instructor (the author) is a native speaker of Japanese who learned English as a

foreign language and studied overseas altogether for 5 years in three graduate schools. Having taught English and content courses (some in Japanese and others in English) in various contexts for 38 years, she had little difficulty in speaking English in class. To support the students with insufficient English, she used techniques such as explaining/ rephrasing difficult notions which appeared in students' presentations, writing some of the important and difficult points on the board and/or drawing concepts as figures when the need arose, letting neighboring students gather as groups to discuss, as well as using L1 (i.e., speaking/inserting/writing L1) whenever it was judged effective.

3.2 About the Seminar

This seminar class (known as a *zemi* in Japanese) is offered to third and fourth year students to learn their specialized area in a small group setting (maximum 30 students in a class), and this course is considered to be the highest-level course at the undergraduate level. Students acquire the knowledge of each specific area, design their graduation thesis study, conduct the research individually under the guidance of the seminar instructor, and present their achievement at several developmental stages. Because this college recently underwent a major curriculum change, the seniors and the juniors belonged to two different programs. The present seminar class was the only one (for seniors) and one of the two (for juniors) offered on the topic of English education. The other seminar on English education available for juniors was taught by a native speaker of English. All the juniors in this major (students in this and six other seminars) had to write their graduation theses in English. As for the seniors, only the ones in this seminar class had to do so, while the seniors in the other seminars wrote their theses in Japanese. Thus, the participants of this study chose this EMI seminar class in part voluntarily, but writing a thesis in English was something that the juniors could not avoid.

The class met for 90 minutes each time, 30 times in a year (15 times per semester). This seminar consisted of reading two books (one on English teaching and the other on bilingualism), learning basic statistics, as well as learning how to deliver student presentations of their research designs (all the students), and results and discussions (seniors).

Because of the nature of seminar classes as defined by the university, which should respect students' initiative and autonomy as much as possible, not only student research

presentations but also reading sessions and learning statistics involved students' summaries and comments on the readings. Twenty five sessions out of the total thirty were conducted basically in English and the rest, (i.e., five sessions to learn statistics) were conducted entirely in Japanese.

Abiding by the rules set by the department, the students participate in one seminar for two years unless they want to change it at the end of their junior year for some reason, which happens very rarely and did not happen in this seminar. They designed and conducted their graduation thesis studies in this class. They presented interim reports of their research in class for feedback from the seminar members and the instructor over two years. The seniors had another course offered in parallel to this one called "Graduation Thesis", in which they had individualized guidance as their research and its writing proceeded. This individual guidance was conducted in Japanese in the instructor's office.

3.3 Data

For RQ1 and RQ2 three sessions of this seminar class, i.e., No.26, No.27, and No.29,

Table 2　*Time Spent on Each Presentation*

	Student ID	Presentation Time	Discussion Time	Total	Theme of the presented study
No. 26 Dec.10	Senior 1	10:34[a]	20:37	31:11	• Differences in effects between short-term and long-term study abroad experiences
	Senior 2	19:43	11:33	31:16	• Bilinguals' code-switching and language combinations
	Senior 3	21:10	19:57	41:07	• English abilities needed to become an English teacher at secondary school in Japan
No. 27 Dec.17	Senior 4	18:40	14:00	32:40	• Assessment of speaking skills in Japanese high school English education
	Junior 1	4:20	19:10	23:30	• Effectiveness of short-term study abroad
	Junior 2	8:20	20:10	28:30	• Effectiveness of computer software on vocabulary acquisition
No. 29 Jan.7	Junior 3	8:00	20:25	28:25	• Effectiveness of computer assisted language teaching
	Junior 4	5:10	8:13	13:23	• Learners' strategies to guess unknown words in a text
	Junior 5	6:04	29:32	35:36	• Japanese university students' anxiety for communication

Note: [a] 10:34 means 10 minutes and 34 seconds

were videotaped in the fall semester of 2014. These classes consisted of three student presentations each: four seniors' presentations of research results and discussions, and five juniors' presentations of their literature reviews and study designs. After each presentation of 5-20 minutes the whole class discussed each study, and so each presenter had approximately 30 minutes of class time for his/her study (with one case of a much shorter total period). The exact time spent on each study in total, the amount of time of each presentation, and that of the following discussion are summarized in Table 2.

With regard to RQ3, one questionnaire (Table 3) was used to ask about the seminar class students' engagement in class and how they viewed the course which was conducted basically in English with some translanguaging devices. All the seniors and juniors (but not the graduate students) answered this questionnaire. In addition, individual or small-

Table 3   *Questions Asked in the Questionnaire*

No.	Questions [a]
1	Name
2	Score of TOEIC, TOEFL, or any other proficiency tests
3	When you are supposed to present in class on your research and prepare for it, in what language do you think and start to make your handouts.
4	When you listen to other students' presentations, to what degree do you understand them?
5	When you listen to other students' comments or questions, to what degree do you understand them?
6	When you listen to the instructor's comments, to what degree do you understand them?
7	The instructor occasionally writes on the blackboard and/or uses Japanese to ease the students' comprehension. Do you think these devices are indispensable or do you not need them?
8	The same people often speak up to ask questions or make comments. What are the reasons for some students' lack of contribution to class? Possible reasons are listed below. ① I feel it is disrespectful to say anything when I do not have complete understanding of the presentation content. ② I understand the presentation contents but cannot think of things worthy to say. ③ I understand the presentation contents and have something to say, but while I am thinking how to say it, the class discussion moves to a different topic and I lose the chance to speak up.
9	How have you been engaged in this seminar conducted in English? Have you made any particular efforts or had any metacognitive strategies? If you had any such efforts/strategies, did they change over time?
10	Are there any suggestions or wishes regarding the language use in this class for next year?

Note: [a]The answers were all free writing. bThe three possibilities were meant to be examples, but all except one student simply chose one or more out of those three options.

group interviews were conducted by the author in Japanese to find out the students' intentions and feelings reflectively regarding their own behaviors/utterances in class shown as video clips. The interviews also asked about their overall attitude toward the class. Out of the 22 seminar members, 13 students in total contributed to the class discussion (when they were not presenters) in the three 90-minute classes. Eleven students were able to join the interview for the reflection sessions. The total amount of interview time was 152 minutes.

3.4 Analysis

The video recordings of the class were transcribed. All the instances of L1 use were marked and listed. Then the reasons for the use of each Japanese word/phrase were either identified (in the case of the instructor's use) or speculated (in the case of the students' use). After that the reasons for the students' use of L1 were confirmed in the interviews when they were unclear. In this way, the functions for using L1, which will be called "types" hereafter, were codified and listed (RQ1). The instructor's educational purposes in her L1 use and the students' strategic/expressive reasons for their L1 use were observed to see if they showed any relationship with the students' academic knowledge (RQ2). The results of the questionnaire and the interviews were summarized in relation to RQ3.

Table 4 *Eight Types of L1 use*

Type	Function
Type 1	Use of L1 or translation from L2 to L1 to ease students' comprehension
Type 2	Use of L1 to give a strong impact and/or attract listeners' attention
Type 3	Use of L1 words peculiar to Japanese culture or to this particular course
Type 4	Use of L1 sentences/phrases as a direct quotation of an imaginary/real speaker
Type 5	Use of L1 words/phrases due to a lack of corresponding English expressions/words in the speaker's English repertoire
Type 6	Use of L1 in accordance with the previous speaker
Type 7	Use of L1 as private "off stage" talks
Type 8	Complete switch to L1 at the end of the class to activate discussion

4. Results

4.1 Eight Types of L1 use (RQ1)

As a result of the transcription of the three classes and their analysis, eight types of L1 use (used by either the instructor or the students) were identified. These types are listed in Table 4, and the number of all the occurrences of L1 use is presented in Table 5. Each type of L1 use and its characteristics are explained below.

In Table 5 L1 use was shown dividing all the data into two parts: the data observed in the seniors' presentation sessions and those in the juniors' presentation sessions. The users of L1 were further divided into what was said by the instructor, the presenter of each session, and all the other students who were not the presenter.

[Type 1: Use of L1 or translation from L2 to L1 to ease the students' comprehension]. L1 words/phrases were either used or added as a translation after the corresponding

Table 5 *Frequency of L1 Use by Types, Year Groups, and Speakers*

L1 Use	Seniors' Presentation Sessions			Juniors' Presentation Sessions			Total
Type [a]	Instructor	presenter	Others	Instructor	presenter	others	
1	7[b]	-	-	6	1	-	14
2	5(1P)[c]	5(2Q)[d]	9(2Q)[d]	19(2P)[f]	1(1Q)[e]	2	41
3	6	4	1	1	-	-	12
4	1	-	-	10	-	1	12
5	-	1(1Q)[e]	-	-	1	4(2P)[f] (1T)[h]	6
6	-	-	-	-	3(3Q)[g]	-	3
8		-			2		2
Total	19	10	10	36	8	7	90

Note:
[a] Type 7 L1 use is known to exist but cannot count the tokens since this type of L1 use occurs among multiple groups of neighboring students simultaneously in a soft voice, and thus the tokens are not included in the table.
[b] Most tokens of Types 1-6 L1 use appeared when speakers were speaking to all in the class. Otherwise, the target of the utterances are marked like the following: (1P), (2Q), etc..
[c] 1P means that out of the total tokens 1 token was addressed to the presenter.
[d] 2Q means that out of the total tokens 2 tokens were addressed to the person who asked a question.
[e] 1Q means that out of the total tokens 1 token was addressed to the person who asked a question.
[f] 2P means out of the total tokens 2 tokens were addressed to the presenter.
[g] 3Q means that out of the total tokens 3 tokens were addressed to the person who asked a question.
[h] 1T means that out of the total tokens 1 token was addressed to the teacher.

English. The purpose is to aid the students' comprehension. This happened 14 times (13 times by the instructor and once by a student) in the 3 classes observed in this study.

Ex1) Instructor: Within one sentence something happens, within one turn, turn is *jibun no shaberu junban*… (After the presentation of Senior 2's study; See Table 2 for information regarding the presenters and their studies)

Ex.2) Junior: Students will overcome their reticence, *mukuchi,* and increase their communicative competence. (During the presentation of Junior 1's study)

[Type 2: Use of L1 to give a strong impact and/or attract listeners' attention]
L1 was used to give a strong impact and/or attract the listeners' attention. This function of L1 use was observed most frequently out of all the eight types. The instructor used it more frequently in juniors' presentation sessions, especially when her talk became long due to the lack of the students' contribution to the discussion (19 occurrences in juniors' sessions as opposed to only 5 in seniors' sessions). The students used it more frequently than the instructor in the seniors' presentation sessions (14 occurrences).

Ex3) Senior: … they really like code-switching, so they don't care what kind of code-switching they do, but they like code-switching. It is things. *Dakara* (=therefore) so that's why maybe … (During the discussion on Senior 1's study) (Note: By "It is things" this senior meant "that is the fact.")

Ex4) Instructor: To whom can digital materials be beneficial? What do you think? *Kikai wa dame?* (=Aren't machines good enough?) (After Junior 2's presentation)

[Type 3: Use of L1 words peculiar to Japanese culture or to this particular course]
L1 words were used when one needed to use specific terms related to the Japanese school education system such as *gakushuu shidoo yooryoo* (=Course of Study Guidelines), *ikiru chikara* (=zest for living), or words to refer to a concept specific to this class such as *osewa yaku* (=a senior who takes care of his/her third year "buddy" student). This type of L1 was used both by the instructor and the students, but mostly in the seniors' presentation sessions.

[Type 4: Use of L1 sentence(s)/phrase(s) as a direct quotation of an imaginary/real

speaker]

L1 was used as a direct quotation of an imagined/real speaker. The purpose of this function is similar to that of Type 2. One peculiarity of Type 4 L1 use is that this type is limited to quotations. L1 was used for this purpose mainly by the instructor but once by a senior. Type 4 L1 use was used mostly during the juniors' presentation sessions (10 times in the juniors' sessions, but once in the seniors' sessions).

> Ex5) Instructor: Imagine that there was a rather difficult essay, and that was given to ten people, for example, and they have to answer comprehension questions. Some are good and some are bad. After that you ask one by one, "so when you read it, how did you start reading?" "*Dokkara?* (=from where?)" "*Sashie o mazu mita?* (= Did you look at the illustrations/pictures first?)" ⋯ So you ask about those reading strategies. (During the discussion time of Junior 4's study)

In this example, "*Dokkara?*(=from where?)" and "*Sashie o mazu mita?* (= Did you look at the illustrations/pictures first?)" are possible (=imaginary) questions that the presenter (the person who will conduct this research on reading strategies) could ask her research participants.

[Type 5: Use of L1 words/phrases due to a lack of corresponding English expressions/words in the speaker's English repertoire]

Type 5 is the use of L1 due to a lack of corresponding English expressions/words in the speaker's English repertoire. Type 5 was used only by the students. The frequency of this type was not so high (altogether 6 tokens). The presenters prepared their talks in detail, and thus they had all the words in mind that they needed for their presentations. If the other students encountered words that they were unable to retrieve in a discussion, the tendency was that they would refrain from speaking up rather than facing a lexical gap "on stage" and resorting to a Japanese word for it.

Out of the total 6 tokens, 3 cases of simple single-word or two-word insertion were found in the data: *mujun* (=contradiction), *dasshutsu geemu* (=escape game), and *senjuumin kana* (=indigenous people, isn't it?). The rest (3 tokens), however, appeared when a student was pushed to speak up by the instructor. It was obvious that she had something to say because of her vigorous chatting with her neighbor in Japanese. The

student who was picked was unable to say what she had in mind right away in English. Thus, she spoke (in fact, asked questions) in Japanese. Because students are rarely forced to speak like this, the latter example tends to occur rather infrequently.

[Type 6: Use of L1 in accordance with the previous speaker]
L1 was used when a student was asked a question in Japanese and answered it. This type of L1 use happened only among students in the data.

[Type 7: Use of L1 as private "off stage" talks]
Students talked among themselves with their neighboring students. The video recorder could not catch when and what exactly they were saying. Therefore, Table 5 above does not show the tokens of Type 7 L1 use. However, the interviews with the seminar members confirmed that such chatting was constantly occurring and it was triggered by something that had been discussed "on stage".

[Type 8: Complete switch to L1 at the end of the class to activate discussion]
The whole class switched the language into L1 for approximately 10 minutes toward the end of the class, when the discussion became so stagnant that the instructor judged that the discussion would become livelier if L1 use was encouraged. This happened twice, both at the end of one junior's presentation session. When the class discussion switched into the L1 mode, the students made efforts to say something no matter how little relevance it had to the issue. Even though there were many conversational turns within the approximately 10-minute switches and many sentences/phrases within those turns, it is necessary to have a different framework to analyze these sentences further. Type 8 L1 use refers to a long chunk of Japanese discourse unlike the other types, which are a word or a short utterance. This long chunk was kept as a whole package, and no further analysis of each sentence or phrase within the package was conducted.

4.2 L1 Use and the Students' Year Group Difference (RQ2)

RQ2 asked the relationship between L1 use and students' academic knowledge/experience, operationalized as the difference between their year groups. Table 6 below is a modification of Table 5. Table 6 shows how often each type of L1 use occurred in total when the seniors' studies were the content of the class

Table 6   *Total L1 Use in the Sessions of Each of the Two Year Groups*

Types of L1 Use	Seniors' Presentation Sessions (136 minutes 14 seconds)	Juniors' Presentation Sessions (129 minutes 24 seconds)	Total
1	7	7	14
2	19	22	41
3	11	1	12
4	1	11	12
5	1	5	6
6	0	3	3
8	0	2	2
Total	39	51	90

Table 7   *Difference of the Total L1 Use Between the Year Groups*

	x^2	df	p
Type 1	0	1	1.00
Type 2	0.22	1	.64
Type 3	8.33	1	.00 Seniors > Juniors
Type 4	8.33	1	.00 Seniors < Juniors
Total	0.12	1	.73

Note: Alpha=.05; The *p* values smaller the alpha level is dark-
ened.

presentations/discussions (the left row, 136 minutes 14 seconds altogether) and when juniors' studies were the content of the class presentations/discussions (the right row, 129 minutes 24 seconds altogether). Thus "the sessions of the two year groups" in Table 6 do not indicate whether it was the juniors or the seniors who uttered those L1 words/phrases. Rather, the number shows, for example in the left column "Seniors' presentation sessions", the frequency of L1 used by both the instructor and all the students in class during the sessions when senior members presented their studies and those studies were being discussed as a whole class.

The frequency of L1 use looks different between the two groups with regard to some types. In order to see if any statistically significant difference exists in any of the types of L1 use, a Chi-square test was performed for the pairs of Types 1, 2, 3 and 4, which had

Table 8 *L1 Use by the Instructor and by the Students in the Sessions of Each of the Two Year Groups*

L1 Use	Seniors' Presentation Sessions (136 minutes 14 seconds)		uniors' Presentation Sessions (129 minutes 24 seconds)		Total		
Type	Instructor	Students	Instructor	Students	Instructor	Students	All
1	7	-	6	1	13	1	14
2	5	14	19	3	24	17	41
3	6	5	1	-	7	5	12
4	1	-	10	1	11	1	12
5	-	1	-	5	-	6	6
6	-	-	-	3	-	3	3
8		-		2	-	2	2
Total	19	20	36	15	55	35	90

enough total tokens to conduct the test. The result is shown in Table 7. As Table 7 shows, the total tokens of L1 use of all 7 types do not show any statistical difference (p=.73). However, when examined by types of L1 use there are some differences. Type 3 L1 use shows a statistically significant difference (p=.00). Type 3 L1 use (words peculiar to the Japanese culture or this class) was more frequently used in seniors' presentation sessions than in juniors' sessions. Type 4 L1 use (direct quotations of an imaginary/real speaker), on the other hand, was more frequently used in juniors' presentation sessions. As for the similarity, Type 1 L1 use and Type 2 L1 use were similar between the seniors' presentation sessions and the juniors' presentation sessions. As for Types 5, 6, and 8, the uses appear different between the two year groups, but it is difficult to say whether there is a statistical difference or not due to the small number of tokens.

4.3 L1 Use by the Instructor and the Students in Relation to the Students' Year Group Difference (RQ2)

A similar analysis to that conducted in 4.2 above was conducted again, but this time after dividing the L1 use into that of the instructor and that of the students within the Seniors' sessions and the Juniors' sessions, hoping that the nature and the reasons for the differences observed above will be revealed even more clearly. Table 8 shows the frequency of the two kinds of speakers, modified from Table 6. Table 9 shows the results of the Chi-square tests performed to see if any statistically significant difference exists

Table 9 *Difference of the Use of L1 Between the Sessions of the Two Year Groups*
by the Types of Speakers

Compared Pairs (L1 Type, Speaker)	x^2	df	p	
Type 1 - Instructor's L1 Use	0.08	1	.78	
Type 2 - Instructor's L1 Use	8.17	1	.00	Seniors' S < Juniors' S
Type 4 - Instructor's L1 Use	7.36	1	.01	Seniors' S < Juniors' S
Type 2 - Students' L1 Use	7.12	1	.01	Seniors' S >Juniors' S
Total - Instructor's L1 Use	5.26	1	.02	Seniors' S < Juniors' S
Total - Students' L1 Use	0.22	1	.64	

Note: Alpha= .05; The pairs with *p* values lower than .05 are marked with a shadow.

between the speaker types.

As Table 8 shows, the distribution of L1 use appears to differ between the instructor and the students with regard to some types of L1 use; for example, Types 1, 4, 5, 6, and 8. Furthermore, the distribution difference of the L1 use between the instructor and the students appears to be opposite in the two year groups with regard to Type 2; in other words, in the seniors' presentation sessions, students' Type 2 L1 use outnumbers that of the instructor's, but in the juniors' presentation sessions, the tendency becomes opposite. To confirm the significance of the differences exemplified above, a Chi-square test was performed to every pair which had sufficient total tokens for analysis. The results are shown in Table 9.

The results of the Chi-square tests show the following. First, as "Type 2-Instructor's L1 use" in Table 9 shows, when the instructor used L1 for a strong impact/getting attention (Type 2), she used it in juniors' presentation sessions significantly more often than in seniors' presentation sessions. On the other hand, as "Type 2- Students' L1 use" in Table 9 shows, when the students used L1 for the same purpose (Type 2), they did so in seniors' presentation sessions significantly more often than in juniors' presentation sessions. These two phenomena reflect the fact that class discussions were more autonomous and student-led in the seniors' presentation sessions while that was not the case in the juniors' presentation sessions. Secondly, as "Type 4- Instructor's L1 use" in Table 9 shows, when the instructor used L1 for direct quotation of an imaginary/real person (Type 4), she used it in juniors' presentation sessions

significantly more often than in seniors' presentation sessions. This also reflects the same characteristics of the class stated above between the two year groups. In total, although students' L1 use did not show too big a difference between the seniors' presentation sessions (20 tokens, shown in Table 8) and the juniors' presentation sessions (15 tokens, shown in Table 8), the instructor's L1 use showed a significant difference (19 tokens versus 36 tokens, shown in Table 8). It shows how much she needed L1 when the class was conducted around the juniors' presentations even though the total time of both sessions were almost the same (136 minutes 14 seconds and 129inutes 24econds).

A most likely reason for this difference comes from the following. The four seniors' presentations took place in early December only a week or two prior to the due date of the graduation paper submission. Therefore these students' data collection and analysis had been completed by then. Furthermore, after actually having written almost all that they had to say in their theses before these presentation sessions, the presenters were capable of explaining their own studies and entertaining questions and comments clearly on their own. On the other hand, generally speaking, the juniors' research plans were still rudimentary and vague. In addition, due to their having relatively less experience in using English in the academic seminar course domain and their lower English proficiency in general, they were not able to express their study designs very clearly. This sometimes confused the listeners, resulting in the instructor speaking a lot, using many more discourse strategies including L1 use, and even switching the class code totally into Japanese (Type 8)[6].

4.4 Students' Attitudes Toward Conducting the Seminar in English With Some Translanguaging (RQ3)

4.4.1 Results of the questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of questions regarding their background information (Question 1. Name; Question 2. English proficiency score (mostly TOEIC)), and eight questions with regard to their attitude toward the way this seminar was being conducted. The answers are summarized below.

【Question 3: In which language do they prepare for presentations?】

The students' study strategies and language use to prepare for their presentations varied. All except five students thought in Japanese, but nobody wrote a draft in Japanese first and translated it when they prepared a handout or a thesis; they wrote in English from the beginning.

【Question 4: To what extent do they understand other students' presentations?】

As for the comprehension of other students' oral presentations, the juniors said that they understood about 40-80%, although one of them (who had a TOEIC score within the range of 600-699) said at times only 30%. The juniors who experienced long-term (9 months or longer) study abroad and the seniors said that they understood 80-100%. The graduate students understood 100%.

【Question 5: To what extent do they understand other students' comments?】

【Question 6: To what extent do they understand the instructor's comments?】

As for the comprehension of other students' and the instructor's comments, the juniors said that they understood 40-80%. The juniors who experienced a long-term study abroad and the seniors said that they understood 70-100%; one of the seniors (who had a TOEIC score within the range of 600-699) said 50-80%. The graduate students understood 100%.

【Question 7: What do they feel about the necessity of the instructor's use of L1 and writing on the board as aids for student comprehension?】

All the students said that support by writing on the blackboard was necessary and beneficial. All but one answered in the same way regarding the instructor's L1 use. One senior and the TA said that that was useful for the juniors.

【Question 8: What do they think are the reasons for not speaking up in class? 】

As possible reasons for the students' lack of contribution, the questionnaire listed the following: Reason 1 Students feel it is disrespectful to speak up when they do not fully understand the presentation content; Reason 2 Students understand the presentation content but cannot think of things worth saying in class; Reason 3 Students know the content and have something to say, but while thinking how to say it in English the discussion moves on to a different topic.

The seminar students' answers were the following: 7 students chose Reason 1, 13 chose Reason 2, and 11 chose Reason 3 (plural responses were possible). A Cochran's Q test did not show any statistically significant difference among the three choices ($Q^{(2)} = 3.5$, $p = .17$). This indicates that all of these reasons are equally behind their hesitancy to speak up in class. Although these options were given as examples, all the respondents except one senior chose one or more options out of them and did not offer any other reasons. This senior said that the lack of students' contributions stems from the dependency on others; in other words, the students did not feel that it was their responsibility to move the seminar discussion forward.

【Question 9: How did they engage in the class? Did they use any metacognitive strategies? Did they change over time?】

The participants wrote about the metacognitive strategies they used in their own words. Their answers can be summarized in four frequently expressed types. First they said that they made efforts to concentrate and tried to comprehend what was presented in class and the discussions afterwards (six people mentioned this out of the 19 respondents in total). EMI requires more conscious attention by the listeners in order to comprehend the contents fully. Secondly, five participants (all seniors) said they tried to speak up as much as possible; two said that they made it a rule to speak in discussion sessions at least once per class. Two juniors said that they were trying to prepare English sentences to express what came up in their minds just in case they had a chance to speak. Thirdly, six participants said they did some exercise/studying on their own to better engage in the seminar, such as listening to English, increasing academic vocabulary, practicing speaking alone at home, and reading English texts. Lastly, three participants said that when they had a chance to present/speak, they tried to make it as easy as possible for others to understand.

【Question 10: Are there any suggestions or wishes regarding the language use in this class for next year?】

Only 12 participants responded to this question. Even among them, most thought that the language use they experienced would not need any change. Six of them mentioned the importance of the environment in which Japanese use is acceptable. Two others, admitting this point, stressed that L1 use should be allowed judiciously at times because

they remembered occasions when some students could have said what they said in L1 in their L2 fully. One student liked to have everything done solely in English. Her background and English proficiency level did not differ from the others, and so this seems to be her own personal belief. Two wrote that it would be beneficial to have more frequent small-group discussions in class and then discussions including the whole class. One senior wished that seniors in that year had had a higher level of initiative in making the students more engaged in discussions.

4.4.2 Results of the reflective interviews

Reflective interviews asked the intentions of each of the students' L1 utterances in class. Other than such confirmation, the informant students' talk in the interviews centered around the following topics: (1) their understanding of this EMI course content, (2) their own L1 and L2 use in class, (3) their thoughts on the language use of the instructor and the other students, and (4) their overall attitude toward and evaluation of this EMI course.

4.4.2.1 Their understanding of this EMI course content

All of the informants said that their understanding of what has been said in English increased as their knowledge of English education, bilingualism and research as well as their English ability increased.

However, five students said that due to their low English proficiency they had a hard time especially in the initial stage of, or the whole of their junior year. These students' TOEIC scores at the time of the data collection ranged from 560 to 815. Since four of them were seniors, their English proficiency at the beginning of their junior years must have been lower. One senior's statement regarding this issue is shown below. The letter in the parenthesis is the pseudo initial of each informant cited. The interview was done in Japanese and the speech was translated into English by the author.

> Senior (H): My understanding became much better this year. When I was a junior, I did not know what the presenter was saying, and so I was just sitting and listening. It was boring.

Two seniors and one junior said that they often chatted with their neighbors (off

stage) to confirm what was going on in class. This junior said that all the juniors do so frequently. One graduate student said that he saw such off-stage chatting going on often among the two seniors who happened to sit close to him in class. The author herself saw it happening on a regular basis. That is seen as a necessary strategy by all the four students mentioned above in order to keep involved in class.

> Junior (N): ... it depends on the presentation content. We sometimes confirm our understanding with other students, saying "what that presenter wants to say is this, isn't it?"

4.4.2.2 Their own L1 and L2 use in class

As was already reported in Section 4.4.1 questionnaire results, especially the responses to Questions 8 and 9, students needed to deal with high psychological barriers against speaking up in their L2 and made efforts to overcome them. One student said that she spoke up only when she was very clear about what she wanted to say and when her utterance seemed relevant to the flow of the discussion at that time.

> Senior (N): I cannot say anything other than what I am very sure of. I am too scared. It would be terrible if any bad influence should be given.
> (Note: N meant that she would not like it if she had any bad influence on the course of the discussion because of her possibly irrelevant utterance.)

Just like the case with comprehension, three students with relatively lower English proficiency (in the TOEIC score range of 600-699) had difficulty in speaking up in class. They said that they lost their chances to speak up while they were thinking about how to express their points in English. One of those three students, Senior (H) described such experiences:

> Senior (H): That happens fairly often. I had something to say. I did have a thought, but while I was thinking how to say a certain part, I hear, "Next", and I felt "Oh, it's over". This happened many times.

Senior (H) also said that sometimes she asked a student sitting next to her to ask

what she wanted to ask because she did know how to say it. Another student said that he used Japanese while he chatted "off stage". The same student had a scene in the video recording in which he was explicitly requested to express his opinion, and he began his turn initially in Japanese and then shifted to English later. He explained how he was feeling at that time in the following.

> Senior (K): At this time the atmosphere was like "Speak up right now", and so I was pressured and said anything I could say in Japanese, buying time, and I managed to continue my talk in English.

K was among the ones who spoke up most in this year group. The episode above shows even K needed some strategies to cope, especially in stressful situations.

4.4.2.3 Their thoughts on the language use of the instructor and the other students.

The seminar students were asked about their attitude toward the instructor's use of various strategies through Question 7 of the questionnaire: "The instructor occasionally writes on the blackboard and/or uses Japanese to ease the students' comprehension. Do you think these devices are indispensable or do you not need them?" The questionnaire responses showed that all thought the use of the blackboard was useful. As for L1 use, all except one took L1 use of the instructor positively. This student thought that forcing the students to understand only through English would be necessary.

One senior and the class TA said, as part of the answer to Question 7 mentioned above, that the instructor's L1 use was especially useful to juniors who had difficulty in understanding what was going on in class. The reflective interviews confirmed this point. The TA of the class thought allowing students to use need-based translanguaging was indispensable to all the students in class.

> TA: Regarding the value of allowing this "off stage" code switching, eh, H often sits close to me and so she does that often with K. I often see the students in class check each other's understanding. "Is this right?" "This is it, isn't it?" Like this. I think there are quite a lot of students who use Japanese for confirmation such as: "This means this, isn't it?", "What does this mean?", "(We are now) at

number such and such in the handout", "He/She is talking about this now." In these occasions I think they are mostly using Japanese. If they had to do it all in English, even the ones who have full understanding may have difficulty in explaining to others, I believe that a few minutes of "off stage" session in Japanese is useful and should form the relevant schema for the topic as well.

Furthermore, a senior student guesses the juniors' feelings as below.

Senior (K): They are afraid of speaking up in front of their seniors, especially the ones whose English is still poor.

Yet K also thinks it is better to give those juniors an opportunity to speak up and force them to say something.

Senior (K): Even if they don't like it, I think it is important to force them to say something.

It is interesting to know that the seniors seem to feel the responsibility to give feedback to juniors' presentations more so than to the seniors' presentations.

Senior (I): We do have such a feeling that we must make comments when juniors present their research.

Thus, the overall attitude toward the instructor's and the students' translanguaging seems favorable, although two seniors at least expressed the opinion that strict discipline also has important educational values.

4.4.2.4 Their overall attitude toward, and evaluation of, this EMI course

Studying in the EMI environment was in part obligatory and in part voluntary for the students. As was explained in the method section (3.2 About this seminar), writing their graduation theses in English was obligatory for all juniors in their major but necessary only for the students in this seminar for the seniors. If students wanted to study English education, EMI goes with it for both seniors and juniors. If they had wanted to take a seminar conducted in L1 all the students could have done so although they would have needed to specialize in something other than English education as the theme of their

thesis study.

Senior (R) said that it made sense to have the seminar class in English because the students needed to write their theses in English as the end product.

> Senior (R): When the end product has to be produced in English, I would prefer English throughout the process. At the beginning I was reading previous studies in Japanese, but when I thought about writing (the thesis), I started to feel that reading English materials is easier.

When asked whether the quality of their theses went down because the seminar was conducted as EMI, Senior (R) rejected the possibility. As was explained in the method section, this seminar has a parallel course called Graduation Thesis, in which seniors have ample time to discuss their studies individually with the instructor in Japanese. The existence of such a parallel course would have contributed to this senior's feeling that she lost nothing. If we view these courses as one package, we can say that translanguaging at a higher-level dimension is taking place with one course conducted basically in English and the other in Japanese both for the same instructional goal, i.e., completion of graduation thesis study.

The fact that the seminar course operates over two full years (4 semesters) also seems to have influenced the students' evaluation of the course.

> Junior (N): At the beginning I had an impression that it was difficult and that there was no way I could speak in class in English. Yet, as time proceeded, my knowledge increased. As knowledge increased whether through English or through Japanese, on whatever topic such as English education or World Englishes, I realized that I came to accumulate what I was able to say. It is not the matter of English proficiency. I felt I could contribute to class even in an EMI course if only I had relevant knowledge.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The present study addressed three research questions. The answers to these questions are summarized below and will be discussed by comparing the findings with those of previous studies.

RQ 1 asked: For what purposes do the instructor and the students use their L1? The analysis of the data revealed eight different types of L1 use. Among them Type 1 (for comprehension), Type 2 (for attracting attention), Type 3 (Japan specific terms), and Type 5 (lack of words within the speaker's repertoire) are commonly observable use of L1 in L2 classrooms and were mentioned in previous studies as well: attention keeping by Kang (2008), focusing attention and interpersonal interaction by Swain and Lapkin (2000), conveying meaning of words by Cook (2001), and Storch and Wigglesworth (2003).

On the other hand, an often mentioned function of L1 (i.e., the managerial purpose), was not observed in the data of the present study. This may be because the present study was on university students' presentation and discussion sessions, whereas many L1 use studies involve English language courses and immersion students' paired task undertakings. University students in this study did not need disciplining and how they were supposed to act in class was more straightforward than pupils who needed to accomplish miscellaneous types of tasks in pairs in an immersion context.

Type 4 (citing an imaginary person's speech), Type 6 (in accordance with the previous speaker), Type 7 (off stage talk), and Type 8 (complete switch to L1) are relatively unique to this class. Because this is a case study, Type 4 and Type 8 appeared due to this particular instructor's habits and decisions. Type 6 and Type 7 occurred because the whole class shared the attitude of permitting L1 if necessary.

RQ 2 asked: How is L1 use in class similar or different between the class sessions when third year students' research studies are being discussed and those when fourth year students' research studies are being discussed? In other words, what is the relationship between L1 use and students' academic knowledge/experience levels in the field of study? As was seen in the frequency comparison of L1 use between the sessions of the two year groups (Tables 6 and 7), the total use of L1 by both the instructor and the students showed a difference in Type 3 and Type 4. Further analysis revealed

some differences which had not been detected when analyzing both types of the speakers together. Type 2 L1 use (a strong impact/ getting attention), for example, did not show any difference between the two year groups. However, it was shown that the students used it more than the instructor did in the seniors' presentation sessions, but the instructor used it more in the juniors' instruction sessions. We know that Type 3 L1 use (words specific to Japan or this class) was used more in the seniors' presentation sessions in the initial analysis, but it was found that both types of speakers used it equally as far as the sessions dealt with seniors' studies. Type 4 L1 use (direct quotation) was known to be used in the juniors' presentation sessions in the initial analysis, and it was found that the instructor used it more often. All these differences mean one thing: that is, the junior students' sessions required more pedagogical strategies from the instructor. She had to speak more, guide more, and resort to more strategies.

These differences between the two year groups are at least partly due to the juniors' still primitive presentation contents, and their lack of ability to express their research designs and thoughts in English did influence the language use in class. The questionnaire responses and the reflective interviews also revealed how both English ability and the knowledge of course contents were gradually accumulated, and with the increase of such knowledge the students' understanding and contribution to class increased. In that sense, as previous research says (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000), Type 7 L1 use (off stage utterances) as a learning strategy among the students, as well as the differential use of L1 by the instructor according to the students' needs, certainly aided the students in thinking and learning at their cognitive level in class. In other EMI contexts, a similar gap in students' academic knowledge levels may exist regardless of their ages within a single semester course. Therefore, the influence caused by such academic readiness on EMI practice described in this study might be useful to help interpret EMI students' behaviors in class.

RQ 3 asked: How do the students engage in the class and how do they view a course that is conducted basically in English with some translanguaging devices?

The questionnaire and the interview results indicated that the students viewed both EMI and translanguaging favorably. The reasons for this positive evaluation of the course style come from the characteristics of this particular course. First, this was a 2-year long (4-semester) course; students had a long time to develop. Therefore, even when some

students were unable to make sense of all that was going on during their first year in this seminar, they did so in their final year. This situation is rather unusual because normally a course is completed in one semester. Secondly, L1 use was necessary for most students and was used strategically. Thirdly, a parallel course named Graduation Thesis existed, and so while the seminar was in English, it was possible to discuss the necessary parts in this parallel course in Japanese. Owing to these conditions the students felt that they developed a familiarity with academic activities conducted in English and that they accomplished the conducting and writing of their own research study without feeling any disadvantage caused by the EMI system in the seminar.

The pedagogical implications from the present study are the following. A local language cannot be incorporated if it is not known to all the participants, for example, with international students who did not learn it. However, if EMI courses are designed specifically for the students who know the local language as an L1 or an L2, such EMI courses can be taken before the EMI courses which are taught exclusively in English. In those cases strategic L1 use in class is very beneficial. The timing and amount of L1 use (at the end of the class or in the middle, differentiating the ratio between semesters or years of students) should vary depending on the type and content of the course, students' needs, and linguistic and academic abilities.

There are limitations in the present study. First of all, this is a case report, and the author and the instructor of the course are the same person, although this is a common problem inherent to the case study of a real classroom. Therefore, this offers only a sample practice of an EMI course with a specific student body and a teacher who knows their L1. If similar case reports are accumulated in the future, however, some pedagogical and learning strategies useful for EMI and widely applicable to many contexts may emerge. Secondly, the course was a seminar type, which differs from the type of courses analyzed in most of the reported studies. This limits the applicability of the implications of the present study. Thirdly, the availability of the parallel course in Japanese to this one is another special element, which is good for the students in the present class but may limit the implications again unless EMI class students elsewhere create a study group of this kind parallel to it and help each other.

Despite all these limitations, the author hopes that the present case report offers some useful information to those people who are thinking of launching EMI in their own

institutions for students whose English is not satisfactory yet and/or those people who are experiencing problems in conducting existing EMI programs. It is worth exploring the incorporation of the learner's stronger language if the curriculum regulation permits the use of non-English language(s) in EMI.

Notes

1) A part of this paper was orally presented in the 2015 Conference of the Research Association of Mother Tongue, Heritage Language, and Bilingual Education on August 9th, 2015 at Ritsumeikan University. The author would like to express her heart-felt gratitude to Dr. Masako Douglas and Mr. Michael James Davies for their invaluable comments on an earlier draft. All remaining errors are however my own.

2) When this paper discusses the use of L1 in EMI classrooms, the L1 is assumed to be the local language, which is also the strongest language of most or all the students who take the EMI course. However, there are cases when the course is taken by native speakers of a language which is neither the local language nor English. It would be possible that students sit together as groups of common native language speakers so that within each of these groups students can use their L1 to help each other in class, upon the instructor's encouragement to do so.

3) An additional language learned can be the third language (or the fourth, etc.) for the learners, but an "L2" is used here as the cover term for all languages learned after one's first language.

4) When they conceptualize translanguaging, García and Wei (2014) oppose the concept of each language being separate. Rather, their bilingual model posits one linguistic system which includes various linguistic features belonging to so-called different "languages" in the conventional sense. (Figure 1.1 on page 14 depicts the concept visually.) Viewing bilinguals' linguistic resources in this way should certainly explain very well the lives of growing children in multilingual communities. However, the context such as that of the present study, i.e., an EFL environment where most students grew up fairly monolingually in the local language and have been learning English as a foreign language, the "language" distinctions like an L1 and an L2, and the concept of integration of "two languages" seem more appropriate. Thus, this paper adopts Baker's definition of translanguaging (Baker, 2011) and uses the terms, L1 and L2.

5) There is a possibility that students had taken some English lessons at home or private English schools before they became seventh graders.

6) In the present study, the influence of individual difference in students' English abilities on L1 use was not investigated quantitatively. This choice was made because for one, the academic knowledge and the English abilities were difficult to separate with the present data and the former was expected to influence more on the L1 use of everybody in class. The other reason is that the participants' English abilities are better examined when not only L1 use but also L2 English use were analyzed together, which was beyond the scope of the present study.

References

Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low *English proficient learners. English Language Teaching, 2* (2), 49-55.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism, 5*[th] edition. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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.

Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Behan, L., Turnbull, M., & Spek, J. (1997). The proficiency gap in late immersion (extended French): Language use in collaborative tasks. *Le journal de l'immersion, 20*, 41-42.

Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics, 30* (2), 216-235.

Björkman, B. (2010). So you think you can ELF: English as a lingua franca as the medium of instruction. *Hermes-Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 45*, 77-96.

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education, 62* (4), 431-449.

Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2013). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for Educators.* New York: CUNY-NYSIEB. Retrieved from http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/03/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf

Chang, Y-Y. (2010). English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reflections from Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 2* (1), 55-84.

Cho, D. W. (2012). English-medium Instruction in the university context of Korea: Tradeoff between teaching outcomes and media-initiated university ranking. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9* (4), 135-163.

Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching, 39* (1), 1-14.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. Canadian *Modern Language Review, 57* (3), 402-423.

Cots, J. N. (2013). Introducing English-medium instruction at the university of Lleida, Spain: intervention, beliefs and practices. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 106-128). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée, 10* (2), 221-240.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1528-1538). Springer US.

Declaration, B. (1999). The European higher education area. *Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education, 19.* Retrieved from http://www.magna-charta.org/resources/files/

BOLOGNA_DECLARATION.pdf

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2011). Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes, 10,* (3), 345-539.

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh, & G. Meier (Eds.), *The Multilingual Turn in Languges Education: Opportunities and Challenges* (pp. 258-277). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Wei. L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Implications for language, bilingualism and education.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Pivot.

Hellekjær, G. O. (2010). Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education. *Hermes-Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 45,* 11-34.

Hu, G., Li, L., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction at a Chinese University: rhetoric and reality. *Language Policy, 13* (1), 21-40.

Im, J. H., & Kim, J. (2015). Use of blended learning for effective implementation of English-medium instruction in a non-English higher education context. *International Education Studies, 8* (11), 1.

Inbar-Lourie, O., & Donitsa-Schmidt, S. (2013). Englishization in an Islaeri teacher education college: taking the first steps. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp.151-173). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kang, D. M. (2008). The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System, 36* (2), 214-226.

Kang, S., & Park, H. (2005). English as the medium of instruction in Korean engineering education. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 21* (1), 155-174.

Kim, J-Y (2015). Nonnative English-speaking Professors' Experiences of English-medium Instruction and their Perceived Roles of the Local Language. Asia TEFL Conference Nanjing, China November 7-9, 2015.

Kirkpatrick, (2014). Afterword. In R. Barnard, & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives.* (pp.214-221). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kojima, N., Sato, Y., & Hamciuc, M. (2013). Nihonjin gakusei he no eigo baitai ni yoru gakka gakushuu to tiim tiichingu- Ritsumeikan Asia Taiheiyoo Daigaku (APU) ni okeru burijji koosu no kokoromi [English-medium content course learning and team-teaching: A trial of a bridge course at Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University (APU)]. *Polyglossia, 24,* 210-222.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18* (7), 655-670.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18* (7), 641-654.

Liu, J. (2008). L1 use in L2 vocabulary learning: Facilitator or barrier. *International Education Studies, 1* (2), 65-69.

Macro, E. (2014). Overview: where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research? In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives.* (pp.10-23). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Manakul, W. (2007). Role of English in internationalization of higher education: The case of the Graduate School of Engineering, Hokkaido University. *Higher Education and Lifelong Learning, 15,* 155-162.

Saarinem, T., & Nikula, T. (2013). Implicit policy, invisible language: policies and practices of international degree programmes in Finnish higher education. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp.131-150). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Shohamy, E. (2013). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), (2012). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196-210). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?. *TESOL quarterly, 37* (4), 760-769.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4* (3), 251-274.

Teshigawara, M., & Ueda, T. (2008). Eigo ni yoru daigakuin reberu koogakukei jugyoo no shitsu koojoo o mezashite: jugyoo jukoo shien no jisshi jookyoo to ankeeto choosa kekka [Improving the Quality of a Graduate-Level Content Course Taught in English: A Description of Student Support and Questionnaire Survey Results]. *The Journal of University Education Research, 5,* 123-127.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but.... *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57* (4), 531-540.

Van der Walt, C., & Kidd, M. (2013). Acknowleging academic biliteracy in higher education assessment strategies: a tale of two trials. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 27-43). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). English-taught programmes in European higher education. *ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Bonn: Lemmens.*

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43* (5), 1222-1235.

Wilkinson, R. (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 3-24). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Yip, D. Y., & Tsang, W. K. (2007). Evaluation of the effects of the medium of instruction on science learning of Hong Kong secondary students: Students' self-concept in science. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5* (3), 393-413.