English in the age of comprehensive internationalization : defing competence parameters for teachers in higher education

PDF erstellt am: **28.05.2024**

English in the age of comprehensive internationalization: defining competence parameters for teachers in higher education

Patrick STUDER
ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften
Theaterstrasse 17, 8400 Winterthur, Switzerland
patrick.studer@zhaw.ch

Die Einführung von englischsprachigen Studiengängen im Zeitalter der umfassenden Internationalisierung stellt höhere Bildungsinstitutionen vor neue Herausforderungen. Englisch ist nicht mehr nur Instrument, mit welchem Inhalte vermittelt werden, sondern kann als Mittel verstanden werden, mit welchem globale Kompetenzen vermittelt werden können. Dieser Artikel sucht Antworten auf die Frage, wie die Idee eines umfassend internationalisierten Unterrichts auf Englisch in Kompetenzstandards für Hochschullehrende übersetzt werden kann. Insbesondere beschäftigt sich dieser Artikel mit der Entwicklung von solchen Standards für Lehrende, die ihre Inhalte ohne Hilfe von Sprachdozierenden vermitteln. Anhand einer Fallstudie in einem Bachelorstudiengang einer Fachhochschule der Schweiz wird der qualitative Prozess nachgezeichnet, der hinter der Entwicklung solcher Kompetenzstandards stehen kann. Dieser Prozess umfasst grundsätzliche konzeptuelle Überlegungen, die Beschreibung von Standards, Überarbeitungsphasen sowie erster Erfahrungen mit der Anwendung der Standards im Feld. Am Schluss werden fünf konsolidierte Standards zur weiteren Bearbeitung vorgestellt.

Schlüsselwörter:
English-taught programmes, English-medium instruction, englischsprachige Hochschullehre, umfassende Internationalisierung, Kompetenzstandards.

Keywords:
English-taught programmes, English-medium instruction, comprehensive internationalization, teaching competence, descriptors.

1. Introduction

This paper deals with the English-medium classroom in higher education, and specifically with the English-taught programme (ETP), which is a widespread means of internationalizing higher education curricula in Switzerland (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 38-39). While internationalized curricula can take different forms and may serve different purposes (e.g. van der Wende 1996a+b), in reality the main driver behind the change of the medium of instruction has been the idea to design curricula so as to attract a foreign student population. This narrow perception of the internationalized classroom is encouraged by quality indicators used to measure and rank university internationalization profiles (e.g. *Times Higher Education*), which focus strongly on the number of foreign students enrolled in universities.

Such a narrow view of internationalization, however, stands in sharp contrast to insights from research (e.g. Hudzik 2011, 2015; Wächter 2003; Leask 2015; Green & Whitsed 2015) and current EU policy efforts emphasizing a more

inclusive and comprehensive approach to internationalization that focuses on the integration of a "global dimension in the design and content of all curricula and teaching/learning processes" (European Commission 2013: 6). This expanded perception of internationalization is often referred to as internationalization at home. Beelen & Leask (2011: 5) suggest that internationalization at home comprises "a set of instruments and activities 'at home' that focus on developing international and intercultural competences in *all* students" (my emphasis). While internationalization at home can include foreign students, its key objective is to include, and to offer to, all domestic students an international learning environment (for a full argumentation, cf. de Wit et al. 2015: 49, also Sursock 2015: 71). The establishment of ETPs, therefore, can be viewed as part of a university's efforts at internationalizing its regular study portfolio by incorporating "an international and intercultural dimension into the preparation, delivery and outcomes of a programme of study" (Leask 2009: 209).

If ETPs are introduced in an effort to internationalize a curriculum in a comprehensive way, three questions emerge prominently: Firstly, to what degree does comprehensive internationalization of a study programme require broader curricular adjustments (modifications in study content, additional modules, etc.)? Secondly, how can the use of English as a medium of instruction contribute to internationalization in a comprehensive sense? Thirdly, how can we translate the extended role of English in the classroom into teaching competences?

This paper provides first tentative answers to the second and third questions, reporting on how language-related teaching competence parameters were developed through and for class evaluation. Ultimately, such teaching competence parameters can be used to assess a teacher's suitability to participate in ETPs. The parameters were developed in the framework of a project entitled 'Internationalization of Universities of Applied Sciences', funded by SERI (State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation) and tested in a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration study programme in a University of Applied Sciences in Switzerland.[1]

2. Conceptual considerations

There are different labels that are used to refer to the integration of language into content teaching, which reflect different approaches and terminologies. The most common labels found in the literature are CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) and EMI (English-medium Instruction). Despite various attempts at

---

clarification, there is considerable overlap between these approaches in terms of the bandwidth of language integration they allow into their definition and the educational contexts they may refer to (e.g. Greere & Räsänen 2008; Dafouz & Smit 2014; Macaro et al. 2018).

English-medium instruction (EMI) is not a clearly defined self-contained linguistic phenomenon. It broadly refers to a communicative event that is characterized by the switch of classroom language into English in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the population is not English (for an operational definition cf. Dearden 2014: 2). EMI is often defined as a vehicle of internationalization aiming to make a geographical area more attractive to foreign students and to the broader international academic community, while improving domestic students' English language abilities (e.g. for the Taiwanese context: Chen & Tsai 2012: 186-187). At the simplest level, EMI refers to content being delivered in a classroom through English.

Whereas, in EMI, language is often conceptualized as having no function other than being the medium through which content is delivered, both ICL and CLIL tend to be located at the other end of a continuum where language is simultaneously a medium *and* the object of instruction (e.g. Wilkinson & Zegers 2007 on ICL; Dalton-Puffer 2011 on CLIL; see also Wilkinson this volume). We could, with reference to Smit & Dafouz (2012) and Dafouz & Smit (2014), tentatively distinguish between CLIL and ICL in that the former approach represents the integration of formal language objectives into the curriculum; ICL, on the other hand, refers to the communicative focus of content teaching, which requires some attention to the language used in class. In higher education, and especially in contexts where no additional support from language teachers is possible, the function of English in reality often falls on the EMI end of the continuum. Content teachers often neither possess the language skills nor the linguistic awareness (or interest) needed to pay attention to questions of language development in their lesson planning and delivery.

The answer to the question as to where to place content teachers on the continuum from EMI to ICL and CLIL is not an easy one to find. It crucially depends on role we attribute to the L2-medium teacher in the internationalized curriculum and the perceptions of quality we associate with programmes taught through English. There exist, to date, only a few studies that attempt to define the role of language in higher education from the perspective of teaching quality. In Freiburg, Germany, for example, the university's language learning centre has developed an internal Quality Management Scheme for organizational units wishing to have their international profile options certified (cf. Gundermann and Dubow, this volume). The Freiburg model is, in part, based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR 2001) and a previous Quality Management scheme developed at Copenhagen (TOEPAS cf. Kling & Stæhr 2012; Kling 2015). While I commend these efforts in that they raise questions

about quality in internationalized curricula that centre on language and communication, we have to view these previous approaches as culturally and institutionally bound in that they were developed to address specific local teaching and learning contexts. Moreover, both approaches focus on the EMI end of the continuum.

Both quality management schemes, Freiburg and Copenhagen, focus on the language behaviour of content teachers in ETPs, which is assessed through observation. This focus on content teachers is in line with the literature on internationalization which emphasizes the teachers' 'pivotal', 'indispensable', 'primary' role in implementing policy on the ground (Green & Whitsed 2015: 8; Hudzik 2011, Leask & Bridge 2013). While both quality schemes, Freiburg and Copenhagen, focus on teacher observation, only Freiburg observes teachers *at work*; in the case of Copenhagen, mock-performances are examined. When speaking of teacher observation, in the context of the present paper, I refer to the Freiburg approach as it allows us to collect more holistic and comprehensive data (teacher self-assessment, student evaluation and observation notes), which is line with Rowley's (1997: 9) call for the inclusion of all stakeholders involved in the "service experience."

If we try to define an extended role of English in higher education in the sense of ICL or CLIL, we need to think about what English language use can do in the regular content class. Broadly speaking, the switch of language helps students build up English language and communicative proficiency in their fields of study, thus facilitating the development of the "extensive mix of skills" students need in order to "function in complex environments" (Sursock 2015: 15). Thus, they learn to *use* English in (potentially work-relevant) contexts of study. At the same time, it may also mean that they learn *about* the language they use so they understand the potential and limitation of communicating through an L2-medium.

Which components of the L2 can be actively developed in the content classroom? If we picture the content classroom as a place in which teachers and students are co-present physically or virtually for the purpose of teaching and learning, then oral communication clearly constitutes the main characteristic of this particular communicative situation. Indeed, speaking has been identified as one skill area in L2-medium instruction where students tend to make the biggest progress, especially at undergraduate level (e.g. Rogier 2012; cf. also Ruiz de Zarobe 2008; Lasagabaster 2008).

In terms of general language skills, there are two areas that lend themselves to active development, especially at undergraduate level: vocabulary and speech control. Vocabulary (together with morphology), alongside elements of speech performance such as fluency and quantity, has long been identified as direct language learning benefits of CLIL at primary and secondary school levels (Dalton-Puffer 2008). Vocabulary training not only actively facilitates the

students' language development but also supports general academic performance. Previous studies have pointed out that students perceived their lack in disciplinary and general academic vocabulary as a key obstacle to subject comprehension while listening to English-medium teachers (e.g. Hong-Kong: Evans & Morrison 2011; generally: Berman and Cheng 2001; on vocabulary thresholds Laufer & Ravenhorst-Kalovski 2010). The fact that international students often struggle with understanding their English-medium teachers, even when these teachers are native speakers (Berman & Cheng 2001: 26), underlines the importance of students' passive and active speech control in classes delivered through English. The suitability of speech control training is further supported by recent insight into students' foreign accent development in EMI, also when the students' instructors were non-native speakers of English (Richter 2015).

Dalton-Puffer (2008), and other colleagues (Hüttner & Rieder-Bünemann 2010; Studer & Konstantinidou 2015), have further documented the benefit of ICL/CLIL and EMI in building confidence of speaking and general confidence in one's language ability, developing flexibility in spontaneous speech, engaging in dialogue, or listening actively to others. These competence areas, in part, make up what, with reference to the CEFR, could be understood as discourse, strategic and interactional competences. These competence areas can be connected to broader communicative activities, such as:

- monologic activities, such as presenting to an audience (cf. productive activities and strategies, particularly oral production, CEFR 2001: 4.4.1);
- dialogic activities, such as conducting an interview or moderating (cf. interactive activities and strategies, particularly spoken interaction, CEFR 2001: 4.4.3);
- self-directed correction activities activating resources to overcome communication problems (CEFR 2001: 4.4.1.3).

Communicative activities such as these constitute, as Rogier (2012: 133) points out, elements of L2-medium instruction that may benefit student language and communication learning. A language-sensitive content teacher, therefore, can be pictured as someone who is able to facilitate learning experiences with activities that allow students to use the language, alone and in teams, in professionally and study-relevant communicative situations. This idea of a joint class experience where learning takes place through oral exchange and negotiation can be referred to, broadly, as a teacher's "ability to create an interactive environment," which constitutes one of the two most important attributes found by Dearden (2014: 24) to describe an English-medium teacher. The most important attribute of an English-medium teacher, according to Dearden (2014: 24), can be related to the delivery of content, i.e. the "ability to explain difficult concepts."

Interactivity, as well as the successful delivery of content, are aspects of a learning experience that seem to reflect lecturing quality in general. Revell & Wainwright (2009: 214), for example, suggest that the quality of a lecture depends strongly on participation, interaction of students, structural clarity, and rapport. All elements, with the exception of structural clarity, follow from a teacher's effort to enhance and facilitate interactivity in the classroom. The change of language, or generally the use of a language which may be neither the teachers' nor the students' first language, offers an opportunity to participants to engage through attention to the medium of communication they share. But it is precisely this that presents EMI teachers with problems. Teachers may not feel adequately confident, prepared or willing to take advantage of the communicative opportunities they have. Instead, teachers who struggle with the language change may over-focus on content delivery (Rogier 2012: 125).

From what has been said so far, it seems only logical to assume that if teaching quality is connected to interactivity and the active use of speech in ways outlined above, then an ETP teacher, to some limited extent, also assumes the role of the students' communication instructor or, at least, their communication facilitator. From this also follows that language and communication teaching methodology forms an integral part of considerations of ETP quality and, consequently, of ETP teacher assessment. While the language-methodological considerations for ETP quality await further clarification, such considerations will likely draw inspiration from student-centred approaches surrounding content-based instruction, as described, for example, by Krahnke (1987), and from ideas following task-based learning, as originally developed by Willis (1996).

3. Developing language-related quality parameters for teachers

3.1 Competence dimensions

In the following sections, I will summarize how the above conceptual considerations guided us in the definition, and revision, of ETP teacher competence parameters in developing an observation protocol to be used for the purpose of evaluating language-related teaching performance in the classroom.

In a first step, broad competence dimensions, or areas, were proposed by a small team of researchers which would align with the vision of the internationalized classroom presented above. These dimensions were then refined further into analytic categories relevant to the context studied. While no in-depth description of these dimensions and categories can be provided here, I will briefly outline their main characteristics and purpose in the study.

Six potentially relevant competence dimensions were identified by the research team that relate to L2-medium content teachers:

1. Basic language competence
2. Strategic competence
3. Monologic competence
4. Dialogic competence
5. Communicative-didactic competence (ICL)
6. Language-didactic competence (CLIL)

Basic language competence (1) was understood as the language-competence threshold, a necessary pre-condition of successful classroom performance that would be noticed mainly if absent. Strategic competence (2) was conceptualized as the ability to cope with challenges in producing speech (repair, achievement, avoidance, etc.). In addition to language and strategic competence dimensions, four other dimensions were identified that were to reflect language-related teaching competences as we move from EMI to ICL and CLIL.

Monologic competence (3) referred to hearer-oriented discourse competence (discourse structuring, cohesion, logic). Dialogic competence (4) was used as an umbrella category to describe instances of the explicit inclusion of the 'other' in the joint construction of meaning (asking questions, joint consolidation of content). While monologic competence was perceived as important mainly from a content learning perspective in episodes of a class where information had to be delivered or concepts consolidated and explained, interactivity and opportunities for active student participation were believed to show greater potential for language learning.

The two dimensions (5 & 6) were to draw attention to a teacher's deliberate attention to language, i.e. on episodes during a content class which were dialogic with an ICL purpose or with a CLIL focus. Dimension (6), language-didactic competence, would even potentially extend to lesson-planning efforts that address language and communication objectives as well as language teaching methodology.

The six dimensions were not understood as forming a scale but they were viewed as making different contributions to the English-medium classroom, ranging from language production and delivery, to the inclusion of students and systematic attention to language. While not necessarily representing progressive steps of complexity, the competence dimensions closer to the language-didactic end of the continuum were assumed to present a greater challenge to teachers than those at the language-production end. It was assumed that there would be little evidence of ICL or CLIL in the classroom where the field experiment was planned.

3.2 Analytic categories

Following the establishment of broad analytic dimensions, analytic sub-categories were defined that could be assigned to the six dimensions. The following points guided the definition of sub-categories:

1. Existing sub-categories from the CEFR (2001) were included where possible.

2. Where the CEFR (2001) did not suggest any meaningful sub-category, new sub-categories were defined.

3. Each sub-category was to consist of one positively-worded can-do descriptor.

4. The sub-categories were to reflect a high degree of detail allowing for the re-construction and diagnosis of communicative teaching behaviour and were expected to be reduced gradually to a number of qualitatively distinctive parameters after revision and application (CEFR 2001: 37-38; Alderson 1991).

5. No limit was set as to the number of sub-categories included at this point.

Initially, we defined 25 analytic categories for observation of speaking and interaction in the international classroom under the six analytic dimensions, which is seen in table 1 (version 'zero').

General language competence	1. Vocabulary range
	2. Vocabulary control
	3. Phonological control
	4. Fluency and Cohesion
	5. Grammatical control
Strategic competence	6. Planning action
	7. Compensating
	8. Monitoring and repair
	9. Listening comprehension
	10. Understanding conversation between speakers from different cultural backgrounds
Monologic competence	11. Overall oral production (monologic)
	12. Sustained monologue (descriptive or putting a case):
	13. Addressing audiences

Dialogic competence	14. Conversation (social use of language)
	15. Formal discussions and meetings
	16. Goal-oriented cooperation
	17. Non- / paraverbal communication
	18. Identifying cues and inferring
Communicative-didactic competence (ICL)	19. Facilitating a positive learning experience of students in L2 situation
	20. Using multilingualism in the classroom
	21. Managing teaching units facilitating student orientation in a L2 situation
Language-didactic competence (CLIL)	22. Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2
	23. Facilitating comprehension and development of L2 register (domain-specific lexical range and control)
	24. Facilitating comprehension and development of students' ability to pronounce L2
	25. Facilitating development of communication skills in L2 (domain- and situation-specific)

Table 1: Version 'zero'

3.3 First revision of descriptors through expert feedback

Once the analytic categories had been defined, a first version of descriptors was drafted (at least one descriptor per analytic category). In this initial phase, descriptors were based, in wording, as closely as possible on the CEFR (2001) illustrative bank of validated descriptors (level C1), in line with the Freiburg approach (Gundermann & Dubow, this volume), where an analogous procedure was chosen. Especially categories relating to ICL/CLIL competences, however, did not have CEFR (2001) equivalents so that descriptors had to be formulated by the research team. Most descriptors for categories that did have CEFR equivalents had to be adapted to the particular context under investigation.

The aim of the subsequent revisions was two-fold: First, the extensive list of categories was to be consolidated so as to identify distinctive categories relevant to teacher observation in the context of ETPs; second, the descriptions belonging to the categories were to be revised so as to make them "clear, transparent and useful" (North 1995: 449). The revision process loosely followed the Delphi method of reflective research whereby group communication (in our case: ETP experts) is structured in a way as to be able to deal with complex problems. The communication typically involves: "some feedback of individual contributions of information and knowledge; some assessment of the group judgment or view; some opportunity for individuals to revise views; and some degree of anonymity for the individual responses" (Linstone & Turoff 1975/2002).

In a first revision, the descriptors were fed into a database and sent to 25 EMI experts from the project network contacts. The experts were to score each descriptor according to its perceived importance in ETP teacher observation (no importance, little importance, moderate importance, high importance) and were invited to suggest alternative formulations, modifications, additions, or to provide any other qualitative feedback. The results from this consultation were analysed, presented in a project meeting and further consolidated in a workshop with the same experts. Based on these results, a consolidated list of descriptors was produced.

Of the 25 experts participating in the consultation, seventeen completed the questionnaire fully. Based on the results from the consultation, the descriptors were divided into three categories: highly important, moderately important and little important. Highly important descriptors were defined as those by a minimum of ten experts (c. 60%) and would, together with those ticking moderate importance, be found important by at least more than 70% of the participants. There were seven descriptors that could be classified as highly important.

Three of the seven highly important descriptors referred to teachers' language competence in terms of their vocabulary control, vocabulary range, and their phonological control. One highly important descriptor referred to strategic competence (compensation abilities: circumlocution and paraphrasing, descriptor 7). The remaining three highly important descriptors emphasized dialogic and language-methodological competences. Dialogic competence descriptor 16 (goal-oriented cooperation) received a high rating similar to compensation strategies. The expert participants further found descriptor 19 (positive attitude to the L2 classroom) and, to a lesser degree, the language-didactic descriptor 22 (lesson planning) to be of high importance. However, the experts found this last descriptor (22) in need of rewording. It is worth mentioning that none of the monologic abilities listed above were found to be highly important.

Fifteen descriptors fell into the bracket 'moderately important'. In the bracket 'moderately important', raters seemed less unanimous, which was seen in the variance of the scores awarded to individual descriptors as well as in the experts, qualitative feedback. There were four descriptors that fell into the bracket 'little importance'. These included two descriptors from the category dialogic competence (descriptor 14 on the teacher's ability to use language for social purposes and descriptor 18 on the teacher's ability to infer from, and react to, student input). The results of this first consultation and expert workshop led to a consolidated list of descriptors, which was to be used in a field study.

3.3.1 Consolidated list of descriptors for field study

The consolidated list comprised sixteen descriptors. In total, nine descriptors were dropped or amalgamated with other descriptors. Eight descriptors were left unchanged; eight descriptors were modified. I will focus, in particular, on the changes made to the original descriptions. Note that the revised descriptors are referred to by lower case letters; the original descriptors are numbered as in table 1.

There were four language competence descriptors following revision as displayed in table 2 (a through d). Descriptors a) and b) dealt with vocabulary while descriptors c) and d) focused on phonological control and fluency. As there had been some overlap between the original descriptors 1 and 2, it was decided to shorten descriptor 2, removing redundant parts dealing with vocabulary range. In line with the outcome of the consultation and the follow-up consolidation workshop with experts, descriptor 5 on grammatical control was dropped altogether.

No	Description	Sub-category	Revision
a)	Can select appropriate formulations from a broad range of domain and discourse-specific language to express him/herself clearly, without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.	Vocabulary range	No revision
b)	Uses vocabulary sufficiently accurately so as to support, and not distract from, the content of the lesson.	Vocabulary control	Re-phrasing, deletion of focus on range
c)	Pronunciation is comfortably intelligible to speakers with different L1, sentence stress and intonation supports his/her message, speech rate is at an appropriate level.	Phonological control	No revision
d)	Speaks fluently, allowing gaps to be readily overcome with circumlocutions; little obvious searching for expressions or avoidance strategies. No major language-related disruptions, pauses or gap-fillers. Speaker uses discourse connectives and cohesion markers appropriately.	Cohesion and fluency	No revision

Table 2: Consolidated list of descriptors of language competence

Out of the five descriptors belonging to the dimension of strategic competence, two remained on the consolidated list in table 3. A new descriptor e) was suggested as an amalgamation of the original descriptors 7 and 8 (compensating, monitoring and repair). Descriptor f) was also formed as a result of joining two descriptors (9 and 10) and was adapted to focus on a teacher's interviewing abilities with students, such as comprehension and clarification checks. The original descriptor 6 (planning) was dropped.

No	Description	Sub-category	Revision
e)	Can recognize the cause of communication breakdowns and implement repair strategies, such as circumlocution and paraphrase to cover gaps in vocabulary and structure. Can backtrack when he/she encounters a difficulty and reformulate what he/she wants to say without fully interrupting the flow of speech.	Monitoring and repair (compensation included as repair strategy)	Amalgamation of descriptors 7 and 8
f)	Shows ability to follow extended and complex spontaneous speech of L2 users from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds through clarification and comprehension checks even when the speech is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly.	Active listening comprehension	Focus on interviewing techniques, amalgamation of descriptors 9 and 10

Table 3: Consolidated list of descriptors of strategic competence

Monologic competence in table 4 was reduced to one descriptor only, reflecting the moderate importance given to this category by the experts in the consultation and the consolidation workshop. The new descriptor g) presented an amalgamation of several descriptors (11, 12 and 13). In line with the expert's call for a more holistic approach to rating, Descriptor 11 (overall oral production) was used as the basis for the new descriptor g) and was expanded by other elements, such as descriptive and argumentative points from descriptor 12 and handling of interjections from descriptor 13.

No	Description	Sub-category	Revision
g)	Can give clear, detailed descriptions and presentations on complex subjects, integrating sub-themes, developing particular descriptive or argumentative points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion. Can handle interjections from the audience well, responding spontaneously and almost effortlessly	Communicative competence, overall oral production (monologic)	Amalgamation descriptors 11, 12 and 13, more holistic description

Table 4: Consolidated list of descriptors of monologic competence

In the consolidated list detailing dialogic competence (table 5), four out of five descriptors were retained, as the experts acknowledged the emphasis given to interactive activities in the literature. Descriptor 18 (inferring from student input) was dropped as it had been accorded low importance by the experts and seemed difficult to measure through observation. Descriptor 16 (goal-oriented cooperation) was kept with a slight modification. Descriptor 14 (ability to use language for social purposes, conversation) was retained because of disagreement among the experts. The text was, however, modified slightly to include the function of social language to build rapport with the audience. Descriptor 17 (non- and para-verbal behavior) was retained for the same reasons but was left unchanged. Descriptor 15 (formal discussion and meetings) was kept with a new focus on moderation and session chairing abilities.

No	Description	Sub-category	Revision
h)	Can use language flexibly and effectively to build rapport with the audience, including emotional, allusive and joking usage.	Conversation	Re-phrasing, focus on audience rapport
i)	Allows student counter arguments and can easily keep up with a discussion/debate. Can chair a discussion/debate convincingly, responding to questions and comments and answering complex lines of counter argument fluently, spontaneously and appropriately.	Formal discussion and meetings	Re-phrasing, focus on moderation
j)	Effectively helps along the learning progress of students by allowing time for and inviting students to join in, say what they think and by continuously checking their understanding.	Goal-oriented co-operation	Re-phrasing, clarification
k)	Conveys confidence in his/her delivery, e.g. through body language, intonation, positioning himself/herself to achieve maximum visibility while maintaining (eye-)contact with the students.	Non-/ para-verbal communication	No revision

Table 5: Consolidated list of descriptors of dialogic competence

With regard to the category of communicative-didactic competence (ICL) in table 6, two out of three descriptors were retained (descriptor 19, positive attitude, and descriptor 21, managing teaching units). Descriptor 19 was considered highly important by the group but was felt difficult to measure. The group of experts suggested adding examples of observable display of attitude. Descriptor 19 was subsequently amalgamated with descriptor 20 (use of multiple languages as one example of showing a positive attitude to multilingualism). Descriptor 21 was kept without further revisions.

No	Description	Sub-category	Revision
l)	Conveys a positive attitude towards the L2 situation, drawing attention to multilingualism and multiculturalism as a resource and opportunity for learning and classroom interaction by some of the following measures: • By meta-communication addressing the audience as a multilingual and multicultural learning group • By meta-communication referring to the professional world as an international space • By addressing the cultural or linguistic significance of study content (e.g. in examples used for illustration of content) • (In monolingual groups) by using L1 on a principled, didactic basis; • (in multilingual groups) by using other languages or references to etymology to clarify terms/concepts.	Facilitating a positive learning experience of students in L2 situation	Re-phrasing, clarification and list of examples, amalgamation with descriptor 20
m)	Manages a teaching unit appropriately in an L2 situation by clearly introducing context, goals and the stages of the session at the start, indicating the different stages during the session, and summarizing the session by revisiting the main points.	Managing teaching units facilitating student orientation in an L2 situation	No revision

Table 6: Consolidated list of descriptors of language-methodological competence (ICL)

In the area of language-didactic competence (CLIL) in table 7, descriptor 24 (development of phonological control) was dropped from the list for conceptual reasons. Descriptor 22, which was the only highly important descriptor from the original list, was left as it was despite the experts' initial suggestion for rewording. The consolidation workshop did not reveal any concrete points for modification. Descriptors 23 (development of L2 register) and 25 (opportunities for students to use L2 in authentic situations) were retained without modifications at this point as there had been disagreement about their suitability in teacher observation.

No	Description	Sub-category	Revision
n)	Can plan teaching units that address learning needs of students in specific study contexts (seminar, tutorial, lecture, laboratory), taking into consideration the language level of audience, including visual aids (e.g. slides) or other support (e.g. handouts), the selection of appropriate texts / tasks for preparation and post-mortem analysis.	Planning teaching units facilitating student comprehension in L2	No revision
o)	Displays appropriate awareness of the students' challenges in using L2 register by some of the following measures: • By consolidating (whole-class) of terminology, concepts • By ensuring that new material is intelligible by inferencing from verbal context, visual support, etc. • By student elicitation or dictionary, etc. look-up as needed for specific tasks and activities • By presenting words accompanied by visuals (pictures, gestures and miming, demonstrative actions, realia, etc.) • By the provision of word-lists, etc. with translation equivalents • By exploring semantic fields and constructing 'mind-maps', etc.	Facilitating comprehension and development of L2 register (domain-specific lexical range and control)	No revision
p)	Displays appropriate awareness of communicative needs of students by creating opportunities for students to participate directly in authentic communicative interaction in L2, including group activities and tasks, role-play, simulations, mini-presentations, etc.	Facilitating development of communication skills in L2 (domain-and situation-specific)	No revision

Table 7: Consolidated list of descriptors of language-methodological competence (CLIL)

3.4 Application of descriptors in field study

The resulting sixteen descriptors were subsequently tested in a field study in one University of Applied Sciences in Switzerland. The English-taught programme observed was an international study option of the BSc in Business Administration, a full-time degree programme entirely taught through English (see Ali-Lawson & Bürki, this volume). The first full-time class in this programme commenced in 2012 and, at the time of the present study, included 95 students who constituted approximately half the student population of the programme, and 31 teachers. In the course of this field study, one full week's worth of studies (10 courses in 8 modules at 90 minutes, involving 8 teachers) was observed by

6 expert raters. If possible two raters were co-present to share impressions after the class. All raters were invited to take free notes on their observations using the consolidated list of descriptors and provide a short report at the end of their observations.

All raters received two documents with the descriptors, one for grading the teachers on a scale from 3 to 6 (6 being excellent and 4 being a pass) and one for the rating of the descriptors themselves. In the assessment of the descriptors, the raters could indicate whether a descriptor was useful in evaluating a teacher's performance, helpful in consolidating the rater's overall impression of the class, important in terms of construct relevance, easy to use, observable in the classroom or possibly redundant.

In the following, I look at the raters' experiences in the field in greater detail, starting with their feedback on the construct relevance of the consolidated list of descriptors when applying them in the field. For this purpose, raters were asked to indicate on the sheet their score for each descriptor in terms of whether or not they found it relevant to the construct of teacher competence for teaching in English-medium programmes (1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree; 3: agree; 4: strongly agree). Three raters returned their completed forms after class observation. Three raters did not use these forms but commented freely on the descriptors. The results from the completed forms are summarized in table 8.

If unanimous agreement about a descriptor's relevance to the construct being measured were a pre-condition for inclusion, then the forms indicated that four descriptors should be considered highly construct relevant. The raters focused their attention on language competence (vocabulary range and phonological control), on dialogic behavior (goal-oriented cooperation), and on communicative-didactic competence (ICL) (structural explicitness). Still relevant, yet slightly less so than the previous ones, the raters identified six descriptors in the dimensions of language competence (cohesion and fluency), strategic competence (monitoring and repair), monologic competence (overall oral production), dialogic competence (formal discussions and meetings) and language-didactic competence (CLIL) (planning teaching units, development of L2 register). The two descriptors on language-didactic competence received the highest points in the bracket 'relevant'. Feedback on the remaining six descriptors (b, f, h, k, l, p) was mixed so that they could not be considered as relevant to the construct under investigation.

Highly relevant	Relevant	Irrelevant / Disagreement
Descriptor a (vocabulary range)	Descriptor d (cohesion and fluency)	Descriptor b (vocabulary control)
Descriptor c (phonological control)	Descriptor e (monitoring and repair)	Descriptor f (active listening)
Descriptor j (goal-oriented cooperation)	Descriptor g (overall oral production)	Descriptor h (social use of L2)
Descriptor m (structural explicitness)	Descriptor i (formal discussions and meetings)	Descriptor k (para- and non-verbal communication)
	Descriptor n (planning teaching units)	Descriptor l (positive attitude to L2)
	Descriptor o (development of L2 register)	Descriptor p (facilitating development of communication skills)

Table 8: Revised list of descriptors according to their relevance in the field

The analysis of construct relevance was compared to the free comments by the raters in their teacher evaluation forms and their final reports. In total, fifteen completed teacher evaluation sheets were received from four raters. Due to unforeseen circumstances, however, one rater dropped out so that one rater had to fill in nine evaluation sheets alone. One rater did not fill in evaluation sheets but commented freely on the observations.

One aspect that stood out when comparing notes and evaluation sheets was the overall positive impression of the teachers' performances. No teacher gave the impression that he or she might have failed the evaluation; on the contrary, performance was generally rated between good and very good. It seemed that four competence dimensions were selected more rigorously than others: Language competence, dialogic competence, communicative-didactic competence (ICL) and language-didactic competence (CLIL).

The raters tended to be particularly strict in awarding full points on phonological control; most teachers were only given the second highest points or even lower scores. The reasons for giving lower scores listed in the comments section ranged from speech production criteria such as "intelligible but accented", "mispronunciations", to speech performance criteria such as speech rate ("high speech rate") or speech monotony ("monotonous, doesn't project voice"). While speech performance criteria emphasized the raters' focus on students and the idea that students may easily feel overburdened, the comments on the teachers' speech production abilities seemed to indicate an underlying native-speaker orientation as accent and mispronunciations were taken as sufficient reason to reduce points even when it did not affect intelligibility. Overall, speech performance criteria had a greater impact on the points than speech production ability.

With regard to dialogic competence, there were few lower points in the evaluations of teachers, which did not seem to impact the overall assessment of their performance considerably. The lowest points were awarded on descriptor (j) (goal-oriented cooperation); some lower scores were also found in

descriptor (i) (formal discussions and meetings). The comments raters provided on their evaluation sheets raised the point that it could not always be observed and that raters did not know how to treat it if it was not visible in a class. Goal-oriented cooperation, on the other hand, was always found to be present in some measurable way. The descriptors on goal-oriented cooperation and formal discussions and meetings were seen to be serving the same goal, offering an interpretation of dialogic competence as a quality ensuring comprehension through repeated information rather than through convincing students of specific points. This interpretation of the teachers revealed a picture of dialogue which was information-heavy. It is not surprising, in this context, that other dialogic descriptors such as self-confident appearance and 'positive face-work' (reduction of teacher-student distance through e.g. humour) as in descriptors (h) and (k) were seen as irrelevant to the construct being measured. While new teacher models stress the role of the teacher as a coach rather than someone passing information onto students, the use and feedback on dialogic competence descriptors in the field suggested an underlying picture of the teacher who primarily imparts knowledge onto students.

There was considerably more variance in points awarded in the areas of ICL and CLIL. Within communicative-didactic competence (ICL), descriptor (l), emphasizing a positive attitude to the L2, received the least attention by the observers. If it was felt to be present, which was mostly the case, it received full points; if absent, none. In other words, there was very little nuance in grading a teacher's attitude and enthusiasm in an L2 situation. Feedback on descriptor (l) emphasized that it was too broad for assessment. Descriptor (m) (structural explicitness), on the other hand, was felt to be more relevant to teacher performance and was perceived to be straightforward for assessment. Approximately half of the evaluation sheets contained slightly lower scores under this category. The interpretation of descriptor m in the field supported previous notions of students tending to feel overburdened by the L2 situation and needing clear signposting.

Of the three language-didactic descriptors, descriptor (n) (lesson planning) received little critical rater attention. Teachers generally received medium to high points on this descriptor, with some indication in the feedback sheets that the descriptor was difficult to assess. Descriptors (o) and (p) (L2-lexical development and the creation of authentic opportunities to use the L2) were applied most rigorously by the rater team of all descriptors in the areas of ICL and CLIL. With regard to descriptor (o), most teachers did not receive high points and, in some cases, the observers noted that they found no evidence of active register development in the class. There was one teacher with a mere pass and three teachers that failed on this particular descriptor. With regard to descriptor (p), the points teachers received were even lower. One teacher only received a pass on descriptor (p) and seven teachers even failed. Feedback on these two descriptors was critical to the extent that the raters questioned

whether content teachers could be asked to provide active language-learning opportunities. Especially descriptor (p) was controversially discussed by the raters.

4. Discussion and conclusion

This paper set out to describe experiences made in a research project that focused on the development of quality parameters for observation of English-medium teachers in English-taught programmes in Swiss higher education. The project first situated broader internationalization trends, drawing attention to the fact that comprehensive internationalization needs to lead to a more systematic inclusion of language into content teaching.

The paper then presented conceptual considerations underlying teacher observations and the rationale for the development of analytic dimensions, categories and descriptors. In a third step, the paper discussed the qualitative revision processes the descriptors underwent and first experiences made with a consolidated list of descriptors in the field.

The paper suggests that if we are to reduce the number of descriptors to ones that are distinctive to the context studied, then our focus shifts to five analytic sub-categories for further development. This revised list of descriptors underlines the impression that language-related quality in ETP teaching, in the eyes of experts, is connected to

1. phonological control in L2, i.e. little accent, hearer-oriented speech rate and lively intonation (general language competence)

2. student comprehension (dialogic competence)

3. explicit content structure (communicative-didactic competence ICL)

4. L2-consolidation activities (language-didactic competence CLIL)

5. opportunities for L2 use in classroom (language-didactic competence CLIL)

This reduced and revised list of descriptors marks a clear departure from previous approaches as it emphasizes interactive and didactic competences in an L2-medium context, conceptualizing the L2 as an object of learning in the observation of ETP teacher performance. Descriptors such as the ones presented in this study can be developed further into scales and may ultimately have practical use in quality assurance of ETPs, suggesting paths for teacher training and evaluation. At a broader level, this study has attempted to make an initial contribution to the discussion of quality in ETPs by highlighting the teacher's role as a language and communication facilitator in a comprehensively internationalized classroom.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. C. (1991). Bands and scores. In J. C. Alderson, & B. North (eds.), *Language testing in the 1990s. Developments in ELT,* (pp. 71-86). London: British Council/ Macmillan.

Ali-Lawson, D. & Bürki, J. (2018). Organisational challenges and opportunities when implementing an international profile. *Bulletin VALS-ASLA, Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée, 107,* 127-141.

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

Atechi, S. (2004). *The Intelligibility of Native and Non-Native English Speech. A Comparative Analysis of Cameroon English, British and American English* (PhD thesis). Technische Universität Chemnitz.

Beelen, J. & Leask, B. (2011). Internationalisation at home on the move. *Internationalization of Higher Education Handbook.* Berlin: Raabe Academic Publishers.

Berman, R. & Cheng, L. (2001). English academic language skills: Perceived difficulties by undergraduate and graduate students, and their academic achievement. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4,* 25-39.

Chen, S. & Tsai, Y. (2012). Research on English teaching and learning: Taiwan (2004-2009). *Language Teaching, 45(2),* 180-201.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge, U.K: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Dafouz, E. & Smit, U. (2014). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics, 37(3),* 397-415.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkmann (eds.), *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching* (pp.1-19). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principle? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31,* 182-204.

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction – a growing global phenomenon.* London: British Council.

de Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L. & Egron-Polak, E. (2015). *Internationalisation of Higher Education.* Brussels: European Union.

European Commission (2013, July 11). European higher education in the world. COM 2013 499. Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0499.

Evans, S. & Morrison, B. (2011b). The student experience of English-medium higher education in Hong Kong. *Language and Education, 25(2),* 147-162.

Green, W. & Whitsed, C. (2015). *Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines. Reflective Narrative Accounts from Business, Education and Health.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Greere, A. & Räsänen, A. (2008). *Report on the LANQUA Subproject on Content and Language Integrated Learning "Redefining CLIL – Towards Multilingual Competence.* Southampton: LLAS.

Gundermann, S. & Dubow, G. (2018). Ensuring quality in EMI: developing an assessment procedure at the University of Freiburg. *Bulletin VALS-ASLA, Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée, 107,* 113-125.

Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From Concept to Action.* Washington, DC: NAFSA, The Association of International Educators.

Hudzik, J.K. (2015). *Comprehensive internationalization. Institutional pathways to success.* New York: Routledge.

Hüttner, J. & Rieder-Bünemann, A. (2010). A cross-sectional analysis of oral narratives by children with CLIL and non-CLIL instruction. In C. Dalton-Puffer; T. Nikula, & U. Smit (eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms,* (pp. 61-80). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kling, J. & Stæhr, L. S. (2012). *The development of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS).* Copenhagen: Centre for Internationalization and Parallel Language Use, University of Copenhagen.

Kling, J. (2015). "You try with a little humor and you just get on with it": Danish lecturers' reflections on English-medium instruction. In D. Slobodanka, A.-K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (eds.), *English-medium instruction in European Higher Education,* (pp. 201-222). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter Mouton.

Krahnke, K. (1987). *Approach to Syllabus Design for Foreign Language Teaching.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal, 1(11),* 30-41.

Laufer, B. & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G.C. (2010) Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical text coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 22(1),* 15-30.

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13(2),* 205-221.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Leask, B. & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalization of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 43.1,* 79-101.

Linstone, H.A. & Turoff, M. (1975/2002). *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley (electronic reproduction 2002).

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

North, B. (1995). The Development of a Common Framework Scale of Descriptors of Language Proficiency Based on a Theory of Measurement. *System, 23(4),* 445-465.

Revell, A. & Wainwright, E. (2009). What Makes Lectures Unmissable? Insights into Teaching Excellence and Active Learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 33(2),* 209-223.

Richter, K. (2015). *English-Medium Instruction and Pronunciation. A longitudinal case study of Austrian business students at the University of Applied Sciences Vienna* (PhD thesis). University of Vienna.

Rogier, D. (2012). *The effects of English-medium instruction on language proficiency of students enrolled in higher education in the UAE* (PhD thesis). University of Exeter.

Rowley, J. (1997). Beyond service quality dimensions in higher education and towards a service contract. *Quality Assurance in Education, 5(1),* 7-14.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2008). CLIL and foreign language learning: A longitudinal study in the Basque Country. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1(1),* 60-73.

Smit, U. & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education. An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. In U. Smit & E. Dafouz (eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher education: Gaining insights into English-medium instruction at European universities*, AILA Review, 25 (pp. 1-12). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Studer, P. & Konstantinidou, L. (2015). Language attitudes and language proficiency of undergraduate students in English-medium instruction. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée, No spécial, volume 3,* 215-231.

Sursock, A. (2015). *Trends 2015: Learning and Teaching in European Universities.* Brussels: European University Association.

Van der Wende, M.C. (1996a). *Internationalizing the Curriculum in Dutch Higher Education: An International Comparative Perspective* (Ph.D. dissertation).

Van der Wende, M. (1996b). Internationalizing the curriculum in higher education. Report on an OECD/ CERI Study. *Tertiary Education and Management, 2(2),* 186-195.

Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: Internationalization at home in context. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7(5),* 5-11.

Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, R. & Zegers, V. (2007). Introduction. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (eds.), *Researching Content and Language Integration in Higher Education* (pp. 11-16). Maastricht: Maastricht University.

Wilkinson, R. (2018). Quality, internationalization, and English-medium instruction: a Dutch perspective of higher education. *Bulletin VALS-ASLA, Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée, 107,* 7-25.

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning.* London: Longman.