

Educational Linguistics

Ruth Breeze

Carmen Sancho Guinda *Editors*

# Essential Competencies for English-medium University Teaching

 Springer

# Educational Linguistics

Volume 27

## Series Editor

Francis M. Hult, Lund University, Sweden

## Editorial Board

Marilda C. Cavalcanti, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brazil

Jasone Cenoz, University of the Basque Country, Spain

Angela Creese, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

Ingrid Gogolin, Universität Hamburg, Germany

Christine Hélot, Université de Strasbourg, France

Hilary Janks, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa

Claire Kramsch, University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A

Constant Leung, King's College London, United Kingdom

Angel Lin, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Alastair Pennycook, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

*Educational Linguistics* is dedicated to innovative studies of language use and language learning. The series is based on the idea that there is a need for studies that break barriers. Accordingly, it provides a space for research that crosses traditional disciplinary, theoretical, and/or methodological boundaries in ways that advance knowledge about language (in) education. The series focuses on critical and contextualized work that offers alternatives to current approaches as well as practical, substantive ways forward. Contributions explore the dynamic and multi-layered nature of theory-practice relationships, creative applications of linguistic and symbolic resources, individual and societal considerations, and diverse social spaces related to language learning.

The series publishes in-depth studies of educational innovation in contexts throughout the world: issues of linguistic equity and diversity; educational language policy; revalorization of indigenous languages; socially responsible (additional) language teaching; language assessment; first- and additional language literacy; language teacher education; language development and socialization in non-traditional settings; the integration of language across academic subjects; language and technology; and other relevant topics.

The *Educational Linguistics* series invites authors to contact the general editor with suggestions and/or proposals for new monographs or edited volumes. For more information, please contact the publishing editor: Jolanda Voogd, Associate Publishing Editor, Springer, Van Godewijkstraat 30, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/5894>

Ruth Breeze • Carmen Sancho Guinda  
Editors

# Essential Competencies for English-medium University Teaching

 Springer

*Editors*

Ruth Breeze  
Instituto Cultura y Sociedad  
Universidad de Navarra  
Pamplona, Spain

Carmen Sancho Guinda  
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
Madrid, Spain

ISSN 1572-0292

Educational Linguistics

ISBN 978-3-319-40954-2

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-40956-6

ISSN 2215-1656 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-40956-6 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016955087

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

# Foreword

English has become the most important and widespread language of instruction across the higher education landscape, as universities push to internationalise and to compete in the global higher education market through facilitating student and staff mobility. Since the turn of the millennium, there has been exponential growth in English-medium academic instruction in non-Anglophone settings, where more and more universities now offer degree programmes taught wholly or partly in English for home, international and exchange students or where universities from Anglophone countries have set up transnational overseas campuses operating entirely in English. At the same time, universities in Anglophone countries seek to attract increasing numbers of international students from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds who clearly need to possess the competencies to cope with academic and daily life in English. Understandably, the ubiquitous presence of English across higher education today gives rise to much critical debate pertaining to issues such as entry requirements, assessment, standards, varieties, academic literacies, resources and support where students' English language skills are concerned (for detailed discussion, see Murray 2016).

Whatever the complex outcomes of such debate across the internationalised higher education landscape, university teachers (whether we teach academic content, English skills or both) face a fundamental pedagogical and ethical concern. This concern is to nurture our own students' capacities to engage effectively with their academic and professional discipline areas through English and their capacities to continue developing their skills and knowledge (including English skills and knowledge) in response to changing needs and circumstances in the future. In other words, we have a pedagogical responsibility not simply to teach content or language or to make academic content linguistically accessible but more importantly to stimulate the attitude of mind, ways of thinking and 'will and skill' (McCombs and Marzano 1990) needed for students to be able to take meaningful charge of their own learning now and into their future personal and professional lives. These are the core pedagogical concerns under focus in this volume, framed in terms of four essential competencies of *critical thinking*, *creativity*, *autonomy* and *motivation*. What is perhaps striking about these competencies is that they clearly have relevance

beyond English-medium academic instruction, or rather they have relevance for students in all categories, regardless of whether English is an additionally acquired language for them or not. These are essential competencies for effective personal engagement in academic studies in all contexts. This means that, if students who have acquired English as an additional language are enabled to develop these essential and transferable competencies, they will be cognitively and motivationally advantaged (rather than linguistically disadvantaged) in the quality of their learning and academic engagement in English-medium university settings.

Viewed in this light, the theoretical and pedagogical insights contained in this collection have potentially significant implications for our practice as teachers in English-medium universities and, through us, for the quality of learning that all our students experience and achieve.

## Sources Cited

- McCombs, B., & Marzano, R. J. (1990). Putting the self in self-regulated learning: The self as agent in integrating will and skill. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 51–69.
- Murray, N. (2016). *Standards of English in higher education: Issues, challenges and strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

University of Warwick  
Coventry, UK

Ema Ushioda

# Contents

<b>Introduction: Making Essential Competencies Visible in Higher Education</b> . . . . .	1
Carmen Sancho Guinda and Ruth Breeze	
<b>Part I Critical Thinking</b>	
<b>On the Teaching of Critical Thinking in English for Academic Purposes</b> . . . . .	19
Tim J. Moore	
<b>Promoting Critical Cultural Awareness in the International University.</b> . . . . .	37
Ruth Breeze	
<b>Critical Thinking, Language and Problem-Solving: Scaffolding Thinking Skills through Debate.</b> . . . . .	51
David Rear	
<b>Indexicals and L2 Learners' Metadiscursive Awareness.</b> . . . . .	65
Francis Cornish	
<b>Part II Creativity</b>	
<b>In Search of Creativity</b> . . . . .	85
Alan Maley	
<b>Teaching Creatively and Teaching for Creativity.</b> . . . . .	99
Teresa Cremin	
<b>Creativity and Digital Literacies in English for Specific Purposes</b> . . . . .	111
Christoph A. Hafner, Lindsay Miller, and Connie Kwai Fun Ng	
<b>Towards a Corpus-Attested Definition of Creativity as Accessed through a Subtextual Analysis of Student Writing</b> . . . . .	125
Marija Milojkovic and Bill Louw	

### **Part III    Autonomy**

<b>Three Versions of Learner Autonomy and their Implications for English-Medium Degree Programmes . . . . .</b>	<b>145</b>
David Little	

<b>Listening to Local Voices: Teachers' Representations on Learner Autonomy. . . . .</b>	<b>159</b>
Faiza Bensemmane-Ihaddaden	

<b>Reevaluating the Roles of the Stakeholders in Language Education: How Student Autonomy Is Promoted through Projects in English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) Courses . . . . .</b>	<b>169</b>
Miriam Symon	

<b>Learner Autonomy and Awareness through Distance Collaborative Group Work in English for Academic Purposes . . . . .</b>	<b>183</b>
Elisabet Arnó-Macià	

<b>Argumentation and Floor Management in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning. . . . .</b>	<b>201</b>
Kenneth Keng Wee Ong and Sujata S. Kathpalia	

<b>Rising Spirals and Virtuous Circles: The Interrelationship between Motivation and Learner Autonomy . . . . .</b>	<b>219</b>
Ruth Wilkinson	

### **Part IV    Motivation**

<b>Motivation in Language Learning. . . . .</b>	<b>235</b>
Lindy Woodrow	

<b>Essential Motivational Group Dynamics: A 3-Year Panel Study . . . . .</b>	<b>249</b>
Yoshifumi Fukada, Tim Murphey, Joseph Falout, and Tetsuya Fukuda	

<b>Managing and Mediating the Research Element on Master's Courses: The Roles of Course Leaders and Supervisors. . . . .</b>	<b>267</b>
Amos Paran, Fiona Hyland, and Clare Bentall	

<b>Authentic Learning and Student Motivation: Building Instructor and Student Confidence through Genuine Interaction and Authentic Classroom Materials . . . . .</b>	<b>281</b>
Christine Jernigan	

<b>Motivation, Technology and Language Learning . . . . .</b>	<b>295</b>
Linda Weinberg	

## About the Contributors

**Elisabet Arnó-Macià** is associate professor of English for specific purposes at Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (Barcelona, Spain). Her research interests centre on technical and academic communication, the role of technology in language teaching and learning, and multilingualism in educational settings. She has co-authored books such as *English for Academic Purposes: Learning English Through the Web* (Edicions UPC, 2001, with Clàudia Barahona) and *La Conciencia Lingüística en la Enseñanza de Lenguas* (*Language Awareness in Language Teaching*, published by Graó, Barcelona, 2007). She has also co-edited *Information Technology in Languages for Specific Purposes: Issues and Prospects* (Springer, 2006), with Antonia Soler and Carmen Rueda. She has recently published in journals such as *The Modern Language Journal* and *The Journal of English for Academic Purposes*.

**Faiza Bensemmane-Ihaddaden** is a professor of English linguistics and didactics at the University of Algiers 2, Algeria, whose Department of English/Anglophone Studies she currently directs. She teaches and supervises students on master and PhD programmes. Her research interests include language learning strategies, learner autonomy, curriculum development, narratives of learning and teaching and teacher education. She has authored and co-authored papers and articles on English language learning, classroom research and learner autonomy. She is also an English curriculum designer for middle and secondary education and a founding member of the Algerian Association of Teachers of English (AATE), which promotes teacher development. In 2011–2012, she was a visiting research fellow in the Department of Education at Goldsmiths, University of London.

**Clare Bentall** is a lecturer in education and associate director of the Development Education Research Centre at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London. She is also a freelance trainer and senior fellow of the Higher Education Academy. Her PhD looked at how teachers learn during teacher training in Mozambique. She teaches on MA programmes and training courses for other educators who work in a range of contexts: higher education, clinical education,

development education and further education. She is particularly interested in theories of learning and how they apply in these different contexts. She is also involved in a number of projects looking at how to develop teachers' abilities within schools and colleges to incorporate a global dimension into education.

**Ruth Breeze** (MA, MA (Ed), PhD) is a senior lecturer in English at the University of Navarra, Spain, and a member of the GradUN Research Group in the *Instituto de Cultura y Sociedad*. She has researched and published widely in the area of discourse analysis applied to media language and specialised discourse. Her most recent books are *Rethinking Academic Writing Pedagogy for the European University* (Rodopi, 2012) and *Corporate Discourse* (Bloomsbury, 2015). She is also co-editor of various collected volumes, including *Interpersonality in Legal Genres* (Peter Lang, 2014), *Theory and Practice in CLIL* (Rodopi, 2014) and *Evaluation in Media Discourse: European Perspectives* (Peter Lang, 2016). Her interest in teaching in English in expanding circle countries stems from her own involvement in the internationalisation process in European universities. She has designed and led courses and workshops for university lecturers in Spain and Slovakia who are involved in implementing international programmes and/or starting to give content courses in English. She has also researched on how taking courses in an L2 affects student performance and on appropriate admissions criteria for EMI programmes.

**Francis Cornish** gained a PhD in linguistics in 1982 from the University of Sussex, UK, and in 1997, a postdoctoral degree in the language sciences from the University of Toulouse II, France, where he was professor of English linguistics in the Studies of the Anglophone World Department from 2004 to 2011. Prior to this, he lectured in general linguistics (syntax) in the Language Sciences Department at the same university (1995–2004) and in the UK in French language and French and general and applied linguistics at the University of Kent (1976–1994), as well as briefly at the University of Sussex (1974–1976). He currently acts as handling editor on the editorial board of the French linguistics journal *French Language Studies* (CUP) and is a member of the advisory board of the online French linguistics journal *Discours*. Francis Cornish is now retired but maintains links with his host university (Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès) as emeritus professor. He is the author of two books on anaphora in English and French within a discourse context and has written numerous articles and chapters in edited volumes on anaphora and deixis, reading in a foreign language, agreement and text and discourse structure, as well as information structure, reference, predication and the lexical semantics-syntax interface.

**Teresa Cremin** is a professor of education (literacy) at the Open University. She is an academician of the Academy of Social Sciences, a fellow of the English Association, the past president of the United Kingdom Literacy Association and a board member of Booktrust and the Poetry Archive in the UK. She is also a coordinator of the British Educational Research Association's Special Interest Group on Creativity and a member of the ESRC Peer Review College. Teresa's sociocultural

research and her teaching and consultancy focus on creativity in teaching and learning from the early years to higher education, teachers' literate identities and practices, and the pedagogies of reading and writing for pleasure. Additionally, she has recently explored the creativity involved in contemporary enactments of Gussin Paley's work with young children scribing and enacting their own narratives, the literary discussions of extracurricular reading groups, and working with practitioners as researchers, investigating the everyday literacy practices of young people in the twenty-first century. Teresa has written and edited over 25 books and numerous papers and professional texts, most recently publishing with Debra Myhill *Writing Voices: Creating Communities of Writers* (2012, Routledge) and editing with colleagues *The International Handbook of Research into Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture* (2013, Wiley Blackwell).

**Joseph Falout** researches, publishes and presents internationally about educational psychology of language learning and teaching, with an interest towards pedagogical applications. Papers include 'Coping with Demotivation: EFL Learners' Remotivation Strategies' in *TESL-EJ*, 'Demotivation: Affective States and Learning Outcomes' in *System*, 'Forming Pathways of Belonging: Social Inclusion for Teachers Abroad' in *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education*, 'Japanese EFL Learners' Remotivation Strategies' in *Researching Cultures of Learning: International Perspectives on Language Learning and Education* and 'The Social Crux: Motivational Transformations of EFL students in Japan' in *Transnational Higher Education in the Asian Context*. He edits for the *OnCUE Journal*, published by the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT), and the *Asian EFL Journal*. His collaborations in teaching and researching include contributions to originating the theoretical and applied foundations of critical participatory looping (CPL) and present communities of imagining (PCOIz). An assistant professor at Nihon University, College of Science and Technology, in Japan, Falout teaches English for academic purposes and English for specific purposes to undergraduate and graduate students. He has also taught English composition and essay writing, public speaking and English as a second language at colleges in the USA.

**Yoshifumi Fukada** (Ed.D., University of San Francisco, in international and multicultural education with emphasis in second language acquisition) is professor in the Department of International Studies at Meisei University, Tokyo, Japan. His research interests include L2 learners' and users' dynamic identities, their agency in their English-learning and social interactions (in and out of class), and their use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in international communities. Recently he conducted a critical ethnographic study on international students' target language-mediated socialisation in the host country, receiving a research grant from the Ministry of Education (2010–2013). He also has been involved in a collaborative mixed-method research on present communities of imagining (PCOIz). He publishes and presents nationally and internationally. papers including 'Statistical Analyses of Imagined Communities' and 'Generating Agentive TL Interaction in

TBL Projects', both of which were selected as best papers in 2008 and 2011, respectively, for JALT conference proceedings, and given special introductory publication in this academic society's journal, *The Language Teacher* (TLT). Since receiving a doctoral degree in 2001, he has been teaching some undergraduate and graduate courses including sociolinguistics/applied linguistics senior seminar, English pedagogy and Meisei Summer School Project (MSSP), a project-based English educational programme.

**Tetsuya Fukuda** is a full-time instructor at the English for the liberal arts programme of International Christian University (ICU) and a part-time lecturer at Waseda University in Tokyo, Japan. At ICU, he teaches reading and writing courses, coordinates a grammar course and lectures on cultural issues. He has also taught at other schools at both secondary and tertiary levels and written textbooks, workbooks and examinations professionally. As a researcher, he conducts research, makes presentations and writes papers nationally and internationally, and his research interests include sociocultural issues involving English learners in Japan, especially motivation for learning English, how inclusiveness works in motivation, the role native and local English teachers play, how English learners perceive varieties of English and implementation of English-only policy in Japanese secondary schools. One of his recent papers is 'Current Issues Surrounding English-Only Policy' published by the Society of Private Secondary Schools in Tokyo in 2012, and one of his presentations is 'Connecting Group Identity to Motivation: A Preliminary Study' at the Japan Association for Language Teaching Pan-SIG conference in 2013. More information about Tetsuya can be obtained at his website, <https://sites.google.com/site/tetsuyaenglish/>, or please contact him at [tfukuda@icu.ac.jp](mailto:tfukuda@icu.ac.jp).

**Christoph A. Hafner** is associate professor in the Department of English, City University of Hong Kong. His main research interests are in specialised discourses, digital literacies and language learning and technology. He teaches a range of courses at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, including discipline-specific English (science and law), new media writing and new technologies for language teaching. His most recent books are *Discourse and Digital Practices: Doing Discourse Analysis in the Digital Age* (co-edited with Rodney Jones and Alice Chik and published by Routledge, 2015) and *Understanding Digital Literacies: A Practical Introduction* (co-authored with Rodney Jones, also published by Routledge, 2012).

**Fiona Hyland** is an honorary associate professor in the English Language Education Division in the Faculty of Education at the University of Hong Kong. She has more than 30 years of experience in teaching and researching in the areas of applied linguistics and teacher education in a variety of international contexts. Her PhD was on the topic of written feedback to ESL writers, and she has published widely in both journals and edited volumes on the subject of feedback. She is co-author (with Ken Hyland) of *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (2006,

Applied Linguistics Series: Cambridge University Press) and serves as book reviews editor for the *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

**Christine Jernigan** has trained language instructors at Duke University, the University of Texas at Austin, the Centro de Estudos Linguísticos in Brazil and the University of New South Wales in Sydney. She has also taught both English and Portuguese to adults and children. Her research focus is on learner expectations and motivation. She currently teaches at North Carolina State University and has recently published the book *Family Language Learning: Learn Another Language, Raise Bilingual Children* (<http://www.amazon.com/Family-Language-Learning-Bilingual-Children/dp/1783092793/>). For helpful how-to videos on its chapter topics, visit <http://www.youtube.com/getbilingual> or contact her directly at [christinejernigan@gmail.com](mailto:christinejernigan@gmail.com).

**Sujata S. Kathpalia** is a senior lecturer at the Language and Communication Centre (LCC), Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. She is in the management committee of LCC assisting with academic and administrative matters. As chief editor of the *LCC Working Papers*, she coordinates review work and edits submitted manuscripts. She is also the coordinator of the scientific communication courses and teaches academic writing courses to undergraduates and postgraduates. The courses that she has been involved in include undergraduate courses such as scientific communication I and II and postgraduate courses such as graduate English and scientific thesis writing. Her research interests include genre analysis, academic writing, code switching and English language teaching. Her recent publications have appeared in *System*, *World Englishes* and *IEEE Transactions in Professional Communication*. She is currently working in two funded projects related to discourse analysis of literature reviews in published articles and curriculum development of EAP courses in science and technology.

**David Little** retired in 2008 as associate professor of applied linguistics at Trinity College Dublin. His numerous publications and conference presentations on the theory and practice of language learner autonomy have done much to shape international debate. He played a leading role in the Council of Europe's European Language Portfolio project from 1998 to 2010, coordinated two ELP-related projects for the European Centre for Modern Languages between 2004 and 2011 and is a member of several Council of Europe expert groups.

**Bill Louw** has worked in the Department of English at the University of Zimbabwe, twice as chair, for more than 40 years. In 2015, he was visiting international professor at Coventry University, UK. Bill Louw invented corpus stylistics in 1987, the year in which the first edition of the *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary* had reference corpora of 22 million words of running text. Other discoveries followed, all of which involved the digital use of collocation. Contextual prosodic theory began in 2000. He discovered corpus-derived subtext in 2008 and devoted a lecture tour to it in the same year. In the seminal volume *Perspectives on Corpus*

*Linguistics*, edited by Vander Viana, Sonia Zyngier and Jeff Barnbrook and published by John Benjamins, Bill Louw's work is featured as the only approach to corpus studies that is based upon the philosophy of language and especially on the work of the logical positivists of the Vienna Circle and upon analytic philosophy in general. Bill Louw and Marija Milojkovic have published both jointly and separately since 2010. They published a major article in *The Cambridge Handbook of Stylistics* in 2014 and a separate co-authored volume in 2016, entitled *Corpus Stylistics as Contextual Prosodic Theory and Subtext*. Other applications of their work are to be found in humour studies and business communication.

**Alan Maley** has been involved with EFL/ESL for some 50 years. He has lived and worked in ten countries, including China, India, Singapore and Thailand. He has published over 40 books and numerous articles. He is a former president of IATEFL. For 20 years, he was series editor of the *Oxford Resource Books for Teachers*. He was a founding member of the Extensive Reading Foundation and is currently helping to found the 'C' group, dedicated to the promotion of creativity in language learning. In 2012, he was presented with the ELT Lifetime Achievement Award. His main professional interests are currently in creative writing, literature, creative materials design and the dynamics of teacher-student interaction. He writes poetry and stories for a hobby.

**Lindsay Miller** is an associate professor in the Department of English at City University of Hong Kong. He teaches a variety of proficiency courses at BA level and conceptual courses at MA level and has PhD supervision. Lindsay's main research interests are in the areas of learner autonomy, listening and teacher education. He has published widely in these areas and has co-authored *Establishing Self-Access: From Theory to Practice* (1999, with D. Gardner) and *Second Language Listening: Theory and Practice* (2005, with J. Flowerdew). Both books are published by Cambridge University Press.

**Marija Milojkovic** is an English language instructor at the University of Belgrade, teaching contemporary English at the English Department, within the Faculty of Philology. Her interests in using corpora in literary stylistics, classroom stylistics and investigations of non-native academic writing have led her to collaborate with Bill Louw on contextual prosodic theory. Her own literary applications of the theory, presented in their co-authored book, involve working on authorial intention and the verifiable connection between inspiration and literary output, as well as applying the theory to Slavic languages. Her classroom research has so far aimed to introduce contextual prosodic theory to university students. This study is the first to view English non-native text itself from the point of view of CPT. Currently, Marija Milojkovic is working on a corpus stylistics project designed to provide corpus-attested definitions for literary devices.

**Tim J. Moore** is an associate professor in academic literacy at Swinburne University of Technology and adjunct research associate at Monash University in Melbourne,

Australia. He is the author of *Critical Thinking and Language: The Challenge of Generic Skills and Disciplinary Discourses* (Bloomsbury, 2011). He has also published on this subject in a number of journals: *Higher Education Research & Development*, *Studies in Higher Education*, *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* and the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. Other research interests are in academic and professional literacies, critical discourse analysis, philosophy and policy in higher education. He is co-editor of the journal *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* and editor of the recent special issue 'Key Thinkers, Key Theories: The Contribution of Theory to Academic Literacy Practice' (2014).

**Tim Murphey** (PhD, Université de Neuchâtel, Switzerland, in applied linguistics), TESOL's *Professional Development in Language Education* series editor; co-author with Zoltan Dörnyei of *Group Dynamics in the Language Classroom* (CUP, 2003); author of *Music and Song* (OUP, 1991), *Teaching One to One* (Longman, 1992), *Language Hungry* (Macmillan Language House, 1998; Helbling, 2006), a novel about Japan's entrance exam system *The Tale that Wags* (Perceptia, 2010) and *Teaching in Pursuit of Wow* (Abax, 2012); and co-editor with Jane Arnold of *Meaningful Action* (CUP, 2013), he currently researches Vygotskian sociocultural theory (SCT) applications with particular emphasis on student voice, agency, identity and community construction. He has taught in graduate schools in the USA, Taiwan and Japan, published books with a dozen publishers and produced ten freely downloadable videos at the NFLRC-UH, as well as 50 short YouTube teacher training vidlets (2–5 min) at the University of Hawaii. Since 2010, he has been a plenary speaker for 14 times in 11 countries. He especially enjoys creatively encouraging students to take responsibility for their language abilities and getting them to express themselves (google 'the real voice of Japanese students' or 'realvoice2'). You can freely download many of his articles at academia.edu and contact him at mits-mail1@gmail.com.

**Connie Kwai Fun Ng** is a lecturer in the English Language Teaching Unit at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. She coordinates a third-year business communication for academic purposes course and has been investigating on using Harvard Business School case studies for report writing. She has taught English for specific purposes courses (science, engineering, social science and business) at various universities in Hong Kong for over 10 years. Currently, she is teaching a range of undergraduate courses, including academic writing, and discipline-specific English courses (business and social science). Connie's main research interests are in the area of academic writing, genre analysis, professional communication and learner autonomy.

**Kenneth Keng Wee Ong** (PhD, University of Auckland, in education) is a senior lecturer at Nanyang Technological University, where he teaches writing in the

disciplines courses at the Language and Communication Centre. He coordinates and teaches courses such as scientific communication I and II, engineering communication and English for academic studies for international military officers. He is a member of the College of Science curriculum development team and has contributed chapters to both levels of scientific communication courses. As an editorial board member of the *LCC Working Papers*, he reviews and edits submissions. His research interests include bilingual processing, second language vocabulary acquisition, code switching and computer-mediated communication. His publications have appeared in the *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *Discourse Studies*, *World Englishes* and *English Today*. His recent co-authored book is titled *Guide to Research Projects for Engineering Students: Planning, Writing & Presenting* (CRC Press, Taylor and Francis, 2015). He is currently involved in two funded projects – one on testing Singaporean undergraduates' threshold tolerance for a variety of non-target variations in English syntax by measuring moving-window self-paced reading times and the other on the effects of a smartphone application for peer tutoring on motivation, content knowledge and learning.

**Amos Paran** is a reader in second language education at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, where he teaches on the MA TESOL. He started his professional career in Israel, where he taught EFL in secondary schools and trained teachers. After gaining his PhD in applied linguistics, he taught at the University of Reading before moving to the UCL Institute of Education. He has run teacher training workshops in countries such as Vietnam, Uzbekistan, Israel, Switzerland, Spain and France and works regularly in Chile. His main research interests are reading in a foreign language and the use of literature in language learning, as well as distance education, and he has written extensively on these topics. He is co-editor (with Lies Sercu) of *Testing the Untestable in Language Education*, published in 2010 by Multilingual Matters. His most recent book is *Literature*, co-written with Pauline Robinson and published by Oxford University Press in the *Into the Classroom* series.

**David Rear** is an associate professor in the College of Economics at Nihon University in Tokyo where he teaches courses on critical thinking, intercultural awareness and global studies. Having studied history at the University of Cambridge, he gained his doctorate in applied linguistics at Macquarie University, Sydney. He conducts research in the field of critical discourse analysis, investigating discourses of critical thinking and education policy in Japan. He is currently looking into the relationship between critical thinking and English language skills in the context of Asian students studying abroad. He has recently published in journals such as *Critical Policy Studies*, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* and *Asian Business and Management*. He is also the author of a popular history book published by Random House in the UK and is actively involved in the writing of content-based textbooks for university students in Japan.

**Carmen Sancho Guinda** is senior lecturer in the Department of Applied Linguistics at the Technical University of Madrid, where she teaches English for academic purposes, professional communication and in-service seminars for engineering teachers undertaking English-medium instruction. Her research focus is the interdisciplinary analysis of academic and professional discourses and genres and innovation in the learning of academic competencies. She is currently engaged in projects dealing with language and emotion in professional settings and fostering critical thought among engineering students. Her most recent publications are *Stance and Voice in Written Academic Genres* (Palgrave, 2012), co-edited with Ken Hyland; *Narratives in Academic and Professional Genres* (Peter Lang, 2013), co-edited with Maurizio Gotti, winner of the 2015 Enrique Alcaraz Research Award; and *Interpersonality in Legal Genres* (Peter Lang, 2014), co-edited with Ruth Breeze and Maurizio Gotti. She is a member of the editorial board of *Ibérica, Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* and the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*.

**Miriam Symon** is head of the English Language Unit at the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya. Originally from London, Miriam has been teaching English in Israel for over 20 years and currently teaches English for academic purposes to students majoring in business, computer science and psychology. She has also been an active participant in the European TEMPUS 'English for All' and ECOSTAR projects. Her main areas of interest are English for specific academic purposes, cross-cultural communication, English-medium instruction in higher education and innovative curriculum and materials design. She was awarded a doctorate in education, in the field of English for academic purposes, from the Institute of Education, University of London, in 2012.

**Linda Weinberg** is head of the English Studies Unit at the Braude College of Engineering in Northern Israel. With a first degree from the University of Reading in Italian studies and an MA in international history from the London School of Economics, Linda trained to teach modern foreign languages at King's College London and taught French and English as a second language in schools and colleges in London for a number of years. During this time, while studying for an MA in education at the Institute of Education of the University of London, she was also involved in curriculum design and multicultural and anti-racist education. Since 1991, Linda has been teaching English for academic purposes in Israel and from 2010 to 2013 was actively involved in the European TEMPUS 'English for All' project. Her main areas of interest are motivation and autonomy in language learning, technology-enhanced language learning and English-medium instruction. Linda received her PhD in the field of applied linguistics from the University of Reading in the UK in 2010.

**Ruth Wilkinson** (PhD) currently teaches English to engineers at the Pontifical University of Comillas, Madrid, Spain. She has taught EFL in Spain for 20 years, working with children and adults at all levels of the education system, from infant school to university. Her PhD thesis focuses on the constraints and successes which can be encountered as a teacher journeys towards greater learner autonomy in company with his/her students, taking an honest look at the problems and affective issues which may arise and the transformations which take place. She also develops and runs courses for primary and secondary in-service teacher training, with a special focus on learner autonomy and learning to learn. She is co-editor of *Independence*, the journal of the IATEFL Learner Autonomy Special Interest Group.

**Lindy Woodrow** is an honorary senior lecturer in TESOL at the University of Sydney, Australia. Her research focuses on language learning motivation, and her work has been published in leading academic journals such as *Language Learning*, *Modern Language Journal* and *System*. Her recent publications include 'Researching Motivation' in A. Phakiti and B. Paltridge's *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (Bloomsbury, 2015), 'Motivation and the Transition to University' in E. Ushioda's *International Perspectives on Motivation* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013) and 'Goal Orientations' in S. Mercer, S. Ryan and M. Williams' *Psychology for Language Learning* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

# Introduction: Making Essential Competencies Visible in Higher Education

Carmen Sancho Guinda and Ruth Breeze

**Abstract** This introductory chapter states the motivation underlying the present volume, describes its goals and structure, and examines the challenges posed by the Bologna Process with regard to the encouragement of lifelong competencies in English-medium instruction within the European Higher Education Area. In addition, the editors justify their choice of *critical thinking*, *creativity*, *learner autonomy* and *motivation* as essential competencies, highlight their interconnection, and explain the educational premises that bind the collection together, which is intended to inform and inspire not only European lecturers, but also university teachers all over the world. Finally, the implications of fostering lifelong competencies in English as a second language or lingua franca are discussed. These include, along with linguistic proficiency, mastering the genres and discourses of the discipline and their associated stylistic conventions and rhetorical variants, as well as methodological changes for ensuring interactive learning and making language more salient than when teaching in the first language. Lastly, a closing reflection on pedagogical options and dilemmas is provided.

**Keywords** English-medium university teaching • Essential lifelong competencies • Critical thinking • Creativity • Learner autonomy • Motivation

Why publish this book? First, the issue of teaching competencies<sup>1</sup> has been in the spotlight ever since the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union

---

<sup>1</sup>Following Thornbury (2006, pp. 38–39), by ‘competency’ we understand the framework or combination of knowledge, abilities, mindsets and behaviours needed to teach or train in a specific practical skill and that lead to successful performance, whereas ‘competence’ denotes our internalised knowledge of a certain field or concept.

C.S. Guinda (✉)  
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain  
e-mail: [carmen.sguinda@upm.es](mailto:carmen.sguinda@upm.es)

R. Breeze  
Instituto Cultura y Sociedad, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain  
e-mail: [rbreeze@unav.es](mailto:rbreeze@unav.es)

launched their *Recommendation for key lifelong learning competences*<sup>2</sup> in 2006, yet many university teachers have been at a loss as to *how* to promote such key competencies in the classroom. This change in paradigm, furthered through the ongoing implementation of the Bologna Declaration (1999) in most European countries, has come at a time when the pressure to teach in English to encourage student mobility and raise the prestige of our institutions has also placed increasing demands on university teachers. The challenge is thus often a double one: we need to update our teaching methodology, and we need to do this in English. It is therefore important to gain a deeper understanding of what teaching competencies means, while also integrating this into the perspective of English-medium instruction (hereafter EMI)<sup>3</sup> in higher education. If we start by examining the European *Recommendation*, one of the first things that might strike us is the flexible, cross-disciplinary and transferable nature of those competencies, and also certain areas of overlap that mainly concern *creativity, critical thinking, motivation and autonomy*. This amalgam of ‘knowledge, skills and attitudes appropriate to the context’ (European Parliament and the Council 2006) is essential to achieving personal fulfillment and development, social inclusion, active citizenship and employability.

The European Reference Framework proposed by the European Union (European Parliament and the Council 2006) speaks of the ability to *interpret* concepts, thoughts, opinions, feelings and intercultural nuances when referring to the competencies needed to communicate in the mother tongue and in a foreign language, of *problem-solving* as a basic aspect of the mathematical, scientific and technological competencies, and of a *critical use* of information in the exercise of digital prowess. It also mentions being able to *motivate oneself and regulate one’s own learning process* to become a proficient learner, the *creative transmission* of ideas, experiences and emotions to become culturally aware and articulate, and the need for *creativity, innovation* and risk-taking to acquire a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship. In sum, the four competencies dealt with in this volume provide the foundations for the ‘education for the future’ enunciated by Delors et al. (1996): learning to know, to do, to live together and with others, to be, and to learn. Within this framework, we aim to gather and disseminate concrete and visible lines of pedagogical action to stimulate creativity, critical thinking, autonomy and motivation in higher education, going one step beyond the general guidelines provided by renowned educational scholars such as Bain (2006), Cowan (2006) or Hattie (2012).

A second reason for publishing this collection is that we do not want to confine our scope to Europe but rather turn our gaze to the experiences, knowledge and proposals of colleagues from other continents. Although most of our authors are

---

<sup>2</sup>The European Reference Framework (European Parliament and the Council 2006) defines in its Annex eight key competences to be pursued throughout life in order to keep learning over one’s lifetime: communication in the mother tongue, communication in foreign languages, mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology, digital competence, social and civic competences, sense of initiative and entrepreneurship, cultural awareness and expression, and learning-to-learn, which underpins all the others.

<sup>3</sup>For a more detailed definition of this concept, namely of its CBL and CLIL patterns, see footnotes 3 and 4 in this introduction.

applied linguists who investigate language and education or teach English for academic or specific professional purposes (fields known as EAP and ESP), we think that their expertise may also inspire content instructors, encourage reflection on classroom practices and open up fresh avenues for research. This volume is intended to clarify and refine notions, expose false myths, update readers with recent advances in the state-of-the-art, and share classroom strategies, suggestions, tools and findings related to each of the four competencies addressed, which have traditionally either been taken for granted (i.e. taught or learnt intuitively) or tackled separately, theoretically and under a monocultural perspective.

## 1 The Spirit of this Initiative and its Contributions

To integrate theory and practice we have organized the work into four sections, each devoted to one of the four competencies. Each section has an introductory chapter that explains concepts accessibly and synthetically with operational definitions, summarizes the state of the art and indicates current sites of debate. This is followed by three or four ‘practitioner chapters’ written by teachers and scholars from different cultures and higher education contexts, which provide guidance, effective procedures or cutting-edge research for English-medium university teaching. Our point of departure brings together a series of premises: the conception of teaching and learning as holistic, dialogic, supportive, collaborative and inherently creative processes (Hattie 2012; DeZutter 2011), which are learner- and community-centred and have to be negotiated between teachers and students and reflected upon (Cowan 2006) by both collectivities so as to take action. Like Bain (2006), we believe that knowledge is not received or transmitted one-way but co-constructed, and following Feynman (2000) and Hattie (2012), we hold that, in addition to being evaluators and facilitators, we teachers are activators of change who can increase activity and transform habits of thought and mental attitudes.

Pursuing this objective, we should foster collaborative environments and diverse learning experiences, devise task structures rather than tell, and flee the hackneyed metaphors of ‘the sage on the stage’ and ‘teaching as performance’, according to which students are assigned the passive role of ‘audience’ and not of ‘fellow ensemble’ in what Sawyer (2004) terms the ‘classroom choreography’. Another assumption we adopt is that there are multiple ways of knowing (i.e. verbal, visual and multimedia channels), interacting (i.e. stories, sample cases, conflict or problem solving, deep reasoning, etc.), and practising (i.e. opportunities that can be more or less framed or spontaneous). Furthermore, we understand the essential competencies studied here as dynamic and relative, because they vary with disciplines, contexts, learning media (see for example Hafner et al. this volume) and are perceived differently through the teachers’ or the students’ lenses (see Cremin, this volume). All in all, the philosophy running through this chapter compilation is that teaching and learning may be improvisational as well as structured, and along these lines we endorse and try to elaborate on Sawyer’s (2004, 2011) thesis that what makes good

teachers great is ‘disciplined improvisation’, and illustrate our attempt with a range of initiatives, empirical findings and teaching instances.

A last premise is that none of the competencies occurs in a vacuum: as we perceived in the European Council’s recommendation, and have also learnt from a number of researchers, they are intertwined and feed into one another in a circular relationship. Motivation, for one, is a component of creativity (Sternberg and Lubart 1995), which requires a favourable environment with obstacles to surmount, and a threshold level of analytical ability to recognize challenges and evaluate the feasibility, applicability and efficacy of solutions (Renzulli 1986). In turn, thinking creatively does motivate learners (Amabile 1997), while it also requires autonomy and a willingness to reject conformity and stand up independently for one’s unconventional ideas (Simonton 2003). Likewise, by means of critical thinking we create a mental map of reality (Leicester 2010), which can help us gain autonomy and consequently motivation: originality and imagination are traits of critical thinking (Leicester 2010; Moore 2011), which involves envisaging alternatives and imagining or predicting what situations might be like. Conversely, creativity cannot exist without the active intervention of the ‘triarchic mind’ (Sternberg 1988) – that is, the analytical, synthetic and practical processing elements of intelligence that enable us to obtain information, make decisions and adapt to the world. In fact, many a scholar has emphasized the link between creativity and critical thinking in educational models and frameworks: as early as the 1950s, Guilford (1956) theorized that creativity comprises reasoning in general, problem finding and solving, evaluation, and other factors such as fluency (the ability to spark a large number of ideas), flexibility (the ability to make connections between unrelated concepts), originality (the ability to make unique contributions), and categorization (the ability to group ideas together or separate them). Fredericks (2005) adds to this list the concept of ‘elaboration’, whereby we are able to manipulate an idea and work on it until it is well formed. Recently, it has been argued (Sawyer 2011) that creativity does not end with the fully formed idea but must include its implementation as well. Creative or divergent thinking, it seems, is a subset of critical thinking (Halpern 2010) and actually much literature on critical thought includes chapters on thinking creatively. Innovative approaches today, therefore, involve their joint introduction in curricula (Fairweather and Cramond 2010) and explicit instruction, because nowadays “students need permission and directions to be creative” (Halpern 2010, p. 391) and creativity is simultaneously a ‘habit’ of the mind and ‘a matter of ability’ (Sternberg 2010, p. 412). This intersection of creative and critical thinking, called by Craft (2010, p. 295) ‘possibility thinking’, is a space of conjecture shared by teachers and students, and embraces question-posing, exploration, connection-making, imagination, evaluation, risk-taking, and critical reflection. We wanted the contents of this volume to evolve precisely from this intersection, with critical thinking as the governing competency that alerts us to the need to be creative and autonomous and motivate ourselves, evaluates our plans and performances as creative, autonomous, motivating or critical, and is in itself a critical act that may motivate and confer autonomy. Hence, it is introduced first.

Whereas a great deal of critical thinking syllabi and materials are focused on questioning, reflection and rational argumentation (i.e. the distinction between

types of arguments and the detection, through reflective scepticism, of argumentative fallacies, biased reasoning, hidden agendas and implicit assumptions), few aim at self-reflectivity and stance-taking – that is to say, at meta-reflection or ‘thinking about thinking’, decision-making and the construction of one’s own point of view, judgement and the extrapolation of elements and aspects to other texts and contexts. Arguments appear to be the ultimate purpose of critical thinking, when in fact they should be just one more ‘means of inquiry’ (Weston 2009, p. xi). In our first section, Tim Moore’s overview clearly delimits the multiplicity of abilities encompassed by critical thinking and makes the case for a ‘transdisciplinary pedagogy’ to seek critical thinking connections across disciplines. This approach, already outlined in his 2011 monograph *Critical thinking and language*, is intermediate between the generalist and the discourse-based specifist visions taught so far. Moore urges us to see critical thinking commonalities as part of a ‘larger whole’ or bigger picture that brings together different strands of knowledge, and notes the multifarious nature of the concept (there is no unitary definition), its variability, and the importance of background knowledge. Further, he distinguishes between teaching the competency in pre-tertiary and concurrent EAP contexts, the latter more suited for disciplinary task-based methodologies, and profiles three chief foci: skills, ethics, and evaluative language.

The three practitioner chapters following combine the skills and language-of-evaluation outlooks and are embedded in disciplinary instruction, particularly in science popularizations, business and technology, and foreign language acquisition, although they could be easily adaptable to generalist teaching and learning alike. The contributions by Ruth Breeze and David Rear facilitate strategy maps for questioning reflection. Breeze’s procedure serves to hone students’ intercultural awareness, and with it their concept of an audience, through careful and sensitive writing (i.e. reorganizing and reformulating local information according to the needs of a broader readership) and establishes routines to question the validity of strategies via peer feedback. Similarly, Rear’s six-step training for debate builds on interpretation and analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation and self-regulation, through which students appraise the strengths and weaknesses in their performances. This six-step roadmap not only provides a taxonomy of skills to explicitly help students know what critical thinking entails, but also underscores the language skills inherent in each of them, so often underestimated in discussions by non-native students, as an integral part of critical thought. The section concludes precisely with the reverse approach: a linguistic orientation that unfolds several thinking skills to interpret and appropriately choose certain lexicogrammatical items – indexicals. Francis Cornish’s concern is to improve the metadiscursive awareness of non-native speakers of English and assist them in decoding and encoding indexical references (i.e. deixis, anadeixis and anaphora). With this target in mind he provides a set of standard guidelines for non-literary genres, grounded in the distinction between ‘text’, ‘context’ and ‘discourse’ and pivoting around the discernment of a text’s rhetorical superstructure, discourse structure and topic chains. His model departs from previous textualist views and regards discourse – inevitably rooted in context – as the central factor for making meaning, above textual coherence or cohesion. This valuable study expands the horizons of critical thinking as it suggests fascinating

research into multiculturalism (the lower or higher tolerance of indexical ambiguity displayed by a given language or register, be it a sociolect, technolect, dialect or jargon) and issues of misinterpretation, manipulation and social control due to indexical fuzziness.

In his opening chapter to the next section, dedicated to creativity, Alan Maley introduces this competency by examining its features, providing strategies to encourage it, and suggesting untapped areas and feeder fields worthy of exploration. He additionally underlines the impact of creativity in class management, motivation, the use of space and time, and learning outside the classroom, and points to changes in content perspective, classroom habits, teaching style and pace, and the re-exploration of traditional practices as potential sites of creative action. In her practitioner chapter, Teresa Cremin highlights the difference between ‘teaching creatively’ and ‘teaching for creativity’, two closely related undertakings that are not always coincident, although fostering creativity tends to be accomplished creatively. She reminds us of the major types of creativity (historical, every-day, personal and professional), stresses the importance of knowledge, and contrasts the students’ views on creativity with those of lecturers, replacing the ‘sage on the stage’ and ‘guide on the side’ images of teaching by a ‘meddlers in the middle’ attitude. The next three chapters turn to digital technologies and a variety of tasks to enhance creative learning: Christoph A. Hafner, Lindsay Miller and Connie Kwai Fun Ng apply scientific documentary-making to an ESP course at a university in Hong Kong and spur students’ creativity to arouse in them sensitivity to audience and meta-reflection through the use of two distinct genres and channels: the multimodal video and the written report, whose respective affordances demand different degrees of creativity according to the learners’ perceptions. Lastly, the corpus-based empirical research conducted by Marija Milojkovic and Bill Louw at the University of Belgrade closes the section. It probes lexico-grammatical collocational creativity drawing on the philosophical principles of the Vienna Circle to scrutinize the performance of native and non-native English-speaking students, and identifies three mechanisms of deviation from the native norm, namely the existence of prospection, the frequency of reference lexical collocates and semantic prosody.

The concept of learner autonomy has been central to debates on higher education since the 1960s, but has gathered momentum in the last 10 years. As the European *Recommendation* emphasizes, since universities aim to prepare learners for life, they should equip students to take control of their own lifelong learning process. To do this, universities need to foster not only academic and intellectual competencies, but also personal and interpersonal skills. The section on autonomy sets out the theoretical background as it relates to English-medium higher education, and provides stimulating examples of how this objective can be operationalized. Starting from the specific field of language learning, David Little’s introductory chapter traces how the interest in promoting learner autonomy dates back to influential work by Holec in the 1970s and 1980s (Holec 1981). Holec argued that if learners themselves were able to determine the content of language learning and set their own goals, their learning would be at once more meaningful and more effective. However, the ability to take charge of one’s own learning is not innate, but must be fostered by

the educational system by restructuring our students' experience so that they gradually take greater responsibility for their own progress. At the same time, other visions of autonomy were developing that presented very different dynamics. Famously, Dam's work with teenage students showed how the teacher plays an important role in guiding students and managing the learning environment, and also underlined the vital role of interaction with other learners (Dam 1995). Little argues that the principles at work in autonomous language learning at different levels can be successfully applied to English medium instruction, providing such programmes are redesigned to take account of the role of language and the needs of learners.

The practical chapters in this section amply demonstrate the different ways in which university EMI programmes can promote learner autonomy in language learning. The first three practical chapters look in detail at specific projects designed to foster autonomy, one based on class projects, the others on distance learning platforms. Miriam Symon's chapter documents how carefully structured group projects can be used to promote language and transversal skills in different subject areas. Teachers must organize these projects carefully to ensure that appropriate guidance and support are available, but should then act as facilitators, allowing students to take control of their own work. The role of the teacher in accompanying students is fundamental in helping them to develop their own learning approaches. She concludes that control needs to be transferred to students, but that the learning experience will be shaped by an ongoing process of negotiation. Teachers, too, need to monitor their own actions and reconsider the strategies that they use. In her chapter, Elisabet Arnó considers learner autonomy in the context of distance learning, centring her attention on how students manage their tasks in such settings, what strategies they use, and to what extent they reflect on their language learning process. She notes that students take an active role in steering and monitoring activities, and that collaboration appears to play an important role in developing autonomy in this setting. Students not only deploy a wide range of strategies to carry out the tasks, but they also create a sense of community at a distance, and reflect on their own learning. The chapter by Kenneth Ong and Sujata S. Kathpalia focuses on the way learners interact in order to learn in online settings. Their empirical study of online knowledge construction in multi-party quasi-synchronous chat illustrates how argumentation influences floor management, and sheds light on four interrelated dimensions of collaborative learning: participation, argumentation, and the epistemic and social dimensions. They propose ways in which students can be helped to manage the 'floor' in online discussion, to ensure optimal autonomous learning experiences.

The last two chapters in this section explore the introduction of a more autonomous learning paradigm in traditional university contexts in Algeria and Spain, and look at the way teachers and students respond to this change. In her study based on interviews with Algerian university teachers, Faiza Bensemmane explains the various issues that arise as teachers attempt to change the paradigm, not least the question of student expectations concerning the authoritative role of the teacher, and the need for reflexive practice and peer support. To meet these challenges, she suggests that teachers themselves should try to develop greater autonomy: an autonomous

teacher has the capacity to transform the reality in which she or he lives, rather than reproducing the system he or she has inherited. The teachers she interviewed appeared to be engaging in the co-construction of new understandings of the teaching and learning processes, and thereby building a greater shared awareness of the need to promote autonomy. Finally, in a transitional chapter between this section and the next, bridging the notions and practices of autonomy and motivation, Ruth Wilkinson describes a project intended to help learners take greater responsibility for their own learning. The measures she introduces include: self-assessment and goal-setting, choice of learning materials, peer-review of written and oral work, peer instruction, and the use of a learning-to-learn portfolio, as well as periodic, structured reflections. She finds that the choice of learning materials proves to be fundamental in transforming student motivation. Other aspects, such as self-assessment, goal-setting, and reflection, are a cause of anxiety in some students, and often require teacher support in the initial stages. She concludes that in the long term, small moves in the direction of fostering greater autonomy will help students build a stronger sense of agency and a more positive self-image.

The last section in this volume explores the crucial issue as to how motivation can be enhanced and maintained in English-medium learning situations. Motivation – defined as the energising force which drives an individual to engage in an action, put effort into this action and maintain this effort (Dörnyei 1998) – has been amply researched, but still presents considerable challenges to practitioners at all levels of education. Lindy Woodrow's introduction provides a concise overview of motivation theory in the context of language learning, from early work by Gardner in the 1950s, through self-directed and process models, to the current panorama dominated by researchers such as Dörnyei (Dörnyei 1998; Dörnyei and Ushioda 2009; Dörnyei et al. 2015). Development in this area can be understood as a move from a linear view of motivation to a more complex understanding of interrelated learning and contextual variables. Current trends take a situated approach to research into motivation, encompassing the educational, cultural and social dimensions of language learning and use. On the one hand, we are now aware of the power of imagination in projecting possible selves. On the other, we have seen that motivation, rather than being a constant, is often better understood as a confluence of factors which can spur learners on to high achievement for a specific period of time. This leads to an increasing realisation of the importance of the 'Directed Motivational Current' (DMC), defined as "a potent motivational surge that emerges from the alignment of a number of personal, temporal and contextual factors/parameters, creating momentum to pursue an individually defined future goal/vision that is personally significant and emotionally satisfying", which "captures the contingent, limited, yet powerful nature of motivation in the real world, and provides a tool for understanding how to harness this force" (Dörnyei et al. 2014, p. 103). Such 'currents' need to be harnessed to engage students in effective and meaningful learning processes in the short and medium term.

The four practical chapters in this section deal with different aspects of motivation in our target context. Fukada, Murphey, Falout and Fukuda draw on Dynamic Systems Theory (Ellis and Larsen-Freeman 2009) to look at the development of

student motivation over 3 years, in what they term ‘present communities of imagining’. They thus explore how L2 learners’ motivations are co-constructed socially, while they also develop on an individual (mental) level. By investigating student motivation and looping self-information back to the students themselves, these researchers helped to create healthier ‘Socially Intelligent Dynamic Systems’ within the classroom and student group. In their view, this reflexive procedure stimulated positive growth in their students’ mind-time frames of English-learning motivation. It thus helped not only to generate a more positive attitude within the classroom, but also to project more powerful imagined future selves that spurred greater confidence and more focused learning. In her chapter on the crucial role of authenticity in motivation, Christine Jernigan looks at various aspects of authenticity in English medium higher education, centring on the role of the teacher, the type of material used, and the links forged with the world beyond the classroom. First, teachers need to build authentic relationships with those they teach. In her view, if students perceive that their teacher is not giving of him/herself, they are not as willing to give of themselves. Constructive teaching builds on a genuine relationship between teacher and learners. Second, the materials used should also reflect authenticity, though in quite a different way. The challenges that arise when using realia in the classroom are well known, but should not be insurmountable. Finally, the links between real-world language use and classroom activities have to be reinforced, since the use of genuine materials and tasks based on real-world situations is one of the most powerful motivating factors.

The final two chapters, one by Amos Paran, Fiona Hyland and Clare Bentall, and the other by Linda Weinberg, both address the practical study of motivation, but in very different contexts. One crucial aspect of the university teacher’s role is the supervision of student work, particularly theses and dissertations. Paran, Hyland and Bentall use interviews with course leaders at the University of London to investigate the way students are helped to identify, conduct and write up their research project. Support for students was ensured through a variety of different affordances, including the provision of taught courses on research methodology, the establishment of clear time frames for different stages in the research and writing process, the use of online platforms, and the creation of learning communities. However, these writers stress the role of the supervisor-researcher relationship in providing support to maintain motivation over what may be a long period of time. Supervisors were found to have a key role in specific areas such as conceptualising the research, focusing a broader initial idea, and designing a feasible project – areas where student motivation is liable to flag when appropriate guidance is not available. Paran et al. emphasize the importance of providing both academic and pastoral support, the role of the student’s own peer community, and the need for concrete time frames. Their multidimensional model of thesis supervision also assigns a key role to the course leader in ensuring that structure, timing and support are appropriate to maintain student motivation at this decisive period in their education. Finally, in another empirically-based study, Linda Weinberg looks at learner motivation and self-confidence over a 4-year period in the context of a blended learning course. Although the course challenged learner expectations in various ways, most students managed to adapt, gradually acquiring greater independence as time passed. Their motivation

was mainly instrumental, but there was some evidence that the ‘ideal L2 self’ (Dörnyei 2005) acted as a motivating factor. Various features of the online environment contributed positively to learner motivation and enhanced students’ ability to work more autonomously, which boosted their sense of self-efficacy and increased their motivation. The setting and monitoring of goals, in particular, encouraged learners to acquire a greater degree of self-determination, which ultimately enhances learner motivation (Ushioda 2003).

## 2 Fostering Essential Competencies in University EMI Contexts: What Does It Really Mean?

The increasing numbers of courses taught through English in higher education across Europe fall into a variety of patterns. Some, such as content-based learning (CBL),<sup>4</sup> or content and language integrated learning (CLIL),<sup>5</sup> have a joint focus on learning the language and studying a particular content area. The vast majority, however, are conceptualized by their institutions as simply English Medium Instruction, that is, imparting an area of disciplinary knowledge or a particular series of skills through the medium of English. Arguably, even in these situations, where the language of instruction is felt to be purely instrumental, lecturers have to rethink their teaching methodology in order to meet the challenges of twenty-first century higher education in contexts where English is a second language or *lingua franca*. Lecturing in a second language entails acquiring proficiency in a series of complex discursive practices that may discourage content teachers. And for the students, it means a double cognitive challenge: that of mastering new concepts and practices, but also that of learning the terminology of their field, its characteristic genres and discourses, in what may be for them their second or third language. In other words, students are supposed to assimilate the stylistic and discursive conventions of their target professional community (e.g. the mitigation of scientific claims when disseminating their own research, the expression of steps in a line of mathematical reasoning, etc.) and the text types or rhetorical variants it uses. But who is to teach all this? It has been traditionally assumed, in areas with a shared L1, that students learn these skills and competencies by themselves, often once they are already in the professional arena, and that it is not the content teachers’ job to teach linguistic or communicative issues. Studies such as that of Airey (2012), about Physics lecturers in Sweden, show that this attitude (i.e. ‘I don’t teach language’) predominates in more than one university sector. A number of well-known CLIL

---

<sup>4</sup>CBL teaching is defined as teaching content in language lessons. Content is used by the teacher as a motivational backdrop to help students acquire language (Dale and Tanner 2012, pp. 4–5).

<sup>5</sup>According to Coyle et al. (2000), p. 1), CLIL is a dual-focus educational approach used for the learning and teaching of both content and language, which are interwoven. Depending on the teaching/learning goal, each may receive more or less emphasis.

specialists,<sup>6</sup> in contrast, advocate making language and genres salient while teaching content, because every teacher, consciously or not, offers students a linguistic model, which must be as correct as possible, be it of the mother tongue or of any other language. Basturkmen and Shackleford (2015), in particular, posit the need for content teachers to pay special attention to ‘language-related episodes’ during the class, to provide corrective feedback including language issues, or highlight rhetorical sequences and social conventions that affect students’ written and spoken expression. Teaching transversal competencies like the four studied in this book may also underlie some of these episodes, whatever the discipline, since the feedback provided needs to take account, say, of the thinking skills or motivational issues that may have a bearing on the students’ written work or class participation.

The understanding that language is instrumental to learning, and that contents and competencies should be our priority, should in no sense distract us from the reality that proficiency in English will often be the main factor that conditions our students’ employability when they graduate. In most sectors, it is obvious that an intermediate (B1) or basic conversational competence in general English does not suffice. Of course, students need to be able to communicate on everyday topics, but as they progress through their degree course they need increasingly to acquire professional competence in English at a higher level (C1). Ideally, they will be able to use different registers: one more ‘casual’, with which we greet, ask, interrupt, apologize, give orders, thank, criticize, ask for permission and opinion, propose, tell an anecdote, agree or disagree, etc., and another more ‘formal’ to deduce, explain, define, summarize, argue, classify, etc. (Cummins 1996). In some sense, the content teachers in EMI situations are responsible for fostering their students’ acquisition of the latter: they themselves use the more formal, technical language for transmitting content. However, we would argue that content lecturers in EMI should go beyond this, actively promoting students’ language skills and helping to socialize students into the discourses of their target profession.

Finally, we might also think about the EMI teachers’ own language skills, and how their competences in English will impinge on the quality of their classroom performance. There is already a large body of research on teachers’ language in EMI situations which clearly shows that good communication skills and a principled approach to teaching are more important than, say, native-like pronunciation. Clarity is an indisputable must in every kind of teaching and – importantly – does not depend only on the teacher’s command of the language of instruction, his/her articulation, amenity, or natural tendency to digression, but on a series of *organizational measures* as well. Undoubtedly, in the EMI class clarity is achieved through careful pronunciation, strategic use of repetition, a more abundant and significant use of pauses, trans-cultural similes and examples, and more visuals to reinforce learning (Allison and Tauroza 1995; Crawford Camiciottoli 2005; Morell 2004), but it also results from thorough planning. If we pay special attention to

---

<sup>6</sup>Some of them are Lyster and Ranta (1997), Dafouz and Núñez (2009), Airey (2012), Smit and Dafouz (2012), Ball and Lindsay (2013), Hüttner and Smit (2014), Arnó Maciá and Manchó Barés (2015), and Basturkmen and Shackleford (2015).

designing lessons, to each session's openings and closures, to marking distinctively the transitions between sections and ideas and any topic shift, and to giving enough examples and clarifications when we teach in our L1, we should pay all the more attention to these aspects in EMI. The discursive monopoly of the conventional 'chalk-and-talk' teacher (Mason 1994) is now being displaced to the students, who come to share with him/her the role of expert (at least temporarily), evaluator, controller, and facilitator. They may obtain information and tools from diverse sources, distribute them and present them to others, give peer feedback, and lead discussions. So EMI, in essence, calls for diligent syllabus and lesson planning, for a democratization of tasks and speaking turns to encourage participation and relieve teachers of all the discursive weight (Fortanet 2004; Morell 2007; Musumeci 1996; Nikula 2005). It also requires extreme care in delivering contents clearly, where necessary by applying linguistic adjustments to the audience's culture and linguistic proficiency by means of metadiscourse, significant silence use, visuals, frequent exemplifications and summaries.

Teaching essential competencies in EMI contexts must logically incorporate all of these communicative measures and concurrently should bring to fruition the concept of learning we supported at the beginning of this introduction: a process that is holistic, dialogic, community-centred, and creative. The contributors to this volume have shown us that *creativity* may emanate from teachers and students alike and materialize in the type of contents selected and in the criteria for selecting them, in the use of a certain situation, that is, of space and time, in manipulating genres and transferring knowledge from one genre and medium to another (Ogborn et al. 1996, pp. 14–15), in using tools from specific fields (e.g. linguistic corpora), or in playing with language, exploring lexico-syntactic collocations and their communicative effects. Our authors have also informed us about how we can cultivate a sense of community, through which we will boost motivation and deal more successfully with group work and class projects. In connection with this communal feeling, the combination of students' interdependence and teacher guidance is pivotal to the learners' autonomy and empowers them to have a stronger say in the setting of their learning goals, the choice of the materials they want to work with, and the evaluation and assessment of their own learning. Along the 19 chapters of this book we have uncovered the prominent and complementary roles of planning, imagination and authenticity in this fascinating process, underpinned by critical thinking. Helping develop analytical abilities and staying critical enables both teachers and students to discern reliable information and adjust it to any audience's capabilities and sensitivities, build effective arguments, evaluate, and finally make decisions.

### 3 Moving Forward

The challenges lying ahead for future initiatives are indeed numerous and complex. Some of them have even triggered heated debate in diverse educational circles. Weighing up our teaching circumstances, we must position ourselves along a