

## **EFL College Learners' Expectation on and Experience in Online English-Medium Instruction**

AeJin Kang\*

**Kang, AeJin. (2021). EFL college learners' expectation on and experience in online English-medium instruction. *English Teaching*, 76(4), 3-31.**

This study investigated EFL college-level learners' expectation on and their experience in an online English-medium instruction (EMI) course focusing on how participants interacted with their classmates and the instructor in their online class (zoom session) based on assumptions and rationales of Interaction Hypothesis and classroom interaction research. Analyses of questionnaire, observation, and interview data revealed that participants' experience of interaction and their perception of interaction opportunities in the zoom session were significantly related to how they would evaluate the course-taking experience. It was also found that cognitive strategy such as participants' preparation for each class rather than L2 confidence was more relevant to their level of satisfaction with the course. Results of analyses suggested that an online class could be more effective than a face-to-face class in terms of engaging EFL adult learners in an academic course offered in participants' L2, English. Based on study results, suggestions on how to increase interaction opportunities in online EMI course are made.

**Key words:** English-medium instruction (EMI), interaction, online course, EFL college learners

---

\*Author: AeJin Kang, Professor, School of English Language and Literature, Sookmyung Women's University; 100, Cheongpa-ro 47-gil, Yongsan-gu, Seoul 04310, Korea; Email: [ajkang@sookmyung.ac.kr](mailto:ajkang@sookmyung.ac.kr)

Received 30 September 2021; Reviewed 12 October 2021; Accepted 21 December 2021



© 2021 The Korea Association of Teachers of English (KATE)

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0, which permits anyone to copy, redistribute, remix, transmit and adapt the work, provided the original work and source is appropriately cited.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The current study aimed at exploring how EFL college-level learners would perceive online English-Medium Instruction (EMI) course with their expectation and interaction experience being the focus. The study tried to figure out whether online EMI course would be effective enough in promoting interaction opportunities among the EFL college-level learners as the Interaction Hypothesis argued that interaction promotes comprehension, thus leads to language acquisition (Long, 1996). Classroom researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), with respect to the Interaction Hypothesis, were mainly concerned with two questions such as whether “classroom interaction facilitates student learning and second, if so, how?” (Liu & Xu, 2018, p. 647). Classroom interaction research has produced positive results to the first question from a cognitive theoretical perspective (Dobinson, 2001; Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamasaki, 1994; Hall, 2010) as well as to the second question from sociocultural lens, respectively (Kayi-Aydar, 2014, cited in Liu & Xu, 2018). The current study endeavored to earn an insight for what kind of instructional supports should be practiced to ensure quality learning experience in the EMI classes which are to be offered as online courses through trying to figure out what made it easy or hard for a particular group of EFL college-level learners to interact with their classmates as well as with their instructor in the class (zoom session).

While EMI has become “a common practice in higher education institutions (HEIs) across globe”, “educational issues and language policies and practices are surprisingly implicit or dangerously simplified in the political agendas of most tertiary institutions” (Dafouz, Hüttner, & Simt, 2018, p. 541). Such a tendency was partly evidenced by the observation that although EMI courses are “burgeoning at university level on a global scale, there is a scarcity of pedagogical guidelines about how to implement effective courses” (Lasagabaster, 2018, p. 400). Through the review of 83 EMI studies at the level of higher education (HE) conducted in different geographical areas, Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, and Dearden (2018) found that the research evidence is insufficient to assert that EMI benefits language learning nor that it is clearly detrimental to content learning. Macaro et al. (2018) indicated that “there are also insufficient studies demonstrating, through the classroom discourse, the kind of practice which may lead to beneficial outcomes” (p. 36).

Korea is not an exception in this trend as “Korean universities started offering EMI classes in the 1990s, and the number has significantly increased since the mid-2000s” (E. Kim, 2017, p. 53). Like in a typical EFL country, Japan (Bradford & Brown, 2017), the increase of EMI classes at the tertiary level of education in Korea was accelerated by government’s initiative in international undertakings as well as universities’ globalization efforts. While the number of EMI classes in HE is expected to keep increasing, however, “empirical data that support the efficacy of EMI in Korean higher education are scarcely available” (E. Kim, 2017, p.

59). A few studies addressing this issue with the classroom interaction being the focus reported that students have a lower degree of interaction (classroom participation) than in Korean-medium instruction (KMI) classes (e.g., Ha, 2011; Kang et al., 2007).

Another motivation behind the current study came from the changes happening to schools and colleges due to the recent pandemic situation caused by the COVID-19 since the spring semester of 2020. That is, the students had to take online courses almost suddenly regardless of their preference while the instructors were struggling to provide quality online lessons which would require much more preparation especially for those who were not familiar with the online technology. For any type of instruction including online classes to be successful learning experience, active interaction should be promoted as the Interaction Hypothesis and social constructive theory of learning emphasize that successful learning would require continuous conversation between learners as well as between instructor and learners (Miller, Zyto, Karger, Yoo, & Mazur, 2016; Nandi, Chang, & Balbo, 2009). In that respect, the current study was also interested in whether the online EMI course can induce at least similar level of interaction as offline face-to-face classes would do even when learners had to take an online EMI course without their willingness.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. English-Medium Instruction (EMI)

EMI refers to the instruction in which the instructor uses English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions in which the majority of the population's first language is not English (Dearden, 2015, cited in Macaro, 2019). "EMI is a term used ubiquitously geographically and, usually but not exclusively, applied to Higher Education (HE)" (Macaro et al., 2018, p. 37). While EMI can be "situated within the spectrum of forms for the integration of content and language" (Pecorari & Malmström, 2018, p. 498) which is found in such instructional methodologies as content-based instruction (CBI), content-language integrated learning (CLIL), sheltered instruction (SI), and immersion, EMI is more characterized with the following four features:

1. English is the language used for instructional purposes.
  2. English is not itself the subject being taught.
  3. Language development is not a primary intended outcome.
  4. For most participants in the setting, English is a second language (L2).
- (Pecorari & Malmström, 2018, p. 499)

Furthermore, EMI reflects the phenomenon of English as lingua franca in academic settings (ELFA) and “its rapid recent rise to a global status is a consequence of large-scale mobility” (Mauranen, 2019, pp. 9-10), especially since “the Bologna Declaration in 1999, which promotes student and teacher mobility” (Dimova & Kling, 2018, p. 636) in Europe (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014), Asia (Baker & Hüttner, 2018; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Macaro et al., 2018), the Middle East, South America or Africa (Dearden, 2015). That is, “over the past two decades, EMI has gradually become a common practice in higher education institutions (HEIs) across the globe” (Dimova, Hultgren, & Jensen, 2015; Smit & Dafouz, 2012; Valcke & Wilkinson, 2017, cited in Dafouz, Hüttner, & Simt, 2018, p. 541).

Meanwhile, “international universities in Anglophone settings share many features and issues with other international universities globally” in terms of the observation that they are to use English language as an academic lingua franca especially at “postgraduate level” in which “a significant proportion, if not majority, of students and staff will not have English as their first language” (Baker & Hüttner, 2018, p. 3). Thus, the spread of EMI cannot be separated from ELF phenomenon, but they are rarely investigated together until very recently (Murata, 2018). In this regard, EMI closely manifests English for academic purposes (EAP) approach since “EAP as a lingua franca” (Flowerdew, 2019, p. 80) can be considered a critical factor making EMI inevitable especially for HE in the process of internationalization and globalization happening in the academia.

While “there is no such thing as a prototypical EMI environment”, and “in many, possibly most, EMI settings, the key motivation for using English as a medium of instruction is not to teach English. English is not the end; it is the means” (Coleman, Hultgren, Li, Tsui, & Shaw, 2018, p. 703), there seems an expectation that “language learning might happen incidentally anyway” (ibid.). In the second language acquisition (SLA) literature, it is assumed that “exposure to a great deal of naturally occurring verbal input and chances for meaningful interactions can create the implicit knowledge of the language” (Ellis, 2002; Hulstijn, 2001; Spada, 2011, cited in Coleman et al., 2018, p. 706).

The current study was also concerned with whether the college-level EFL learners taking EMI courses would bring with them an expectation to improve the L2 skills as well as whether and how their current level of L2 confidence may affect the way they approach the EMI course. Especially, the participants of the current study were supposed to acquire a highest level of English proficiency for their study and future career since they are in the fields of TESL, applied linguistics, and English education as a major, double-major, or minor. Hence, they are a group of learners “whose needs are anchored in language, but whose goals extend to mastery of academic, professional and technical content and skills” (Pica, 2009, p. 76). The current study looked at how the participants’ L2 confidence and expectation on the L2 improvement would be related to their interaction in the class and satisfaction with the

EMI experience as well.

## 2.2. Interaction Hypothesis

The interaction hypothesis, proposed by Long (1981, 1983, 1996), was based on discourse analysis research during the 1970s (e.g., Hatch, 1978; Wagner-Gough & Hatch, 1975) and has developed and matured with burgeoning empirical studies since then (Loewen & Sato, 2018). The hypothesis argues that “interactional language modification, based on negotiation of meaning, plays an important role in generating comprehensible input that leads to language acquisition” (Liu & Xu, 2018, pp. 646-647). An implication of this perspective put forward by the hypothesis for L2 classroom is that “interactions between teachers and students are consequential in the creation of effectual learning environments and ultimately in the shaping of individual learners’ language development” (Hall, 2020, p. 1). Through the interactionist approach, SLA research found “interaction to be effective in promoting L2 development; however, there are numerous factors that impact its efficacy” (Loewen & Sato, 2018, p. 285).

Thus, “the interest in interaction, its effects, and the variables impacting its effectiveness have attracted considerable attention, resulting in numerous empirical research studies and reviews (Y. Kim, 2017) as well as meta-analyses (Brown, 2016; Ziegler, 2016) of interaction in general or specific components of interaction (Loewen & Sato, 2018). These studies produced the results that “in terms of interaction, there is some consensus that “there is a robust connection between interaction and learning” (Gass & Mackey, 2015, p. 181), which was even more clearly manifested with “the delayed posttests” (Loewen & Sato, 2018, p. 286) of the empirical studies.

Concerned with the “key constructs of interaction, namely input, negotiation, output, and noticing”, “negotiation for meaning is at the heart of the interaction hypothesis” (Loewen & Sato, 2018, p. 287) and “key elements of negotiation for meaning include clarification requests, confirmation checks, and comprehension checks” (Loewen & Sato, 2018, p. 288), the current study paid a particular attention to how often interaction happened in the online class (zoom session), which was expected to involve such elements of negotiation. In the current study, more specifically, interaction was operationally defined as the voluntary and spontaneous speaking/participation which would take place in the forms of questions and comments mainly functioning as clarification requests, confirmation checks, and comments made by the participants when they responded to two types of input: one was peer-generated input; the other was instructor-initiated ones. In the study, the peer-generated input was referred to as the *individual presentation* based on their *reflection paper* that each participant wrote up as one of the course requirements while the instructor-initiated input was mainly referred to as the discussion topics selected by the instructor among the discussion points

presented at the end of each chapter of the textbook. The study explored what should be taken into account in order to promote interactional opportunities and making them quality learning experience for the online EMI course-takers. It was guided by the following four research questions:

1. Would there be significant relationship between the participants' interaction experience and their satisfaction with the online EMI course?
2. Would the participants' confidence in the L2 skills affect how they would interact in the online EMI course?
3. Would the participants expect to improve the L2 skills by taking the online EMI course?
4. Would the online EMI course be as effective as the offline one in terms of inducing interaction?

### 3. METHOD

The current study was carried out as classroom-based action research (AR) which typically involves instructors investigating into their own classroom routines and relationships with a view to understanding and improving the quality and justice of their practices in the classroom (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014). More specifically, based on the research findings and implications of the current study, it was supposed to help the instructor in assisting the future cohort groups of college-level EFL learners to function more effectively in terms of making themselves confidently available for classroom interaction. In particular, for the EMI instructors to earn the insight and strategies for what kind of as well as how instructional supports need to be ensured in order to help the EMI course-takers to gain quality learning experience by improving the level of interaction in a form of voluntary and spontaneous participation in the academic course which was offered in their L2, English, the current study as a classroom-based AR was hoped to contribute to the field by adding one more empirical observation. To serve this purpose, the study employed mixed methods research (MMR) (Riazi & Candlin, 2014) through collecting both quantitative and qualitative type of data in order to figure out "a complicated and multi-faceted phenomenon" (Liu & Xu, 2018, p. 646) such as classroom interaction taking place in the online EMI course for the EFL college-level learners and provide answers to the four research questions.

### 3.1. Context of the Study

The current study was conducted at a university in a typical EFL environment, Seoul, Korea, and observed *Philosophies in TESL (TESL)* offered by the TESL department as a 3-credit elective major course. The department made it a language policy to offer every course in English. Meanwhile, the university administration encourages the instructors to offer as many EMI courses as possible with a few incentives including financial one as an effort to keep up with the global competitiveness. The EMI course observed by the current study was provided through a flipped classroom approach (Hughes, 2012; O'Flaherty & Phillips, 2015) in which the course-takers were to watch the video-lecture that the instructor uploaded on the intranet in advance and made themselves familiar with the chapter contents as well as ready for the class (zoom session) discussion. Each video-lecture lasted about 44 minutes to 72 minutes which was considered equivalent to the 75-minute offline lecture while each zoom session was held 75-minute long once a week. The course used Crooks (2009) as the main textbook and required the students to write up *Reflection Paper* and deliver it as the *Individual Presentation* as well as take essay-type midterm and final exam, respectively. All the works were done in English. The instructor (researcher of the current study) of the course was a Korean speaker with 21 years of EMI instruction experience by the moment of data-collection for the current study.

### 3.2. Participants

Nineteen students who took the *TESL* in the fall of 2020 were observed by the current study concerned with the theme of participation. There were three freshmen, eleven sophomores, one junior, three seniors, and one graduate student; 17 of them were TESL majors while one was from Education department taking TESL as a double major; the graduate student was at the doctoral program of English education sitting in on the course. Out of the 19 participants, 17 filled out the questionnaire while 5 were invited to interviews as a focal group since they were considered representing the participation spectrum from the most active participation to the least participation in the class throughout the semester. The 17 participants who responded to the questionnaire rated their general English proficiency level between *Intermediate-Mid* and *Intermediate-High* with the mean score of 3.59 and their spoken English level similarly but with lower mean score of 3.18 indicating that they seemed less confident in using oral skills in the target language, English. Table 1 shows the participants' self-assessed English language proficiency while Table 2 presents which skill of the L2 they found most confident or least confident, respectively.

**TABLE 1**  
**Participants' Self-Assessed English Language Proficiency**

Level of Proficiency	General Proficiency	Spoken Proficiency
Beginning	0 (0%)	1 (5.9%)
Intermediate-low	1 (5.9%)	4 (23.5%)
Intermediate-mid	8 (47.1%)	6 (35.3%)
Intermediate-high	5 (29.4%)	3 (17.6%)
Advanced	3 (17.6%)	3 (17.6%)
Total	17 (100%)	17 (100%)

**TABLE 2**  
**Participants' Most and Least Confident Skill of English**

L2 Skill	Most Confident	Least Confident
Listening	6 (35%)	0 (0%)
Speaking	4 (23.5%)	6 (35.3%)
Reading	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)
Writing	3 (18%)	6 (35.3%)
Total	17 (100%)	17 (100%)

### 3.3. Sources of the Data

#### 3.3.1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed based on Kang (2018) to figure out how the participants found their learning experience in the online class (zoom session) as well as get their personal background information such as their grade, self-assessed English proficiency levels, most and least confident English language skills, their assumptions and expectations on the online EMI course. The questionnaire also included the items asking the participants to point out facilitative or preventive factors for their participation, their preference between online class and offline (face-to-face) one, and overall level of satisfaction with the course they took. Seventeen out of the 19 course-takers filled out the questionnaire set up as a google-survey form after they took final exam. The participants were noticed in advance that their responses to the questionnaire had nothing to do with the final grade and it was done anonymously. For the reliability of the questionnaire to be measured, *Cronbach's alpha* was calculated: it was strong enough with  $\alpha=.877$ . The questionnaire data was coded as Q1, Q2 through Q17. However, in the case of Item 30 asking *their suggestions to improve similar courses for the future*, it was coded as A1, A2 up until A8 since there were only 8 participants who responded to the last item. See Appendix A for the questionnaire.

### 3.3.2. Observation

As a means of showing evidence of interaction in the class (zoom session), observation was carried out by the instructor mainly concerned with how many voluntary and spontaneous participations took place in the forms of questions and comments that the participants made in their interaction with their classmates as well as with the instructor. Since the participation was only referred to as voluntary and spontaneous questions, comments and answers produced by the participants in oral modes taking place in the interaction among the participants, and between the instructor and the participants at the online class (zoom session), it did not include the planned and possibly rehearsed participation such as *Individual Presentation* which was required as a course assignment. Out of the 15 zoom sessions throughout the semester, 10 sessions were observed as reported in Table 8. In addition, the current study used another observation data (Kang, 2018) for the purpose of making a comparison between face-to-face classroom interaction and online classroom interaction with the cohort groups whose members shared almost same characteristics in terms of their major, English proficiency levels, learning environment, and the class size.

### 3.3.3. Interview

Five of the 19 course-takers were invited to interviews from January 12 to 22, 2021 after the semester was officially complete. Each of them was contacted by text-message to see whether they could make themselves available for the interview and offer consent for it to be used as a data for the current study, respectively. They were chosen as a focal group since each of them seemed to represent a level of participation from *Low* to *High*. The interview was constructed as “semi-structure” one in which the interviewees were asked by the pre-developed questions while they were encouraged to talk freely with the topic of each question. A ‘semi-structured interview’ is assumed to “offer great potential to attend to the complexity of a story in need of contextualization” (Galleta, 2013, p. 9) of the phenomenon investigated. Each interview was proceeded in Korean, shared L1 between the interviewees and the researcher, and was translated into English for the sake of report for the current study. The interview data was coded as *Int* 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. See Appendix B for the interview questions. Table 3 provides a summary of the interviewees’ information.

**TABLE 3**  
**Interviewees' Information**

I	Grade	Major	Spoken English Proficiency	Level of Participation	Overseas Experience	EMI Experience
1	Sophomore	TESL	Intermediate mid	Low	In an ESL country until 5	2 years
2	Sophomore	TESL	Intermediate mid	Low	No	2 years
3	Junior	TESL	Intermediate high	High	2years in Canada while elementary & 2 years at an international school in China	4 years
4	Freshman	TESL	Intermediate mid	Moderate	3 months in New Zealand while elementary	1 year
5	Freshman	TESL	Advanced	High	No (educated through homeschooling from elementary to high school in Korea)	1 year

*Note.* I refers to Interviewee.

### 3.4. Methods of Data Analysis

The study conducted statistical analyses with the questionnaire items which were developed with the Likert-Scale as well as with the observation data while employing content-analyses for the data generated as the response to the open-ended question of the questionnaire and interview data. For the statistical analyses, correlation coefficient was calculated to see the relationship between the participants' responses to each item of the questionnaire. With respect to the observation data, *t*-test was conducted through R 4.0.2 in order to tell whether the participation rate was significantly different between the participants of the current study and those in the offline course mentioned in the above Observation section. Meanwhile, the qualitative data earned from the interviews as well as the participants' responses to the open-ended item of the questionnaire were examined through the content analyses which were considered "empirically grounded method, exploring in process, and predictive or inferential in intent" (Krippendorf, 2019, p. 1) while trying to figure out what would facilitate the participants' involvement in interaction in the online EMI course.

## 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The report and discussion of the research findings were presented in a comprehensive way reflecting the fact that the current study collected data through mixed method research (MMR) practice which was based on the idea of breaking the boundary between quantitative and qualitative research and utilize different ways to get good data without being confined to traditional research paradigms in the field of applied linguistics (Rose, McKinley, & Baffoe-Djan, 2020). For the study to be able to answer the research questions, it endeavored to figure out what can be inferred from the statistical and content analyses of the data collected by the questionnaire, observation and interviews as well as earn insights into what would facilitate or prevent the participants' interaction in the online EMI course in order to make their learning experience successful enough.

### 4.1. Interaction and Course Satisfaction

The statistical analysis of the questionnaire items showed that there were significant relationships between the participants' responses to the items tapping into the availability of interaction opportunities and experience and that to the item evaluating course satisfaction, respectively. The participants' response to Item 9 asking *whether they might think they were given enough opportunities to speak/ participate in the zoom sessions* was most strongly related to that to Item 29 measuring *their overall satisfaction with the course* ( $r = .75, p < .05$ ). It suggested that whether they might find the online class interactive enough or not can impact a critical aspect of their learning experience in the course, which seemed consistent with the findings of the previous studies working on the rationales of Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) and classroom interaction research (Liu & Xu, 2018).

The participants also rated *the instructor's effort to encourage them to participate in the zoom sessions* relatively highly ( $M = 4.41; SD = .80$ ). It was also significantly correlated with that to Item 29 of *course satisfaction* while there was no significant relationship between their response to Item 15 questioning *whether they can participate more actively if required to do so* and that to Item 29 suggesting that the participants should be urged for interaction without having to be intimidated. Besides, it was noticed that the participants' response to Item 13 enquiring *whether they were nervous in speaking/participation due to the lack of English language skills* was significantly correlated with that to Item 29 in the negative direction. It implied that the EFL college learners were challenged linguistically and should be taken care of through instructional apparatus support such as scaffolding activities and tasks suggested by the notion of zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1987) to increase their confidence in using the L2 skills in the EMI course. These relationships were presented in Table 5 while the participants' response to each item of the

questionnaire was summarized in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**  
**Participants' Responses to the Questionnaire**

Questionnaire Item	<i>M</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>SD</i>
2. Self-assessed general English proficiency	3.59	.87
3. Self-assessed spoken English proficiency	3.18	1.19
6. One of the best ways to improve English skills is to take academic courses in English	3.71	.92
7. Video-lectures were effective enough to learn the chapter contents.	4.00	.50
8. Zoom sessions were effective enough to learn the chapter contents.	3.59	1.00
9. Enough opportunities to speak/participate in the zoom sessions.	4.24	1.09
10. Confident in speaking/participating in the zoom sessions due to good English skills	3.24	1.20
11. Confident in speaking/participating in the zoom sessions due to good preparation for each class	3.65	.86
12. More confident in speaking/participating in the zoom sessions at the end of the course	3.71	.85
13. Lack of English skills made me nervous about speaking/participating in English.	3.35	1.17
14. Lack of comprehension of the contents made me nervous about speaking/participating in English.	3.47	1.07
15. Can participate more actively if required to speak/participate in the zoom sessions.	3.71	.92
16. Can be nervous if required to speak/participate in the zoom sessions.	3.65	.99
17. Can participate more actively if involved in pair- or group-discussion.	3.76	.66
18. Instructor encouraged us to speak/participate in the zoom sessions.	4.41	.79
19. On-line course is as effective as off-line course in learning the contents.	3.71	.92
20. I prefer off-line course for the future.	3.24	1.09
22. I prefer on-line course for the future.	3.35	.79
29. Overall satisfaction with the course	4.06	.75

*Note.* The scores represented from 1 meaning *Strongly Disagree/Not at all* to 5 *Strongly Agree/Well satisfied*.

**TABLE 5**  
**The Relationship Between Interaction and Course Satisfaction**

Questionnaire Item	29. Satisfaction with the Course
9. Enough opportunities to participate in the zoom sessions	.75*
10. Confident in participation due to good L2 skills	.26
11. Confident in participation due to good preparation	.52*
12. Became more confident in participation at the end of the course.	.62*
13. Nervous about participation due to lack of L2 skills	-.53*
15. Can participate more actively if required to speak/participate in the zoom sessions.	.12
18. Instructor encouraged us to participate.	.59*

*Note.* The correlation coefficient (*r*) was significant at *p*-value of less than .05.

## 4.2. Influence of the L2 Skills

It was found that the participants' self-rated levels of English proficiencies were strongly related with their response to Item 10 asking *whether they were confident in participation in the zoom sessions due to good L2 skills*. Such a tendency was partly consistent with what the interviewees mentioned. Two of the five interviewees pointed out that it was hard for them to participate in the zoom session mainly due to the lack of confidence in English oral skills: *"I'm not comfortable when I have to speak spontaneously in English. Thus, it was not easy for me to make comments and/or questions at the end of my classmates' presentations"* (Int. 1); *"Due to the lack of listening and speaking skills in English, I could rarely make questions in the zoom session. Rather, I used to email the instructor to ask some questions"* (Int. 2).

Having considered that Interviewee 1 used to show up almost as soon as the zoom session was opened every Wednesday and made questions in her L1, Korean, before the other students would enter the session, and that Interviewee 2 sent emails to the instructor when she had to clarify what she could not clearly figure out during the zoom session, it was assumed that if they were confident in English oral skills, they might have interacted with their classmates as well as with the instructor far more actively. This finding seemed consistent with those of Ha (2011) and (Kang et al., 2007), respectively, in which classroom participation in the EMI courses turned out to be lower than that in Korean-medium instruction (KMI) classes. It might indicate that a critical cause of lower participation in the EMI class was the lack of L2 confidence.

It was also observed by the relatively strong correlation between their responses to Items asking about their English proficiencies and that to Item 15 inquiring *whether they can participate more if required to do*. That is, the more the participants were confident in the L2 skills, the more they preferred to be pushed to speak in the class. It can be inferred that such instructional apparatus as requirement would work better for those who are more confident in their L2 skills, but can be detrimental to those who are weak in their L2 confidence. It could be also interpreted that even when they are linguistically ready to participate in the class, it may take more than just language skills for the EFL college-level learners to interact with their classmates and the instructor. In fact, two of the interviewees also suggested that they could have participated more if the instructor had called their names and asked them to say something in the zoom sessions: *"If the instructor made participation compulsory assigning points for the final grade, we cannot help but speak more"* (Int. 1); *"It would help us to participate more actively if the instructor makes it clear that final grade will be affected by the level of participation"* (Int. 4).

However, it was worth noting that the participants' L2 proficiencies were not significantly related to how they were satisfied with the EMI course. Rather, there was significant correlation between their response to Item 11 saying that *I'm confident in participation due*

to their preparation for each class and that to Item 29 of course satisfaction. Moreover, their response to Item 10 asking *whether they were confident in participation due to their good English language skills* was not significantly related with that to Item 29. It appeared that the participants of the current study found extra-linguistic factors such as instructor's encouragement, the availability of interaction opportunities as well as their preparation for each class more relevant to their level of satisfaction with the course.

Meanwhile, the interviewees showed ambivalent attitude about a policy such as compulsory participation. While mentioning that the instructor's encouragement alone was not enough to promote the EFL learners' interaction, and suggested that participation should be required, the interviewees revealed concern about such a policy as a threat since they confessed that *"I assume that the students would not like their names to be called on for participation. Neither would I. I must be frightened if I'm pointed out by the instructor to speak"* (Int. 4). Such a concern was manifested more strongly for those whose L2 confidence was weak, which was partly reflected in the negative relationship between the participants' self-rated English proficiencies and their response to Item 16 asking *whether they can be nervous if required to participate*. These relationships were summarized in Table 6.

**TABLE 6**  
**The Influence of L2 Skills**

Questionnaire Item	10	13	14	15	16	29
2. Self-assessed general English proficiency	.82*	-.52*	-.72*	.62*	-.61*	-.06
3. Self-assessed spoken English proficiency	.85*	-.54*	-.76*	.62*	-.58*	-.01
10. Confident in participation due to good L2 skills	1	.64*	-.68*	.63*	-.76*	.26
11. Confident in participation due to good preparation	.57*	.74*	.56*	.49*	.66*	.52*
13. Nervous about participation due to lack of L2 skills	-.64*	1	.76*	.42	.70*	-.53*
14. Nervous about participation due to lack of content-comprehension	-.68*	.76*	1	.74*	.64*	-.19
15. Can participate more if required to do.	.63*	.42	-.74*	1	-.60*	.12
16. Can be nervous if required to participate.	-.76*	.70*	.64*	-.60*	1	-.22
18. Instructor encouraged us to participate.	.35	.37	.32	.01	.04	.59*
20. I Prefer offline course for the future.	-.15	.03	-.21	.57*	-.15	-.02
29. Overall satisfaction with the course	.26	.53*	.19	.12	.22	1

*Note.* The  $r$  was significant at  $p$ -value of less than .05.

### 4.3. Expectation on the Improvement of L2 Skills

While English language development is “not a primary intended outcome” of EMI (Pecorari & Malmström, 2018, p. 499), it was considered that the participants had expected the EMI course to strengthen their L2 skills as roughly half of them (9 participants out of the 17) responded to Item 6 tapping into the belief that *one of the best ways to improve English language skills is to take academic courses in English* with ④Agree or ⑤Strongly Agree ( $M = 3.71/5.00$ ;  $SD = .92$ ). In addition, the participants appeared to have their linguistic expectation fulfilled to a certain degree as 10 participants out of the 17 answered Item 12 asking *whether they became more confident in speaking/participating at the end of course* positively ( $M = 3.71/5.00$ ;  $SD = .85$ ).

According to the interviewees, it was not only oral skills, but also literacy skills they felt improved: “*I found my reading skills improved a lot by reading each chapter rigorously*” (Int. 1); “*I’m feeling more confident in listening and speaking skills as I’ve taken EMI courses for the last 2 years*” (Int. 2); “*I got feeling that I’ve been more confident in spontaneous speaking and essay writing due to the EMI courses I took so far*” (Int. 3); “*I’ve got reading, speaking and listening skills improved a lot since I had to use those three skills often. But I had fewer opportunities to write up in English*” (Int. 4); “*I used to pick up new expressions listening to my classmates and making myself aware of their expressions as well as getting more and more comfortable with reading the chapters while taking the EMI courses*” (Int. 5).

When asked about *what was the most beneficial to improving English language skills* (Item 28), nearly half of the participants (9 out the 17; 52.9%) pointed out two tasks: *reading the textbook* and *making questions and/or comments to the instructor*. The second most beneficial task turned out to be *individual presentation, making questions and/or comments at the end of classmates’ presentation*, and *preparing for and taking exams*. Each of these three tasks was picked up by 8 participants (47.1%), respectively. *Watching the video-lecture* was found effective with 6 participants (35.3%), which was followed by *listening to the classmates* and *doing the written assignment (reflection paper)* by 5 participants (29.4%) each.

The participants’ responses to Item 28 were partly reflected consistently in those to Item 26 asking about *the most improved L2 skill through the course*, and Item 27 on *the least improved one*: 7 out the 17 (41.2%) mentioned *reading* as the most improved one, which was followed by *listening* and *writing* recognized by 4 participants (23.5%) each; only 2 participants (11.8%) picked up *speaking* as the most improved one. Indeed, it was *speaking* as the least improved one since 6 of the participants (35.6%) pointed it out when responding to Item 27. Taken together, it appeared that the participants as a group could earn more confidence in reading the academic texts while it was hard for them to increase speaking

abilities during the time span of one semester. Table 7 presented which skill the participants found most or least improved one in the L2, respectively.

**TABLE 7**  
**The Most and the Least Improved L2 Skills**

L2 Skill	The Most Improved Skill	The Least Improved Skill
Listening	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)
Speaking	2 (11.8%)	6 (35.3%)
Reading	7 (41.2%)	1 (5.9%)
Writing	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)
Total	17 (100%)	17 (100%)

#### 4.4. Better Contribution of Online Course to Interaction

It cannot help but be a thorny issue to tell whether online course can be as effective as offline (face-to-face) course considering the changes happening to college campuses in which the trend is moving toward online classes, which has been accelerated by the pandemic situation. Thus, as an attempt to see whether there might be significant difference between online and offline classes in terms of inducing the course-takers' participation, the participation rate in the EMI course (*TESL*) observed by the current study was compared with that of *Applied Linguistics (AL)* course in Kang (2018), which shared the same language policy, English-only. The two EMI courses were offered as elective major courses by the same instructor to the cohort groups of EFL college-level learners of similar class size with the *AL* being taken by 17 students and the *TESL* by 19 students. The two courses shared other similarities such as *Summary/Reflection paper* and *Individual Presentation* with academic paper or theme as course requirements along with essay-type midterm and final exam, respectively. Table 8 showed the number of participations taking place in each course, respectively.

**TABLE 8**  
**Participation in the Offline and Online Courses**

Offline Course: <i>AL</i> (Fall, 2016)		Online Course: <i>TESL</i> (Fall, 2020)	
Date	# of Participation	Date	# of Participation
10/10/16	2	9/23/20	6
10/12/16	10	10/7/20	8
10/17/16	3	10/14/20	7
10/19/16	1	10/28/20	8
11/2/16	7	11/4/20	11
11/14/16	6	11/11/20	14
11/16/16	7	11/18/20	12
11/21/16	6	11/25/20	14
11/23/16	5	12/2/20	10
11/28/16	13	12/7/20	18
12/5/16	7		
12/7/16	4		
12/12/16	8		
12/14/16	17		
Total # of observations	14		10
<i>M</i> */ <i>SD</i>	.4034/.2515		.5684/.1982

*Note.* Mean score was calculated with the number of participations divided by that of participants as well as by the number of observations.

In order to see whether the mean occurrence of the participation in each course would be significantly different from each other's, *t*-score was calculated with the *p*-value set at less than .05. It turned out that the mean occurrence of the participation in the online *TESL* course was significantly higher than that of the offline *AL* course ( $t = -1.7243, p = .0493$ ) while there was no significant difference between the two courses in terms of number of course-takers ( $t = -.4553, p = .3267$ ). For the two courses, participation was referred to as questions, comments, opinions, and answers made by the course-takers at the end of their classmates' presentations and to the instructor's questions. Thus, it meant voluntary and spontaneous interaction in oral modes since the *Individual Presentation* was not counted as an occurrence of participation, for example. Any voluntary and spontaneous speaking was counted as one participation (interaction) regardless of whether it was made by same participant or not. That is, there were chances that one participant made more than one participation. It was suggested that, at least between the two courses, the zoom session of the online course was more effectively operated than the face-to-face class in terms of inducing the course-takers' participation.

However, it should require careful examination on what exactly led to a higher rate of participation in the online course. It might be cautiously pointed out that it could be due to a

difference between the two courses that the online course was offered through the flipped classroom approach while the offline course was not. The ‘flipped’ refers to the way of delivering the course contents in advance and letting the students study lesson materials on their own before coming to the class in which they were supposed to be involved in discussion and other interactive activities among the students and with the instructor (Hughes, 2012). That is, the online instructor of the flipped classroom could assume that the course-takers were informed of the lesson contents in advance before they were to meet through the zoom session and accordingly was able to secure more time for interaction among the course-takers, which was not possibly available for the regular classroom that would normally proceed with content-delivery being the focus of the lesson, thereby leaving less time for the interaction among the students. Then, it can only be tentatively asserted that the zoom-session operated within the flipped classroom approach deserves a credit for effective participation taking place in the forms of interaction among the participants, and between the instructor and participants.

In fact, the participants did not show clear preference between offline face-to-face course and online course as they responded to Item 20 ( $M = 3.24$ ;  $SD = 1.09$ ) and Item 22 ( $M = 3.35$ ;  $SD = .79$ ) asking *whether they would prefer offline, or online course for the future* with less than ④ Agree, respectively. But it was noteworthy that, even among the participants who answered that they preferred offline course (7 out of the 17; 41.2%), no participant said so since they were more comfortable with offline course when responding to Item 21 asking *what made you prefer offline course*. Rather, it appeared that the participants preferred blended instruction comprising offline and online classes since 8 of the 17 participants (47.1%) chose *half offline and half video-lecture*, another 4 participants (23.5%) wanted *half offline and half zoom session*. The other 5 participants (29.4%) thought *online only* as the best way to take a course. That is, no participant chose *offline only* as a best way of learning. Taken together, the participants of the current study showed tendency to view offline only instruction as the one that cannot serve their needs anymore while searching out a best combination between offline and online components.

On the other hand, among the interviewees, 2 of them (Ints. 2 and 3) favored offline course since they assumed that they could find themselves more comfortable in interacting with the classmates as well as with the instructor in face-to-face environment. Moreover, the interviewees who rarely participated throughout the semester mentioned that “*due to the technological operation allowing only one speaker to be heard, I had to make extra efforts to earn a speaking opportunity before the other classmates would start, which made me uncomfortable*” (Int. 1); “*I was feeling that I could’ve focused more effectively on what’s going on in the face-to-face class, thus participated actively*” (Int. 2). It implied that online environment can be more challenging for those whose confidence in L2 skills is weak. Another two interviewees wanted online course saying that it would give her more flexibility

in terms of time management (*Int.* 1) or due to her experience of having studied through online programs since young (*Int.* 5). Interviewee 4 said that offline course would be more suitable for a discussion-oriented one while online course should be effective enough if it is mainly to deliver information.

#### 4.5. Suggestions to Improve Online EMI Course

Eight participants (47%) provided their suggestions for *how to improve course-taking experience for the future* when responding to the last item of the questionnaire (Item 30). All of them offered their suggestions in English, which partly implied that they were comfortable in writing up in the L2 when expressing personal opinions. First, they wished that the instructor should be more carefully organizing the contents when presenting them through the video-lecture (A1, A2), highlighting the core parts of each chapter so that they did not have to be overwhelmed by the vast amount of the contents (A3, A8) as well as uploading all the class materials before the zoom session (A5). They also recommended small group discussion (A2) and more directly inducing participation by calling their names (A7), providing more opportunities for the comprehensive discussions (for the review of midterm and final exam, respectively) (A4), and assigning them to do projects on their own topic while reducing the number of exams (A4, A6).

The participants' suggestions were roughly consistent with what the interviewees mentioned as a way of promoting their participation: "*If the instructor arranged pair-work or small-group discussion before whole-class discussion, it would help to make us less nervous and be ready for speaking before the whole-class*" (*Ints.* 1, 2); "*We should've been often reminded of the 5 percentage points allocated to 'participation' for the final grade. It could've pushed us to speak in the zoom sessions*" (*Int.* 1); "*If we had to take quizzes, we cannot miss the video-lecture and be informed of the contents more clearly, which would help us participate in the zoom session*" (*Int.* 4). The participants and interviewees seemed to point out that there should be scaffolding apparatus such as pair-work, small-group discussion, and quizzes as well as more carefully organized lessons for content-delivery by which they were guided step-by-step and thus would become more confident in class participation.

### 5. CONCLUSION

The current study examined whether classroom participation (interaction) would significantly relate to course satisfaction when it was offered as online EMI course for college-level EFL learners. The study also looked into which one, between online EMI

course and offline one, can be more effective in inducing course-takers' interaction with their classmates as well as with the instructor. In addition, it endeavored to figure out what would hinder the learners from interacting with their classmates and instructor for the purpose of making suggestions as to how to ensure interaction opportunities and promote quality learning experience for the college-level EFL learners who would take online EMI courses. The analyses of the questionnaire, observation and interview data of the study, above of all, showed that the participants' recognition of interaction opportunities and experience were strongly related to their overall satisfaction with the course as well as to their increasing confidence in participation at the end of the semester. It was considered consistent with the assumptions of Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) and supported the rationales of classroom interaction research (Ginting, 2017; Liu & Xu, 2018) arguing that "interaction is an indispensable component in second language acquisition" (Loewen & Sato, 2018, p. 285) and for quality learning experience.

Second, the study found that the participants, the EFL college-level learners majoring in the fields of applied linguistics and English education, accepted the online course as a better option or at least as effective as the offline course for their study. It was noteworthy that no participant considered offline-only instruction as a best way of taking a course. It can be interpreted that, interaction-wise, the online class (zoom session) observed by the current study functioned more effectively than the face-to-face class (Kang, 2018), thus led the participants to viewing the online course as a better way of learning. In addition, they found it expedient enough to take online course especially in terms of time-management, for example, helping them save commuting time as well as letting them to go back to video-lecture several times whenever necessary for content comprehension partly due to their familiarity with the online environment and convenience that technology provides. It appeared that the college-level learners were now used to online classes as the default setting for their education, which would make it hard for the instructor and students to return to traditional offline-only classes.

However, that does not mean that the participants did not complain about the online course at all. In fact, majority of the participants wished for blended instruction consisting of on- and off-line components together. Such a preference for blended instruction particularly in a format of half offline and half video-lecture to that of half offline and half zoom session or to online-only might indicate that the college-level EFL learners still need face-to-face interaction especially for the course in which discussion should be implemented as an essential part for the course objectives to be fulfilled. It could be interpreted that the flipped classroom approach employed by the online course might give the participants more time and opportunities to comprehend the lesson contents since it allowed them to watch the video-lecture as many times as possible at their convenience. Once they were well informed of the lesson contents, it could lead them to interaction with more confidence. Thus, the

participants' preference for the combination of half offline and half video-lecture should be carefully translated as it might mean that online course could be more effective since it was more readily able to employ the flipped classroom approach.

In effect, that the online course observed by the current study showed higher rate of participation compared with that of an offline course (Kang, 2018) was assumed to have happened possibly due to a fact that the online course was offered through flipped classroom approach (Hughes, 2012). That is, in the flipped learning approach, the participants were supposed to be informed of the chapter contents watching the video-lecture by themselves in advance before attending the zoom session in which whole class discussion was arranged with a few discussion topics following a brief review of the video-lecture and a few individual presentations. At least, timewise, such a format could contribute to increasing the number of participation opportunities compared with that of a non-flipped class. In traditional classrooms, "there is a widespread consensus that many L2 students do not have much opportunities to enhance their spoken fluency" (Derwing, 2017, p. 253). Even so, it can be a bit too simple assumption that flipped learning approach would automatically guarantee a higher level of participation quantitatively as well as qualitatively even without specific instructional apparatuses.

For the effects of flipped learning to be augmented to a maximum degree, the research findings of the current study suggested that a carefully designed lesson plan should be practiced. Having reflected on the participants' response to the questionnaire in terms of what made them nervous about participating in English, it was the lack of content-comprehension more than that of the L2 skills. The data-analyses also showed that the participants wished for the instructor to make clear the core parts of each chapter and upload all the class materials in advance including the discussion topics for the zoom session, which appeared to be critical enough for them to be able to participate with. Thus, the instructor ought to have delivered the video-lecture in a more organized way pointing out what parts of the chapter should deserve more attention as well as announcing specific discussion topics in advance.

In addition, the interviewees confessed that the lack of L2 confidence was the reason for making themselves nervous about interacting with their classmates as well as with the instructor in the zoom session. In particular, the interviewees' information revealed that the participation rate was influenced by the L2 proficiency level up until *Intermediate-Mid* level as the interviewees regarded as *Intermediate-Low* turned out to be least active participants while the interviewee rated as *Intermediate-Mid* was observed as moderately active participant. But once their proficiency level reached *Intermediate-High*, there was no difference between the interviewee of *Intermediate-High* and that of *Advanced* level in their involvement in the online interaction. Such an observation was in line with the 'threshold' notion (Cummins, 2016) implying that L2 learners need to pass certain level of proficiency

in the target language if they were to take advantage of their cognitive and academic abilities earned through either L1 or L2, as well as express themselves in the L2.

Hence, the real-time online class should be more systematically organized especially for those whose English linguistic confidence is not strong enough to speak spontaneously with the academic contents. One promising comment made by the interviewees was that all of them including the two least active participants said that their L2 skills improved a lot throughout the semester taking the EMI course. It might suggest that even the L2 learners currently at a low level of proficiency should be encouraged to take EMI courses. As the participants suggested pair- and small group-discussion which are to take advantage of the benefits of “learner-learner interaction in classroom” (Y. Kim, 2017, p. 132) before the whole class interaction, a future course for the cohort groups and in particular for those who are challenged by the lack of L2 confidence needs to employ such scaffolding apparatuses which are to function as a stepping-stone helping them make ready for the interaction with the whole class (Vygotsky, 1987).

The current study was carried out with limitations which should be overcome by the future studies. The study measured the interaction by mainly counting the number of occurrences of interaction taking place in the forms of voluntary and spontaneous participation such as making questions and comments as well as responses to the instructor’s questions. It could not take a deeper look at how interaction was achieved in what kind of contexts within the academic environment. The subsequent studies need to investigate interaction at deeper levels in order to fully grasp the dynamic nature of classroom interaction and contribute to providing more informed and feasible suggestions for the EMI instructors whose job is to effectively assist EFL college-level learners taking L2-medium courses to grow linguistically as well as academically. In addition, the further studies should be able to recruit bigger number of online EMI courses and participants to produce more cogent and generalized findings. They may also want to examine motivational factors as well as cognitive complexities depending on task types and contents to earn insights on how the adult EFL learners would interact differently in such a challenging environment of online EMI course depending on those variables.

Applicable level: Tertiary

## REFERENCES

- Baker, W., & Hüttner, J. (2018). "We are not the language police": Comparing multilingual EMI programmes in Europe and Asia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29(6), 1-17.
- Bradford, A., & Brown, H. (Eds.). (2017). *English-medium instruction in Japanese higher education: Policy, challenges and outcomes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436-458.
- Coghlan, D., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research* (Vols. 1-2). London: Sage.
- Coleman, J., Hultgren, K., Li, W., Tsui, C., & Shaw, P. (2018). Forum on English-medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 701-720.
- Crooks, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2016). Reflections on Cummins (1980), The cross-linguistic dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 940-944.
- Dafouz, E., Hüttner, J., & Simt, U. (2018). New contexts, new challenges for TESOL: Understanding disciplinary reasoning in oral interactions in English-medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 540-563.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction: A growing global phenomenon*. London: British Council.
- Derwing, T. (2017). L2 fluency development. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *Instructed second language acquisition (ISLA): An overview* (pp. 246-259). New York: Routledge.
- Dimova, S., Hultgren, A., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Language and social life (Vol. 4): English-medium instruction in European higher education*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Dimova, S., & Kling, J. (2018). Assessing English-medium instruction lecturer language proficiency across disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 634-656.
- Dobinson, T. (2001). Do learners learn from classroom interaction and does the teacher have to role to play? *Language Teaching Research*, 5(3), 189-211.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (Eds.). (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A review of the research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 223-236.

- Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamasaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meaning. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 449-491.
- Flowerdew, L. (2019). English as a lingua franca and learner English in disciplinary writing. In K. Hyland & L. Wong (Eds.), *Specialised English: New directions in ESP and EAP research and practice* (pp. 79-90). New York: Routledge.
- Galleta, A. (2013). *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond: From research design to analysis and publication*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2015). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 180-206). New York: Routledge.
- Ginting, S. (2017). The importance of opening moves in classroom interaction. *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies*, 8(6), 7-11.
- Ha, M. J. (2011). EFL Learners' willingness to communicate in the EMI college classes. *Korean Journal of Applied linguistics*, 27(4), 27-53.
- Hall, J. (2010). Interaction as method and result of language learning. *Language Teaching*, 43(2), 202-215.
- Hall, J. (2020). L2 classroom interaction and its links to L2 learners' developing L2 linguistic repertoires: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 1-16.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 401-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hughes, U. (2012). Introduction to flipping the college classroom. In T. Amiel & B. Wilson (Eds.), Paper presented at the *EdMedia 2012-World Conference on Educational Media and Technology* (pp. 2434-2438). Denver, Colorado, USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved on November 20, 2017, from <http://www.learntechlib.org/p/41097/>
- Hulstijn, J. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258-286). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, A. (2018). Exploring how to ensure participation in CBI. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 17(2), 1-27.
- Kang, S. H., Suh, H., Shin, S. K., Lee, J., Lee, H. J., & Choi, J. (2007). Pre-service teachers' evaluation on English-medium lectures. *Journal of Research in Curriculum & Instruction*, 11(2), 637-656.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2014). Social positioning, participation, and second language learning: Talkative students in an academic ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(4), 686-714.

- Kim, E. Y. (2017). English medium instruction in Korean higher education: challenges and future directions. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphrey, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy* (pp. 53-69). Dordrecht, Germany: Springer.
- Kim, Y. J. (2017). Cognitive-interactionist approaches to L2 instruction. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *Instructed second language acquisition (ISLA): An overview* (pp. 126-135). New York: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 15-30). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Fostering team teaching: Mapping out a research agenda for English-medium instruction at university level. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 400-416.
- Liu, J., & Xu, Y. (2018). Interaction in the classroom. In A. Shehadeh (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching: Approaches and methods in English for speakers of other languages* (pp. 646-651). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285-329.
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259-278.
- Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Macaro, E. (2019). English medium instruction: Global views and countries in focus. *Language Teaching*, 52(2), 231-248.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systemic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36-76.
- Mauranen, A. (2019). Academically speaking: English as the lingua franca. In K. Hyland & L. Wong (Eds.), *Specialised English: New directions in ESP and EAP research and practice* (pp. 7-21). New York: Routledge.
- Miller, K., Zyto, S., Karger, D., Yoo, J., & Mazur, E. (2016). Analysis of student engagement in an online annotation system in the context of a flipped introductory physics class. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 12(2), 1-12.

- Murata, K. (Ed.) (2018). *English-medium instruction from an English as a lingua franca perspective: Exploring the higher education context*. New York: Routledge.
- Nandi, D., Chang, S., & Balbo, S. (2009). *A conceptual framework for assessing interaction quality in online discussion forums*. Paper presented at the 26<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Same Place, Different Spaces. Auckland, New Zealand: Ascilite.
- O’Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 25, 85-95.
- Pecorari, D., & Malmström, H. (2018). At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 497-515.
- Pica, T. (2009). Integrating content- and task-based approaches. In V. Cook & L. Wei (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics: Language teaching and learning* (pp. 75-98). New York: Continuum.
- Riazi, A., & Candlin, C. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135-173.
- Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Baffoe-Djan, J. (2020). *Data collection research methods in applied linguistics*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (Eds.). (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: Gaining insights into English-medium instruction at European universities. *AILA Review*, 25(1), 1-12.
- Spada, N. (2011). Beyond form-focused instruction: Reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching*, 44(2), 225-236.
- Valcke, J., & Wilkinson, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Integrating content and language in higher education: Perspectives on professional practice*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *Problems of general psychology, including the volume thinking and speech* (pp. 39-285). New York: Plenum.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. Bonne, Germany: Lemmens.
- Wagner-Gough, J., & Hatch, E. (1975). The importance of input data in second language acquisition studies. *Language Learning*, 25(2), 297-307.
- Ziegler, N. (2016). Synchronous computer-mediated communication and interaction: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38(3), 553-586.

## APPENDIX A

### Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed to see how you have perceived the English-medium instruction

(EMI) course-taking experience, which was provided on-line through the video-lecture and zoom session. Your responses are highly appreciated.

1. Grade: Freshman(    ), Sophomore(    ), Junior(    ), Senior(    ), Graduate-student(    )
2. Self-assessed general English proficiency level:  
Beginning(    ), Intermediate-Low(    ), Intermediate-Mid(    ), Intermediate-High(    ), Advanced(    )
3. Self-assessed spoken English proficiency level:  
Beginning(    ), Intermediate-Low(    ), Intermediate-Mid(    ), Intermediate-High(    ), Advanced(    )
4. What is your most confident skill in English?  
Listening (    ), Speaking (    ), Reading (    ), Writing (    )
5. What is your least confident skill in English?  
Listening (    ), Speaking (    ), Reading (    ), Writing (    )
6. I think that one of the best ways to improve my English language skills is to take academic courses in English  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
7. I found the video-lectures effective enough to learn the chapter contents.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
8. I found the zoom sessions effective enough to learn the chapter contents.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
9. I was given enough opportunities to speak/participate in the class (zoom sessions).  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
10. I'm confident in speaking/participating in the class (zoom sessions) since my English language skills are good enough.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
11. I'm confident in speaking/participating in the class (zoom sessions) since I have prepared for each class.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
12. I became more confident in speaking/participating in the class (zoom sessions) at the end of the course.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
13. The lack of English language skills makes me nervous about speaking/participating in English.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
14. The lack of comprehension of the contents makes me nervous about speaking/participating in English.  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
15. I can participate more actively if I'm required to speak/participate in the class (zoom sessions).  
① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree

16. I can be nervous if I'm required to speak/participate in the class (zoom sessions).  
 ① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
17. I can speak/participate more actively if I'm involved in pair- or group-discussion.  
 ① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
18. The instructor did encourage the students to speak/participate in the class (zoom sessions).  
 ① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
19. I found/assume the online course as effective as offline course in learning the contents.  
 ① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
20. For the future courses, I prefer offline course (face-to-face class).  
 ① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
21. If you answer to the Q20 with ④ Agree or ⑤ Strongly Agree, what made you do so?  
 a) Since I like to see myself in the classroom at the campus. ( )  
 b) Since I feel more comfortable to take off-line course. ( )  
 c) Since I think that I can learn the contents more effectively in offline (face-to-face) course.  
 ( )  
 d) Since I think that I can speak more comfortably in English in offline (face-to-face) course.  
 ( )  
 e) Since I expect myself to more effectively interact with the classmates as well as the  
 instructor in the offline course. ( )  
 f) Since I don't see big differences between online and offline course as far as I can  
 effectively interact with the classmates as well as the instructor. ( )  
 g) Others: \_\_\_\_\_
22. For the future courses, I prefer online course (video-lecture and/or zoom session).  
 ① Strongly Disagree    ② Disagree    ③ Neutral    ④ Agree    ⑤ Strongly Agree
23. If you answer to the Q22 with ④ Agree or ⑤ Strongly Agree, what made you do so?  
 a) Since I think that I can save time to commute. ( )  
 b) Since I feel more comfortable to take online course. ( )  
 c) Since I think that I can learn the contents more effectively in online course. ( )  
 d) Since I think that I can speak more comfortably in English in online course. ( )  
 e) Since I expect myself to more effectively interact with the classmates as well as the  
 instructor in the on-line course. ( )  
 f) Since I don't see big differences between on-line and off-line course as far as I can  
 effectively interact with the classmates as well as the instructor. ( )  
 g) Others: \_\_\_\_\_
24. Which do you think can be a best way to take a course?  
 a) Offline only ( )  
 b) Online only ( )  
 c) Half offline and half video-lecture ( )  
 d) Half offline and half zoom-session ( )
25. If you chose b) On-line only for Q24, which way would you prefer?  
 a) Video-lecture only ( )  
 b) Zoom session only ( )  
 c) Half video-lecture and half zoom session ( )

26. Which skill do you think was most improved throughout the course?

Listening ( ), Speaking ( ), Reading ( ), Writing ( )

27. Which skill do you think was least improved throughout the course?

Listening ( ), Speaking ( ), Reading ( ), Writing ( )

28. Which do you think was most beneficial to improving English language skills? You can check more than one activity.

a) Reading the textbooks ( )

b) Listening to the video-lecture ( )

c) Individual presentation ( )

d) Listening to the instructor ( )

e) Listening to the classmates (e.g., for their presentations) ( )

f) Doing the written assignment (Reflection paper) ( )

g) Making questions and/or comments at the end of the classmate's presentation ( )

h) Making questions and/or comments to the instructor ( )

i) Preparing for and taking exams ( )

j) Others (Please specify what contributed to improving your English language skills)

---

29. Overall, are you satisfied with your experience in the course?

① Not at all ② Hardly satisfied ③ Neutral ④ Satisfied to a certain extent ⑤ Well satisfied

30. Could you please provide suggestions to improve course-taking experience for the future?

## APPENDIX B

### Interview Questions

1. Personal information: grade; major; self-assessed English language proficiency; EMI experience at the college and before; overseas experience

2. What helped you participate in the classroom?

- Preparation, language skills, interaction and/or output opportunities, other factors

3. What prevented you from participating?

- Lack of preparation, language skills, lack of interaction or output opportunities, other factors

4. Having taken the course, what did you find most challenging?

- Reading the chapters, participation, studying on-line, on-line environment, other factors

5. Do you think that you were given enough opportunities to participate in the zoom session? If so, why? If not, why not?

6. Do you think that you were able to improve language skills through taking course?

7. If the course were offered as off-line course, would it be better for your participation?

8. If the course were not flipped, would it be better for your participation?

9. How to promote participation in this kind of on-line EMI course?