

Report on Faculty of Foreign Language Education
Public Lecture 2020: The Integrated Learning of
Content and English as an International
Language in English-Medium Instruction Classes
(Speaker: Professor Nobuyuki Hino, Osaka
University)

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2020-04-14 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: OYABU, Kana メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.24517/00057388

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0
International License.



Report on Faculty of Foreign Language Education Public Lecture 2020
The Integrated Learning of Content and English as an International
Language in English-Medium Instruction Classes
(Speaker: Professor Nobuyuki Hino, Osaka University)

外国語教育系 FD 講演会 2020 報告
「英語で行う専門授業 (EMI) における国際英語の学び」
(講演者：日野信行大阪大学大学院教授)

Kana OYABU*
大藪 加奈

Abstract

On November 1st, 2019, Professor Nobuyuki Hino of Osaka University was invited to Kanazawa University to give a public lecture on the use of English as an international language (EIL) in English-medium instruction (EMI) classes. Professor Hino has explained different schools of thought concerning the use of English in intra-national and international contexts. He has also illustrated English language pedagogy in a content and language integrated higher education class which enables students to learn subject content as well as English. According to Professor Hino, EMI class provides valuable opportunities for students to learn both content and English language for international communication. The lecture attracted audience consisting of English language instructors, instructors of EMI courses, higher education researchers, as well as administrative staff in charge of university EMI. The lecture was in Japanese with English visual aids.

1. Definition of Terms

Professor Hino began his lecture by defining different terms used in his field of study. First, he stated that “EMI” usually refers to English medium education in “Expanding Circle.” Expanding Circle (Kachru, 1985, 1988) is the kind of countries and regions where English is used, but not as a native language of its nationals like Inner Circle (e.g., Britain), or as one of the official languages (often imposed by English-speaking colonizers) like Outer Circle (e.g., India).

Professor Hino then mentioned different schools of research on English used as an international language studied by researchers. They are English as an International Language (EIL) studied by Smith (1976/1983), World Englishes (WE) led by Kachru, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) proposed by Jenkins (2000), and *kokusai-eigo* suggested by Kunihiro (1970). According to Professor Hino, there are similarities and differences in the way scholars see English(es) used in an international context.

* Faculty of Foreign Language Education, Institute of Liberal Arts and Science, Kanazawa University

1.1. English as an International Language (EIL)

The first type of English Professor Hino explained is EIL. EIL scholars such as Smith (1976/1983, 1978/1983, 1981, 1987) do not see native and non-native English users in a hierarchal manner. They are of the opinion that non-native English users do not have to copy native-speaker English. Instead, they can use their version of English to express their own thoughts and values without worrying about speaking in British or American pronunciation or using a typically native expression. In their view, non-native English users are in no way inferior to native English users. This is because, in their view, whether one is a native English speaker or not does not in itself determine the value of what the speaker say, or how clearly one can express oneself.

1.2. World Englishes (WE)

Next, professor Hino describes the position of World Englishes school, led by Kachru (1965, 1976, 1986, 1997). According to Professor Hino, WE had originated from the study of intra-national use of “postcolonial Englishes” among Outer Circle (e.g., India). WE is similar to EIL in that WE scholars regards Englishes of the Outer Circle equal to that of the Inner Circle. WE researchers maintain that the users of World Englishes do not need to follow the Inner Circle English model because different varieties of English are already established languages of each region. Professor Hino mentioned that EIL has largely been integrated with WE. However, he pointed out that unlike EIL scholars, WE scholars seem to place a hierarchal division between established Outer Circle Englishes (e.g., Indian English) and non-established Expanding Circle Englishes (e.g., Japanese English).

1.3. English as a lingua franca (ELF)

Then, Professor Hino introduced ELF (Jenkins, 2000, 2015; Seidlhofer, 2006, 2009, 2011; Mauranen, 2012; Widdowson, 2012, 2015), which he regards as the newest but most potent school in the study of international English in recent years. According to Professor Hino, ELF study focuses on English communication between people who do not necessarily share a mother tongue. For ELF scholars, English is a “fluid” and “dynamic” entity “collaboratively constructed in-situ in a multilingual or translingual setting” rather than “a collection of varieties” (from Professor Hino’s slide). Thus, he distinguished it from more static WE concept of Englishes that are tied to a particular country or region.

1.4. *kokusai-eigo*

Professor Hino also briefly touched upon *kokusai-eigo* (a Japanese word for international English) school developed in Japan (Kunihiro, 1970; Suzuki, 1971, 1975). This school is similar to EIL in that it also deals with English as a means of international communication but it focuses on a Japanese setting. *kokusai-eigo* school aims to find how Japanese people can communicate Japanese culture successfully and confidently in Japanese-style English.

1.5. EIL and EMI

Professor Hino expanded on his version of EIL (Hino, 2018). His EIL integrates WE, ELF, and *kokusai-eigo* concepts, and has following features (Words in quotation marks are from Professor Hino's Power Point slides):

1. It is used in the field of education. (It is a “pedagogical concept.”)
2. It is used to promote multicultural coexistence. (cf. Honna, 2008: “Multicultural symbiosis” as the ultimate goal.)
3. It is used as an international communication tool. (“International rather than intra-national.”)
4. It can be developed and changed (“Indigenization”) not only by Inner or Outer Circle English users, but also by Expanding Circle users.
5. There is no sacred status for this English, so new usage can be coined. (“Creation rather than emergence, of Expanding Circle varieties”)
6. It can be adopted to pedagogical practices of various areas. (cf. Hino, 1992; McKay, 2002, 2003 “Emphasis on locally-appropriate pedagogy.”)
7. Both situational “variation” (ELF) and regional “varieties” (WE) should be looked at. (“Variation of varieties”)

1.6. CLIL, CELFIL, and implicit ICEFL

Professor Hino has also explained three terms that are related to the use of English at a pedagogical setting. They are CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), CELFIL (Content and ELF Integrated Learning), and implicit ICEFL (Integrated Content and ELF). CLIL (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013) refers to a pedagogical method that focuses on the improvement of content knowledge/understanding as well as language acquisition/proficiency. Although CLIL is often discussed in elementary and secondary education, Professor Hino points out that CLIL is relevant in university EMI settings. This is because CLIL can and is applied to “all levels including higher education” (Watanabe, Ikeda, & Izumi, 2011; Smit & Dafouz, 2012). Compared to CLIL, CELFIL (Hino, 2015, 2017) has a narrower focus, as it deals with content and language integrated learning where English is used as a lingua franca by students with a different first language. While CLIL often takes place in classes where all students share their first language (e.g., Japanese), CELFIL class may include students from different countries studying together. Then Professor Hino went on to explain the difference between CELFIL and “implicit ICEFL (Integrating Content and ELF)” (Smit, 2013) which is another concept similar to CLIL and CELFIL.

Compared to the latter, CELFIL has an explicit aim concerning language acquisition while ICEFL, he surmises, regards language acquisition as an implicit byproduct of content-based ELF education.

1.7. EIL and EMI

In Professor Hino's view, EMI contributes to EIL education. This is because EMI provides an authentic situation for EIL use which traditional class, may it CLIL or English language class, lacked. For instance, students do not feel the need to use English if both students and the instructor are Japanese. Being forced to speak in English or taught in English in such an inauthentic situation is counterproductive for students' motivation to learn the content or the language, he argues. However, recent increase in EMI classes makes it possible for students and instructors to use English, and especially EIL or EFL authentically.

2. Background to Professor Hino's Research: "EIL talk show" in English for Millions (1989–1990)

Professor Hino explained how he came to be interested in EIL. This goes back to the time when he was a presenter of English for Millions, a radio program on learning English. In the program, Professor Hino invited various EIL speakers, such as Filipino English speakers, a Malaysian English speaker, a Bangladesh English speaker, and a French English speaker. One of such speakers was Professor Benito Pacheco, an EMI engineering professor teaching at Tokyo University then. According to Professor Hino, Professor Pacheco reported that his Japanese students were learning English from him and from other non-Japanese students even though the EMI class was not an English class. These words by Professor Pacheco gave him an inspiration to research EIL.

3. Professor Hino's Research

3.1. ELF studies on EMI in higher education

Professor Hino stated that ELF research on EMI in higher education has been conducted mainly from sociolinguistic point of view. Thus, how English is used in EMI setting had been the main interest of researchers so far. According to him, there are researches on linguistic and micro-sociolinguistic aspects (e.g., Smit, 2010; Mauranen, 2012; Iino & Murata, 2013; Gotti, 2014) and macro-sociolinguistic aspects (e.g., Shohamy, 2013; Jenkins, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2014, 2017). He decided to research on the pedagogical methodology because concrete methodologies which enable students to learn both the subject content and English as a foreign language had not been studied much.

3.2. Aim and research methods

The objective of Professor Hino's research is to "devise designs and procedures for CELFIL." In order to gain clues for effective CELFIL methodology, Professor Hino had been observing and videotaping various EMI courses, and conducting questionnaire and interviews with students and

instructors. He has also been using “reflective practice” (Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Richards & Farrell, 2005; Farrell, 2015; Freeman, 2016) for developing pedagogy.

3.3. Types of EMI classes observed

In Professor Hino’s research, class observation revealed the existence of different types of EMI classes. Breakdown of students are different: There are classes where Japanese students and international students (mainly non-native English speakers) study together, and classes attended by local Japanese students only. Instructor awareness also vary: There are instructors who make conscious efforts to teach English language as well as the content, and there are instructors who do not employ such an integrated approach.

4. Pedagogy in EMI Classes for EIL Acquisition

Professor Hino introduced a pedagogical framework proposed by Richards and Rodgers (1982) as a starting point to discuss the pedagogy of EIL in EMI classrooms. Approach, Design, and Procedure are the three components of the framework he used to analyse CELFIL (Content and ELF Integrated Learning). According to him, it is assumed that CELFIL is a pedagogy for higher education classes where students already have some basic knowledge of English even though majority of them may be “false beginners.”

4.1. Approach: Theory of language for CELFIL

Professor Hino listed the following as the basic theory of language in CELFIL pedagogy (words in quotes are from Professor Hino’s slides):

- Speakers are not confined to the “linguacultural frame of reference” that the language contains, and they are free to express their values.
- Non-native speakers do not have to follow “native speaker norms”.
- EIL has both “varieties of English” (Smith, 1976/1983) and “variations of English collaboratively constructed in-situ by the participants” (Seidlhofer, 2011; Widdowson, 2015; Jenkins, 2015).
- “Accommodation” (Jenkins, 2000, 2007) and “negotiation of meaning” (Seidlhofer, 2009; Berns, 2008) contributes to communication.

4.2. Approach: Theory of learning for CELFIL

Professor Hino stated the following characteristics as the theory of learning EIL:

- Learning of EIL is based on the intercultural nature of ELF communication (Seidlhofer, 2011; Baker, 2015).

-EIL can be learned by participating in EIL community where they receive support from other users.

-Language learning becomes more effective when cognitive and affective stimuli are given through meaningful content.

4.3. Design: Objectives of EIL in CELFIL pedagogy

According to Professor Hino, the aim of EIL pedagogy is to help students studying in EMI classes to learn both transferrable English communication skills and the subject content. The EIL abilities cover:

-spoken and written language with receptive, productive, and interactive aspects

-grammatical, phonological, lexical, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, discursive, non-verbal, and intercultural skills (Hino, 2019¹)

4.4. Design: Syllabus

In terms of syllabus, CELFIL class can include activities that aid the learning of EIL communication skills such as small-group discussion or special terms vocabulary building activities.

4.5. Design: Teaching method

Professor Hino illustrated teaching methods that can be employed in CELFIL class. One important point is to consider customs and traditions of discipline and locality in which EMI classes are situated. (Hino, 1988, 2016; Kern, 2000; McKay, 2003; Matsuda, 2012). Be it Mathematics or Engineering, different disciplines have different teaching styles, so such styles can be adopted in CELFIL classes. Also, different educational culture and tradition are observed in different regions, so they can be used in teaching CELFIL courses.

One example of regional adaptation Professor Hino gave was the use of L1. For instance, there is a long tradition of using local language (Japanese) in Japan when learning a foreign language. So rather than trying to exclude L1 completely, one can utilize L1 effectively in an EMI class. According to Professor Hino, researchers such as Cogo (2012) and Jenkins (2015) also acknowledge the function of L1 in ELF. Professor Hino showed some examples of L1 use such as a vocabulary sheet with English special terms and translated Japanese words.

Professor Hino also stressed the importance of considering and adopting to actual students. For instance, the use of L1 (of the majority of students) depends on how many international students there are in a class, and the proficiency of such international students concerning the language. Also, if there

¹ An e-book version published by Springer in 2019, a book version published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2020.

are students with various cultural backgrounds, an international model of teaching needs to be employed rather than a very local model. In addition, an authentic environment to practice EIL needs to be included outside classroom if in-class teaching is based on the traditional teaching style of a particular discipline. Furthermore, Professor Hino introduced a useful technique to avoid disrupting the flow of student discussion. This is the use of “recast” correction method, giving students the correct form without explicitly pointing out the errors students made.

4.6. Design: Roles of students and roles of teachers

According to Professor Hino, students can provide learning opportunities to each other in CELFIL classes. For instance, a group discussion gives an opportunity for less experienced students to learn from more experienced EIL users (cf. Lave & Wenger, 1991). On the other hand, the existence of less able students teach more skilled students how to adopt their explanation to diverse audience, and express more clearly in ELF.

Professor Hino introduced three roles of teachers in a CELFIL class. First, the teacher can be a facilitator as in any other active learning classes. Second, the teacher can not only teach subject content but also provide EIL input for students. Third, the teacher can be a role model for students. Being taught by such a teacher, students can familiarize themselves to EIL, and this contribute to the formation of a positive L2-speaker self-image. (Hino, 2017; Dörnyei, 2009).

Professor Hino mentioned the type of teachers in EMI classes in his research. According to him, majority of EMI instructors are content specialist rather than language specialist. He pointed out that the liaison between content teachers and language teachers is necessary for a successful CELFIL, but it is difficult to achieve in Japan.

4.7. Design: Instructional materials

For CELFIL, materials written by non-native speakers of English has values (Mauranen, 2012) especially for non-native English speakers.

5. Procedure: Classroom Techniques and Practices (OSGD)

Professor Hino introduced an effective technique for CELFIL called OSGD (Observed Small Group Discussion). OSGD consists of two parts. At first, one small group conducts a discussion in front of the whole class for 10 to 15 minutes. During this initial discussion, the rest of the students observe not only the content but also the communication strategies employed by the small group members. After the initial small group discussion, the whole group will discuss the content as well as the form of the initial discussion, and the instructor gives feedback in the whole-class discussion.

According to Professor Hino, OSGD is an improved version of a small-group discussion often done in class. In a normal small-group discussion, instructors cannot give an adequate feedback to students because he/she has to observe many groups discussing simultaneously. Instructor only sees a

fragment of a discussion, and students only learn by blindly making efforts without much help from the instructors. OSGD provides more structure as students observe, reflect, and practice discussion, and gain feedback from the instructor, too. In this way, students can learn communication strategies such as “accommodation, negotiation of meaning, translanguaging, backchannels, turn-taking, non-verbal cues, etc.” (from Professor Hino’s slide).

6. Conclusion

Professor Hino concluded his lecture by reiterating the value of EMI courses in providing students with both subject content and English language skills that can be used for international communication. He urged all of us to utilize such an opportunity.

References

- Hino, N. (2018). *EIL education for the Expanding Circle: A Japanese model*. London: Routledge.
- Fenton-Smith, B., Humphreys, P., & Walkinshaw, I. (Eds.). (2017). *English as a medium of instruction in higher-education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Bibliography

(References given in Professor Hino’s Lecture)

The following references were included in Professor Hino’s slides. However, only the authors’ surnames and the year of publication were given. All responsibility of the accuracy of the reference details lies with the report writer.

- Baker, W. (2015). *Culture and identity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Berns, M. (2008). World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and intelligibility. *World Englishes*, 27(3–4), 327–334.
- Cogo, A. (2012). ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(2), 287–313.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and language integrated learning: From practice to principles. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 182–204.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). *Content and language integrated learning: A research agenda*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for*

- TESOL professionals*. New York: Routledge.
- Freeman, D. (2016). *Educating second language teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gotti, M. (2014). Explanatory strategies in university courses taught in ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), 337–361.
- Hino, N. (1988). Yakudoku: Japan's dominant tradition in foreign language learning. *JALT Journal*, 10(1–2), 45–55.
- Hino, N. (1992). Nihon no Shakai Bunka niokeru Honyaku to Gaikokugo kyouiku [Translation and foreign language teaching in Japanese society and culture]. In *Eigo no shidouhou to kannrenkagaku* (『英語の指導法と関連科学』). Nichibun.
- Hino, N. (2015). Towards the development of CELFIL (Content and ELF integrated learning) for EMI classes in higher education in Japan. *Waseda Working Papers in ELF*, 4, 187–198.
- Hino, N. (2016). Negotiation between East Asian values and Anglophone culture in the teaching of English in Japan. In H. H. Liao (Ed.), *Critical reflections on foreign language education: Globalization and local interventions* (pp. 29–45). Taipei: The Language Training & Testing Center.
- Hino, N. (2017). The significance of EMI for the learning of EIL in higher education: Four cases from Japan. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English as a medium of instruction in higher-education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy* (pp. 115–131). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Hino, N. (2018). Designing CELFIL (content and ELF integrated learning) for EMI classes in higher education in Japan. In K. Murata (Ed.), *English-medium instruction from an English as a lingua franca perspective: Exploring the higher education context* (pp. 219–238). London: Routledge.
- Hino, N. (2019). ELF education for the Japanese context. In M. Konakahara & K. Tsuchiya (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca in Japan: Towards multilingual practices* (pp. 27–45). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Honna, N. (2008). *English as a multicultural language in Asian contexts: Issues and ideas*. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Iino, M., & Murata, K. (2013). We are jun-Japa: Dynamics of ELF communication in an English medium academic context. *Waseda working papers in ELF*, 2, 84–100.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49–85.

- Kachru, B. B. (1965). The Indianness in Indian English. *Word*, 21(3), 391–410.
- Kachru, B. B. (1976). Models of English for the Third World: White man's linguistic burden or language pragmatics. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(2), 221–239.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1988). The spread of English and sacred linguistic cows. In P. H. Lowenberg (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987* (pp. 207–228). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes 2000: Resources for research and teaching. In L. E. Smith & M. L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000* (pp.209–251). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). The language(s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism? *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 4–15.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2017). EMI in higher education in East and Southeast Asia: Challenges and proposals. Delivered at the 2nd EMI-ELF Workshop at Waseda.
- Kunihiro, M. (1970). *Eigo no hanashikata [English works for you]*. Tokyo: Minul Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, A. (2012). “Not everyone can be a star”: Students' and teachers' beliefs about English teaching in Japan. In P. Seargeant (Eds.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization* (pp. 38–59). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2003). Teaching English as an international language: The Chilean context. *ELT Journal*, 57(2), 139–148.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2006). English as a lingua franca in the Expanding Circle: What it isn't. In R. Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 40–50). London: Continuum.

- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 236–245.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2013). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196–210). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Smit, U. (2013). Learning affordances in integrating content and English as a lingua franca (“ICELF”): On an implicit approach to English medium teaching. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 3(1), 15–29.
- Smith, L. E. (1983). English as an international auxiliary language. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 1–5). Oxford: Pergamon Press. (Reprinted from *RELC Journal*, 7(2), 38–42, 1976)
- Smith, L. E. (1983). Some distinctive features of EIL vs. ESOL in English language education. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 13–20). Oxford: Pergamon Press. (Reprinted from *The Culture Learning Institute Report*, June 5–7 & 10–11, 1978)
- Smith, L. E. (1981). *English for cross-cultural communication*. London: Macmillan.
- Smith, L. E. (Ed.). (1987). *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in world Englishes*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. In U. Smit & E. Dafouz (Eds.), *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education*. *AILA Review*, 25, 1–12.
- Suzuki, T. (1971). English kara Englich e [From English to Englich]. *The English Teachers' Magazine*, January, 64–67.
- Suzumi, T. (1975). *Tozasareta gengo, Nihongo no sekai [A closed language: The world of Japanese]*. Tokyo: Shinchosha.
- Watanabe, Y., Ikeda, M., & Izumi, S. (2011). CLIL: Jochi Daigaku gaikokugo-kyoiku no aratanaru chosen [New challenges in foreign language education at Sophia University] Vol. 1. *Genri to hoho* [Principles and methodologies]. Tokyo: Sophia University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2015). ELF and the pragmatics of language variation. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 359–372.