

Addressing conceptual disagreements and representation in EMI teacher education

Kerry J. Pusey

MA-TESL from Northern Arizona University
PhD student in Educational Linguistics at the
University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education
E-mail: kpusey@upenn.edu

Recebido: 11 abr. 2020

Aprovado: 30 abr. 2020

Abstract: This paper describes three ways in which EMI teacher education curriculum can be informed and/or improved. Based on insights gained from piloting an EMI teacher training course at a university in the south of Brazil during the 2019 academic year, as well as an analysis of the limited body of literature on EMI teacher education, it is argued that (1) conflicting definitions of EMI, (2) critical dimensions of EMI, and (3) contributions from the field of TESOL be included as themes and/or key sources of information in EMI teacher education programs.

Keywords: English as a Medium of Instruction. Teacher Education. Higher Education. Internationalization.

Resumo: Este artigo descreve três maneiras pelas quais o currículo de formação de professores de Inglês como Meio de Instrução (*English as a Medium of Instruction* – EMI) pode ser informado e/ou aprimorado. Com base nas ideias obtidas com o piloto de um curso de treinamento de professores de EMI em uma universidade no sul do Brasil durante o ano acadêmico de 2019, bem como em uma análise do corpo limitado de literatura sobre a formação de professores de EMI, argumenta-se que (1) definições conflitantes do EMI, (2) dimensões críticas do EMI e (3) contribuições do campo do TESOL devem ser incluídas como temas e/ou fontes importantes de informação nos programas de formação de professores do EMI.

Palavras-chave: Inglês como Meio de Instrução. Formação do Professor. Ensino Superior. Internacionalização.

Resumen: Este artículo describe tres formas en que se puede informar y/o mejorar el currículo de capacitación de maestros de Inglés como Medio de Instrucción (EMI). Sobre la base de los conocimientos adquiridos del piloto de un curso de formación de docentes de EMI en una universidad del sur de Brasil durante el año académico 2019, así como un análisis del cuerpo limitado de literatura sobre la formación de docentes de EMI, se argumenta que (1) existen definiciones contradictorias de EMI, (2) dimensiones críticas de EMI y (3) las contribuciones del campo de TESOL deben incluirse como temas importantes y/o fuentes de información en los programas de capacitación docente de EMI.

Palabras clave: Inglés como Medio de Instrucción. Formación del Profesor. Enseñanza Superior. Internacionalización.

Addressing conceptual disagreements and representation in EMI teacher education

Over the last two decades, higher education institutions (HEIs) across the globe have been increasing the number of courses offered through English as a medium of instruction (EMI). Spurred by increasing pressure worldwide to internationalize higher education, along with the advent of transnational sociopolitical and educational movements, such as the Bologna Process in Europe and the establishment of ASEAN in Southeast Asia, EMI programs have served as a means for facilitating student and faculty mobility, and as a mechanism through which institutions can interpret course credits from other universities (KLING, 2019).

In South America, processes of and activities related to internationalization have seen less development, comparatively. In Brazil specifically, according to a recent survey conducted by the *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior* (CAPES) for the British Council (2018), though EMI courses have been offered in one form or another for well over a decade, out of a total of 320 universities that replied to the survey, the number of universities classified as “highly internationalized” was only eight (i.e., less than 3 percent).

Nevertheless, EMI offerings, whether as individual courses or entire degree programs, have continued to proliferate in Brazil. According to another research report commissioned by the British Council (GIMENEZ; SARMENTO; ARCHANJO; ZICMAN; FINARDI, 2018), out of 84 HEIs that responded to a large-scale survey, 73 were either currently offering or planning to offer EMI courses. One might infer, therefore, that the actual number of programs offering EMI classes in some form or another is well above this figure, given the proportion of respondent universities to the total number of universities in the country, and in light of the time that has elapsed since the survey was administered (i.e., more than two years, at the time of writing).

Thus, the number of Brazilian HEIs offering EMI courses is rapidly increasing, largely in response to global demands to internationalize. However, the implementation of EMI – both in Brazil and in other parts of the world – is often carried out without due consideration of the needs of the teachers and students involved (DEARDEN, 2015; KLING, 2019; DRLJAČA MARGIĆ; VODOPIJA-KRSTANOVIĆ, 2018; MACARO; CURLE;

PUN; AN; DEARDEN, 2018; MARTINEZ, 2016). In other words, the linguistic and communicative demands, pedagogical challenges, and barriers to learning introduced by EMI are often overlooked and underappreciated by educational policymakers. The reasons for this apparent oversight are complex and varied, as will be explained in more detail below. However, in order to rectify - or at least improve the current situation, a potential starting point is through the introduction of EMI teacher education programs. Because EMI maintains a unique duality, in that it functions as both an educational language policy as well as a form of pedagogical practice (CORRIGAN, 2015), EMI teachers themselves play a particularly crucial role: They must at once interpret the language policy within their classrooms (MENKEN; GARCÍA, 2010), as well as utilize certain instructional approaches in order to accommodate students' learning of content through a second/foreign language (L2).

Drawing on the small body of literature that exists on EMI teacher training (cf. MACARO et al., 2018), as well as insights gained from a 48-hour project-based EMI teacher training course that was piloted over the academic year of 2019 at Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos (UNISINOS), this paper argues for the inclusion of three essential concepts (or components) in the curriculum of future EMI teacher education programs. These concepts are as follows:

1. A priori definitions of EMI are inadequate. Rather, local constraints, needs, and principles (cf. NATION; MACALISTER, 2010), which may include coordination with national and/or transnational agreements and partnerships, should determine how EMI is defined at any given place and time.
2. EMI teacher education programs must include critical dimensions of EMI, in addition to language, communication, and pedagogy components.
3. The academic field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) should inform EMI teacher education curriculum.

In what follows, each of these concepts/components are briefly defined and exemplified. Then, the implications of each for EMI teacher education are laid out. It is hoped that by justifying the inclusion of these concepts, future EMI teacher training curricula can be improved, thus bettering the chances of achieving the goals of individual EMI courses, as well as the larger university aims of internationalization.

Conflicting definitions of EMI

The complexities of planning for the implementation of EMI stem, in part, from a number of conceptual disagreements. One such disagreement relates to conflicting definitions of EMI, and of what EMI courses should entail (MACARO et al., 2018; PECORARI; MALMSTRÖM, 2018). On the one hand, some researchers and practitioners interpret EMI as being equivalent to an ‘English only’ learning environment, in which English is the sole language used for instruction, including class lectures, course content and materials (e.g., textbooks, articles), class discussions, and administrative communication (e.g., email, course syllabi, the online learning management system). Such an interpretation is exemplified in the following definition from Aguilar (2017, p. 726), as cited in Pecorari and Malmström (2018):

EMI implies that content – which is given in English – is the priority. Some incidental language learning is expected due to exposure but without any specific language learning goals. English (language) learning is not assessed. Scarce or no collaboration [exists] between content and English specialists. There may be little accommodation in terms of methodology, only to guarantee comprehension and understanding of content. (PECORARI; MALMSTRÖM, 2018, p. 498)

As can be seen, this ‘strong version’ of EMI dictates that the English language itself, as well as any complementary forms of language support, is *not* the focus of instruction, nor is incidental language learning an explicit learning outcome (though it is, apparently, a hoped-for byproduct).

In actual practice, however, reality often belies this strong version of EMI. In so-called “partial EMI” contexts (PECORARI; MALMSTRÖM, 2018), English may be used while delivering lectures as well as in certain (or all) didactic course materials, while the first language (L1) of the teacher and students (i.e., in bilingual settings) may be used for other activities (e.g., giving directions, logistical matters). Indeed, there is a spectrum of possibilities within which EMI may be situated and implemented (KLING, 2019), ranging from the ‘strong version’ with no overt language support and no explicit goal of language development (noted above), to something more akin to content-based instruction (CBI) or

content and language integrated learning (CLIL) – both of which *do* maintain an explicit and planned – for focus on language development. An example definition that represents the opposite end of the content and language integration spectrum, as compared with the definition from Aguilar given above, comes from Pecorari and Malmström (2018):

EMI involves an educational setting in which language learning objectives are in symbiosis rather than in tension with subject content objectives; and in which good planning ensures that the preconditions for success are in place, and that the acquisition of English is incidental, but not accidental (PECORARI; MALMSTRÖM, 2018, p. 511).

Though such a definition is highly idealized (this was in fact the authors' rhetorical intention), it demonstrates the range of possibilities available for the interpretation and thus the implementation of EMI. It would seem, then, that Coleman, Hultgren, Li, Tsui, and Shaw (2018) are correct in observing “there is no such thing as a prototypical EMI environment” (p. 703). Binary definitions of EMI (or a ‘one size fits all approach’; cf. MARTINEZ, 2016) are therefore inadequate when one considers the actual range of programs that exist, and the various ways in which individual instructors implement language policy in their classrooms (MENKEN; GARCÍA, 2010). It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that EMI teacher education programs explore these differing definitions with pre-and in-service EMI instructors, and give teachers a chance to reflect on their own beliefs (or ideologies) regarding language use in the classroom.

Critical dimensions of EMI

Up until fairly recently, EMI has entered into academic discourse mainly in terms of its role as an institutional language policy (CORRIGAN, 2015), and discussions have centered on critical questions of power and agency among the various stakeholders involved (e.g., boards of trustees, university presidents, and deans on the one hand, and teachers and students on the other). By and large, however, such aspects of EMI implementation do not appear to figure prominently into teacher education, as evidenced from a review of the EMI teacher education literature (e.g., BALL; LINDSDAY, 2013; CORRIGAN, 2015; CRESPO; LLANOS TOJEIRO, 2018; DRLJAČA MARGIĆ; VODOPIJA-KRSTANOVIĆ, 2018;

MARTINEZ; FERNANDES, 2020). However, in order for EMI instructors to fully grasp how what they do in their classrooms impacts larger discursive projects (e.g., internationalization, the global spread of the English language), an understanding of such critical issues is vital. Here, a brief discussion of some of the critical dimensions of EMI which might figure fruitfully into teacher education programs is included.

The power struggles that underlie EMI are numerous. To cite but a few of these critical issues, one might initially consider *why* EMI is increasingly being introduced around the globe (SHOHAMY, 2013); how EMI in Brazil/the Global South compares to its implementation in the Global North (PHAN, 2018); whose interests it is serving; and what potential negative effects it might have on local language and culture. A notable example of this latter point is the phenomenon of “domain loss” (COLEMAN et al., 2018; KLING, 2019), which refers to the lack or loss of local language terminology for describing and discussing certain academic content – in this case, as a consequence of the global spread of English. This can already be observed in many STEM fields (e.g., astrophysics, mathematics, medicine, engineering), and is bolstered, in part, by the proliferation of EMI programs. Whether directly (e.g., in university websites, flyers, and other promotional materials) or indirectly (i.e., as a form of ‘symbolic capital’; BOURDIEU, 1991), EMI promotes particular perceptions (whether real or ‘imaginary’; KANNO; NORTON, 2003) regarding the status, prestige, utility, readership, and circulation of English and non-English academic research output, thereby introducing implicit valuations of particular languages (i.e., English vs. local languages) and academic cultural production. Because ‘strong’ versions of EMI also preclude the use of non-English texts, even when these materials may be the best – or only – resources for teaching certain subjects/topics, further detrimental effects may also be introduced in terms of learning potential.

Furthermore, it can be argued that EMI programs function on some level as gatekeepers, offering differential access to certain educational opportunities. Specifically, those who do not enjoy adequate levels of academic English language proficiency (the threshold of which remains to be determined), which is often mediated by sociodemographic factors such as social class, race, ethnicity, and age, among other variables, may be marginalized from full participation in the university and the wider academic community. (Indigenous and refugee students are particularly vulnerable in this respect [cf. SHOHAMY,

2013]). In this regard, it is necessary to interrogate the motives, ethicality, and purpose(s) of EMI, and thereby question the integrity of our educational offerings.

Moreover, even when teachers and students are able to access (i.e., teach or enroll in) EMI courses, there still may be large differences in language proficiency that present significant challenges for both groups. The question thus arises: If teachers are not [fully] able to teach academic content due to limitations in their English language repertoires, how much content learning is actually taking place? Similarly, if students are facing significant gaps in comprehension due to their own linguistic limitations, to what extent is the ‘imagined mobility’ (cf. KANNO; NORTON, 2003) promised by internationalization actually borne out? As Shohamy (2013) observes, “The extent to which university students reach expected levels of academic knowledge when they are taught via a language that many... are not fully proficient in is still an open and under-researched question” (p. 202) – a sentiment also expressed by Macaro et al. (2018, pp. 37-38).

In sum, these critical dimensions of EMI are important for pre – and in – service teachers to consider, as they have implications for how teachers teach their classes and interact with their students. They may additionally affect how teachers conceptualize their roles within the university and wider national and international educational landscape.

Potential contributions from TESOL to EMI

The notion of EMI as a *practice*, akin to a type of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (i.e., “English-for-teaching”; FREEMAN; KATZ; GOMEZ; BURNS, 2015), has only recently begun to receive serious attention (CORRIGAN, 2015) – a trend that is even more recent still in Brazil (MARTINEZ, 2016; MARTINEZ; FERNANDES, 2020). Among other implications, this points to the underdeveloped role of the field of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) in informing EMI (FREEMAN et al., 2015; PECORARI; MALMSTRÖM, 2018). Yet, there is perhaps no other academic field that is more qualified to do so, given that the central challenge of EMI implementation - that is, overcoming barriers to educational access brought on by limitations in English language proficiency, strategic competence, and/or functional adequacy (CANAGARAJAH, 2013;

HERRAIZ-MARTINEZ; ALCÓN-SOLER, 2019) – constitutes the very substance of inquiry that comprises the field of TESOL.

TESOL can lend to the task of teaching EMI courses and supporting students in multiple ways. In terms of pedagogy, TESOL researchers have long investigated teaching practices that enhance communication and support learning in multilingual environments. These include, for example, using open-ended forms of questioning in order to elicit extended (rather than limited) responses; ensuring sufficient ‘wait time’ when posing extemporaneous questions; grouping students strategically for different tasks (e.g., by shared language ability, or mixed ability levels, based on the task at hand); using a variety of scaffolding techniques (e.g., providing reading guides and semi-structured lecture outlines; pre-teaching vocabulary; activating background knowledge before diving into a lecture); incorporating motivational strategies; and using gestures and other multimodal semiotic resources to help amplify meaning (BROWN, 2007; CANAGARAJAH, 2013, 2017; DOUGLAS FIR GROUP, 2016; HALL, 2019; LIGHTBOWN; SPADA, 2013; MATSUMOTO, 2018; MATSUMOTO; DOBBS, 2017).

Another way in which TESOL can contribute to EMI teacher education is by helping teachers to understand basic principles of second language learning. Over the past four decades, a massive amount of research has accumulated on the various factors that influence second language learning processes (GASS; SELINKER, 2008; LIGHTBOWN; SPADA, 2013; DOUGLAS FIR GROUP, 2016; HALL, 2019). To illustrate, the notions of comprehensible input, pushed output, and the negotiation for meaning are one set of interrelated concepts with relevance to EMI. As one necessary precondition for second language development to occur, it is argued that L2 speech and written texts (i.e., ‘input’) need to be at a level of complexity and familiarity that is understandable to L2 users (or just above their current proficiency level). In addition, L2 users need to have opportunities for producing modified output – that is, they need opportunities to modify, negotiate, and ‘push’ (i.e., expand) their verbal or written production in response to cues received from interactional feedback (BROWN, 2007; LIGHTBOWN; SPADA, 2013; MACKAY, 2006). With these concepts in mind, EMI instructors may consider the ways in which they can make their lectures more ‘comprehensible,’ such as by monitoring their speech rate and vocabulary

choices, as well as how they can give students chances to ‘negotiate for meaning’ with their peers (e.g., by discussing critical thinking questions related to course content).

One other example of research in TESOL with implications for EMI concerns the amount of vocabulary knowledge needed for basic comprehension of academic written and aural texts (e.g., academic journal articles or lectures). According to well established findings in L2 vocabulary research (NATION, 2006; SCHMITT, 2008), knowledge of around 3,000 of the most frequently used words is needed in order to achieve 95% comprehension of written texts; however, for 98% coverage, the number jumps to upwards of 8,000 words (NATION, 2006). (This number decreases to around 6,000 words in the case of spoken texts.) Equipped with this knowledge, EMI professors might aid students by creating a class glossary of terms, pre-teaching vocabulary or specialized jargon before assigning a given reading, and planning in advance which keywords to emphasize in their teaching materials and classes (e.g., by writing and defining these words on the whiteboard).

Countless other examples could be given of research from TESOL that could lend support to the design of EMI courses and teacher education programs, such as the role of psychological factors in L2 learning (DÖRNYEI, 2005), or the place of language in EMI course assessment (SHOHAMY, 2013). However, space does not permit a more thorough treatment in the present paper. Suffice to say that insights from TESOL, such as those mentioned above, may help teachers better understand the nature of communication in EMI classrooms, and enable them to create learning environments that are more conducive to incidental language learning (HULSTIJN, 2013). Anticipating the challenges that students in EMI classes are likely to face is particularly important, as these students must cope with not only linguistic barriers, but also conceptual barriers as they learn about new content in their respective academic fields through a nonnative language (SHOHAMY, 2013). Thus, at the very least, possessing some knowledge of TESOL may help ensure that content learning is not adversely affected (MACARO et al., 2018), which is, after all, ‘the main objective.’

Concluding remarks

This paper set out to briefly sketch the current state of EMI in Brazil, as well as indicate ways in which EMI teacher education can be informed and/or improved. Based on

findings from the small number of studies that exist on EMI teacher education (MACARO et al., 2018), as well as insights gained while piloting a teacher training course at UNISINOS over the academic year of 2019, it was argued that three crucial concepts/components be included in future EMI teacher training courses. These concepts were as follows: (1) One size does *not* fit all when it comes to EMI (cf. MARTINEZ, 2016); rather, as both a policy and a practice, EMI should be defined based on the needs, environmental constraints, and principles held by the relevant local stakeholders involved; (2) critical aspects of EMI implementation need to be sufficiently explored in teacher education programs in order for teachers to understand their role in larger university projects and educational goals (e.g., internationalization); and (3) the field of TESOL should inform EMI teacher education curriculum to a much greater extent than it currently does. Each of these concepts were explored in some detail; however, these were necessarily summary treatments of complex issues that could each easily take up an entire article on their own. Readers interested in these topics are encouraged to further explore some of the references given throughout the paper – in particular, the 2018 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue “At the Crossroads of TESOL and English Medium Instruction”.

Going forward, much more research is needed on the impact of EMI teacher education programs – especially within the Brazilian context. Ideally, studies should be longitudinal, and should examine how teacher education programs impact teachers’ pedagogical practices, communicative repertoires (RYMES, 2014), and linguistic development over time. Moreover, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative research methods and data sources would likely yield more robust and informative results. Fortunately, it appears that momentum is building in this regard, with initiatives such as the Brazilian English as a Medium of Instruction Seminar (BEMIS, which held its second annual conference in São Paulo during the year of 2019) as hopeful signs of things to come.

References

At the Crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction [Special issue]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), p. 493-720, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/15457249/2018/52/3> Accessed on March 3, 2019.

BALL, P.; LINDSAY, D. Language demands and support for English-medium instruction in tertiary education. Learning from a specific context. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster: J.M. Sierra (Eds.). **English-medium instruction at universities: global challenges**. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013. p. 44-66.

BOURDIEU, P. **Language and symbolic power** (J. B. Thompson, Ed., G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

BRITISH COUNCIL. **Universidades para o mundo: desafios e oportunidades para internacionalização**. 2018. Retrieved from: <https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/atividades/educacao/internacionalizacao/universidades-para-o-mundo/primeira-edicao> Accessed on August 15, 2019.

BROWN, H. D. **Principles of language learning and teaching** (5th ed). New York, NY: Pearson Longman, 2007.

CANAGARAJAH, S. **Translingual practice: global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations**. London: Routledge, 2013.

CANAGARAJAH, S. Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. **Applied linguistics**, 39, p. 31-54. 2017. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041> Accessed on July 6, 2019.

COLEMAN, J.; HULTGREN, K.; LI, W.; TSUI, C.; SHAW, P. Forum on English-medium instruction. **TESOL Quarterly**, 52(3), p. 701-720. 2018. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1002/tesq.469 Accessed on March 27, 2020.

CORRIGAN, P. C. Designing a pre-service teacher education course in English for the medium of instruction. **Asian EFL Journal**, 88, p. 97-112. 2015. Retrieved from: [https://scholars.cityu.edu.hk/en/publications/publication\(a293f59b-b3d0-4913-adb6-8b9923bfb90d\).html](https://scholars.cityu.edu.hk/en/publications/publication(a293f59b-b3d0-4913-adb6-8b9923bfb90d).html) Accessed on March 7, 2019.

CRESPO, B.; LLANOS TOJEIRO, A. EMI teacher training at the University of A Coruña. **Fourth international conference on higher education advances**. Valencia, Spain: Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València, 2018. p.925-933. Retrieved from: doi:10.4995/HEAD18.2018.8117 Accessed on March 14, 2019.

DEARDEN, J. **English as a medium of instruction: a growing global phenomenon**. London, England: British Council, 2015.

DÖRNYEI, Z. **The psychology of the language learner: individual differences in second language acquisition**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.

DOUGLAS FIR GROUP. A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. **Modern Language Journal**, 100, p. 19-47. 2016. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301> Accessed on August 31, 2019.

DRLJAČA MARGIĆ, B.; VODOPIJA-KRSTANOVIĆ, I. Language development for English-medium instruction: teachers' perceptions, reflections and learning. **Journal of English for Academic Purposes**, 35, p. 31-41, 2018. Retrieved from: doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2018.06.005 Accessed on March 23, 2020.

FREEMAN, D.; KATZ, A.; GARCIA, G. P.; BURNS, A. English-for-teaching: rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. **ELT Journal**, 69(2), p. 29-139, 2015. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074> Accessed on March 23, 2020.

GASS, S.; SELINKER, L. **Second language acquisition: an introductory course** (3rd ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis, 2008.

GIMENEZ, T.; SARMENTO, S.; ARCHANJO, R.; ZICMAN, R.; FINARDI, K. **Guide to English as a medium of instruction in Brazilian higher education institutions 2018-2019**. São Paulo: British Council, 2018.

HALL, J.K. **Essentials of SLA for L2 teachers: a transdisciplinary framework**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2019.

HERRAIZ-MARTINEZ, A.; ALCÓN-SOLER, E. Pragmatic outcomes in the English-medium instruction context: The influence of intensity of instruction. **Applied pragmatics** 1(1), p. 68-91, 2019. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ap.00004.her> Accessed on May 9, 2019.

HULSTIJN, J.H. Incidental learning in second language acquisition. In: CHAPELLE, C. A. (Ed.). **The encyclopedia of applied linguistics**. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2013. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0530 Accessed on March 29, 2020.

KANNO, Y.; NORTON, B. Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. **Journal of Language, Identity, and education**, 2(4). p. 241-249, 2003. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1207/S15327701JLIE0204_1 Accessed on March 28, 2019.

KLING, J. **TIRF language education in review: English as a medium of instruction**. Monterey, CA & Baltimore, MD: TIRF & Laureate International Universities, 2019.

LIGHTBOWN, P. M.; SPADA, N. **How languages are learned** (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

MACARO, E.; CURLE, S.; PUN, J.; AN, J.; DEARDEN, J. A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. **Language Teaching**, 51, p. 36-76, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350> Accessed on January 24, 2019.

MACKEY, A. Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. **Applied linguistics**, 27(3), p. 405-430, 2006. Retrieved from: doi:10.1093/applin/ami051 Accessed on January 9, 2020.

MARTINEZ, R. English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in Brazilian higher education: Challenges and opportunities. In K., Finardi (Ed.). **English in Brazil: views, policies and programs**. Londrina: Eduel, 2016. p.191-228.

MARTINEZ, R.; FERNANDES, K. Development of a teacher training course for English medium instruction for higher education professors in Brazil. In: SÁNCHEZ-PÉREZ, M. (Ed.). **Teacher training for English-medium instruction in higher education**. IGI Global, 2020. p.125-152.

MATSUMOTO, Y. Challenging moments as opportunities to learn: The role of nonverbal interactional resources in dealing with conflicts in English as a lingua franca classroom

- interactions. **Linguistics and education**, 48, p. 35-51, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.08.007> Accessed on December 19, 2019.
- MATSUMOTO, Y.; DOBS, A. Pedagogical gestures as interactional resources for teaching tense and aspect in the ESL classroom. **Language learning**, 67(1), p. 7-42, 2017. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12181> Accessed on October 18, 2019.
- MENKEN, K.; GARCÍA, O. Introduction. In MENKEN, K; García, O. (Eds.), **Negotiating language policies in schools: educators as policymakers**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010. p.1-10.
- NATION, I.S.P. How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening?. **The Canadian modern language review**, 63(1). p. 59-82, 2006. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59> Accessed on September 16, 2019.
- NATION, I.S.P.; MACALISTER, J. **Language curriculum design**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- PECORARI, D.; MALMSTRÖM, H. At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. **TESOL Quarterly**, 52(3), p. 497-514, 2018. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1002/tesq.470 Accessed on March 10, 2019.
- PHAN, L. H. Higher education, English, and the idea of ‘the west’: globalizing and encountering a global south regional university. **Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education**, 39(5), p. 782-797, 2018. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1080/01596306.2018.1448704 Accessed on March 12, 2020.
- RYMES, B. **Communicating beyond language: everyday encounters with diversity**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2014.
- SCHMITT, N. Instructed second language vocabulary learning. **Language teaching research**, 12(3), p. 329-363, 2008. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921> Accessed on September 16, 2019.
- SHOHAMY, E. 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**. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013. p. 196-210.