Constructing English Medium Instruction indicators in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal:</th>
<th><em>Maritime Business Review</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript ID</td>
<td>MABR-07-2017-0020.R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Type:</td>
<td>Research Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords:</td>
<td>English Medium Instruction, Shipping, Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constructing English Medium Instruction indicators in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education

Abstract

Purpose
This paper uses an AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process) and combines this with fuzzy theory to identify key indicators influencing English Medium Instruction (EMI) in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s Higher Education.

Design/methodology/approach
Based on a literature review and expert interviews, an evaluation model with four indicators and thirteen sub-indicators was developed. Questionnaire samples included university English teachers (8), university shipping teachers (9), and shipping practitioners (8).

Findings
Using 25 effective samples, the results found that ‘teachers’ characteristics’ is the most important indicator, followed by ‘syllabus design’, ‘university resources’, and ‘students’ characteristics’. Such a finding could provide valuable teaching and managerial strategies for EMI design in both the university and industry sectors.

Research limitations/implications
Expert questionnaire targets have focused on university English teachers, university shipping teachers, and shipping practitioners. Other related field experts could be further surveyed and compared in the future studies.

Practical implications
The findings of EMI indicators in the shipping courses could be used for course and material design by shipping companies, shipping authorities, and universities. It is expected these indicators could inform the provision of reasonable teaching resources allocation.

Social implications
This paper provides important guidance for designing EMI in shipping courses. Related stakeholders will be able to understand important concepts regarding designing EMI courses.
Originality/value
Firstly, EMI indicators in the shipping courses have seldom been studied in the past. They are, however, important for both shipping industries and education intuitions. Secondly, as its method this paper adopts decision analysis quantitative tool to complement previous qualitative studies regarding EMI studies.

English is a common language in the global shipping industry and many universities in non-speaking countries in the world are now moving towards the use of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) to deliver their courses. Such a medium increases students’ proficiency in the common language used and also allows institutions to recruit students from different parts of the world. Yet, delivering such instruction using EMI is not without its challenges. This paper uses an AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process) and combines this with fuzzy theory to identify key indicators influencing EMI in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education. Based on a literature review and expert interviews, an evaluation model with four indicators and thirteen sub-indicators was developed. Questionnaire samples included three groups: university English teachers (8), university shipping teachers (9), and shipping practitioners (8). Using 25 effective samples, the results found that teachers’ characteristics is the most important indicator, followed by syllabus design, university resources, and students’ characteristics. Results also provide valuable teaching and managerial strategies (e.g. curriculum adjustment) for EMI design in the university and industry sectors.
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1. Introduction
Taiwan, located in the Asia-Pacific region (between the southwest of Japan and the north of the Philippines), is an island of approximately 36,193 square kilometers (with a total population of approximately 23 million). Over 90% of international trade cargoes, (in terms of volume) in Taiwan, are carried by shipping. Understandably therefore, shipping development and education have historically always occupied a central and key position in the university education in Taiwan. For those students who go on to work in the shipping industry, it is essential they have a strong command of the English language (Pallis and Ng, 2011), as this is the medium in which communication is most commonly undertaken in the shipping industry. However, in Taiwan, Chinese is the first language and English is a second or other language, and there is thus a perennial challenge faced by students and lecturers in developing students’ English for the shipping industry. One approach to help address this challenge is to deliver

---

university education about shipping in English in Taiwan. Yet, although the need to introduce English learning into the Taiwanese education system has been conducted and emphasised for decades, there are actual implementation and introduction of such approaches is still in the early stages of development. Continual attempts to improve English learning. For Taiwanese universities, the purposes of introducing English Medium Instruction (EMI) courses are to (1) improve students’ English abilities and strengthen international mobility and employability, and (2) attract more international students to attend such courses. However, there remain a number of implementation barriers and challenges caused by a range of factors such as the learning environment, culture, learning skills, curriculum design, and the prevalence of an exam-based learning approach.

In the shipping industry, qualified shipping practitioners (e.g. seafarers, staff in shipping companies, shipping forwarders, shipping agents, ship-broker, port authorities, etc.) must have ‘good’ English abilities (including listening, speaking, reading, writing) (Pallis and Ng, 2011). Therefore, high proficiency in English is a prerequisite for employment in the shipping industry. In Taiwan, there are around 12 universities that provide shipping management related courses, and these shipping courses in shipping management related departments can be categorised into foundation courses and specialist courses. Generally, the former include introductory type courses such as ‘introduction to maritime management or shipping management’, ‘introduction to trade and shipping’, and ‘introduction to shipping and logistics’. The latter covers topics such as ‘liner shipping management’, ‘bulk shipping management’, ‘port planning and management’, ‘shipping economics’, ‘maritime insurance’, ‘maritime law’, ‘shipping finance’, ‘management of maritime organisations’, ‘shipbroker and chartering management’, ‘shipping and the environment’, and also ‘maritime technology’. The main language of instruction for the majority of these courses continues to be Chinese. Yet, the main language of international shipping operation and management and any shipping information communication (e.g. information announcement in international maritime organisation) is English. Therefore, there are many advantages is arguably a need to add English education in the form of EMI in Taiwanese shipping management related courses in order to link international shipping transport related industries (including insurance, law, international trade, etc.), international education system and other stakeholders (e.g. research organisation, governmental units, etc.).

Introducing EMI in university courses has increased in recent years in East Asia in general (Kedzierski, 2016) and for shipping related courses in Taiwan (Hu et al., 2008; Kedzierski, 2016).

For example, when a student graduates from senior high school (at about 18 years old) in Taiwan, they have learnt English for 6 years, if it is assumed their junior high school has had some form of English education. In recent years, most public elementary schools in Taiwan have started English language education classes when students are ten-years old. Also, some private elementary schools have started to introduce English education or bilingual Education (Chinese and English).
However, the introduction process and implementing of EMI teaching—has been accompanied by a number of issues. These can be broadly categorized as (1) students often lack sufficient vocabulary and have difficulty expressing their academic thinking, feelings, or thinking, (2) inappropriate course material can be unsuitable (e.g., students have difficulty learning all using English medium material due to their limited English ability), (3) Chinese and English language is used interchangeably in texts and language is mixed, and (4) there are significant differences in students’ levels of English in a class, and teachers find it difficult to adopt a uniform standard in any course assessments (e.g., IELTS (Pilcher and Richards, 2017)). Arguably, such issues affect both students’ learning motivation (Kedzierski, 2016) and also teachers’ teaching performances (Poon, 2013).

In addition, subject delivery presents other issues. These can be issues such as how the subject operates when delivered in English, and what exactly ‘English’ is defined to be here (Richards and Pilcher, 2014; Pilcher and Richards, 2016). Further, some countries, such as Malaysia, attempted to introduce EMI but then returned to using Bahasa after the project did not meet expectations (Gooch, 2009). In terms of the continually shifting nature of the shipping industry and how academia responds, some research notes the onus to be on the higher education institutions to keep abreast of the latest developments in the industry and to ensure their courses are up to date (Ng et al., 2009). Another issue to explore would be where shipping education training is situated in terms of whether it is situated in a business school or an engineering school, or whether it is standalone (Ng and Yip, 2009). Also, what such a position means for the accreditations it needs (Ng and Yip, 2009). Such issues help give a greater context to current understanding of EMI and are explored in this paper. Although it has been rightly noted in the literature that “a global labour market cannot be regulated by a national policy” (Gekara, 2009, pp. 229), it is useful to research and reflect on national policies toward shipping education, especially as it is expected that international guidelines are adhered to and taught in shipping education training (Ng and Yip, 2009).

In terms of methods adopted to research, previous studies in the EMI field have used a wide range of methods. Many of these studies have been based on reviews of the literature (Hu et al., 2008; Ng and Yip, 2009; Horck, 2010; Mok and Yu, 2011), or on surveys (Pallis and Ng, 2011) or on questionnaires (Dinwoodie, 2000; Ng et al., 2009; Fei and Lu, 2015). Notably, the approach has mainly adopted a qualitative approach or used only basic descriptive statistics. In this paper, in order to complement this previous analysis, method of EMI research, and obtain more insights into implications for the curriculum design and teaching strategies.
in the university, a **more in-depth and quantitative approach of a Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)** is used in this paper. This analysis approach to analysis method could help university teachers and related policy-makers to identify the most relevant indicators to develop their teaching strategies and allocate teaching resources— in the university.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews the literature regarding the background and implementation of EMI. Section 3 presents the methodology, and the results are presented and analysed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 provides discussions and conclusions, and also considers limitations and areas for future research.

### 2. Literature Review

#### 2.1 EMI Related Studies

Much research has noted the changing face of education in the shipping industry (Demirel and Ziarati, 2013). Many countries are adopting moving toward EMI, and requiring asking lecturers to teach in English, for example, Italy (Costa and Coleman, 2013), Finland (Hahl et al., 2016), Korea (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2014; Lee, 2017), and China (Hu and Lei, 2014). In Taiwan, Huang (2015) used a self-assessment questionnaire to gather 157 student samples to explore students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of EMI courses for Taiwanese students. Huang’s findings were that results found most students were motivated to take EMI courses to strengthen their English ability and professional knowledge. In Spain, Dafouz and Camacho-Miñano (2016), using 383 samples of student grades, used accounting as a case to explore the impact of EMI on university student academic achievement. Their results showed found no statistical differences across groups, and that the use of EMI did not lower student final academic outcomes. Further, Hellekjær (2009) used 578 Norwegian university students to study their academic English reading proficiency and to draw conclusions regarding the success of their previous English instruction at high school. Results showed found that about 30% of the sample had serious difficulties reading in English, while an additional 44% found it more difficult reading in English than reading in their first language. In another study, Kim et al. (2014), using 249 Koreans and 61 international students from non-English-speaking countries, found that English proficiency is of fundamental importance for success on EMI courses. Thus, EMI is a much-researched area, something which is entirely reflective of its increased use and prominence worldwide. Yet, the studies reviewed here highlight a number of challenges and key indicators for any research into EMI, which we now consider and expand on here, especially given that they were ones we used in our fuzzy AHP analysis.

#### 2.2 Key Indicators Influencing EMI in the Shipping Courses
Drawing on personal interviews with senior shipping practitioners and previous studies (e.g. Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Hu, 2007; Pan, 2007; Hellekjær 2009; Kirkgöz, 2009; Byun et al., 2011; Evan and Morrison, 2011a; 2011b; Tong and Shi, 2012; Costa and Coleman, 2013; Poon, 2013; Başbek et al., 2014; Goodman, 2014; Huang and Singh, 2014; Kim et al., 2014; Agai-Lochi, 2015; Clegg and Simpson, 2016; Dafozou and Camacho-Miñano, 2016), four indicators are described as follows.

2.2.1 Syllabus Design

Syllabus design is here denoted to relates to teaching strategies (e.g. material, textbook, assignments, examination, assessment process) used in the course content. These are key in helping which can guide students in understanding how to learn the teaching subject matters, provide effective learning guidelines, and improve levels of English. The content of syllabus design includes learning material, learning strategies and learning assessment (Costa and Coleman, 2013; Poon, 2013; Clegg and Simpson, 2016). In a shipping context, syllabus design will includes topics such as relate to introduction to shipping market (including liner and bulk shipping), port operation and management, maritime logistics and networks, and so on. Teaching points may well differ depending on teachers’ area of expertise and interests. Generally, in Taiwan, students have spent much time on reading about shipping, although listening, speaking, and writing may need to be further focused on. In terms of assessments, a term-project is also conducted in many the shipping related courses. Students are in addition asked to make a presentation at the end of the semester.

2.2.2 Students’ Characteristics

The category of Students’ characteristics includes students’ learning background, their English level, shipping knowledge (e.g. understanding main components of shipping), and learning habits (e.g. course material preparation and review, and note taking skills) (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Byun et al., 2011; Evan and Morrison, 2011a; 2011b; Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Başbek et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2014; Başbek et al., 2014; Evan and Morrison, 2011a; 2011b). In terms of students’ English knowledge and level, there are many important

---

* We interviewed two directors who work for Evergreen Marine Corp. and two who work for Yang Ming Marine Transport in Taiwan. These two companies are the number one and number two shipping companies in Taiwan and their global rankings are 6 and 8 in September 2017, respectively (Alphaliner, 2017). These two interviewees have more than 30 years’ practical working experiences and have been continuously concerned with university education for a long time. Based on these background data, it is believed that these experts constitute effective interview samples. Expert interviews were conducted in December 2016. Interviews took place in interviewees’ offices and used several questions (e.g. “What do you think about the English Medium Instruction in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education”, “Do you have any improvement suggestions to enhance English Medium Instruction in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education”, “Could you provide your comment or feedback about our initial questionnaire content?”) and questionnaire content as the focus for expert review. We further revised our questionnaire based on interviewees’ comments and feedback, in terms of what aspects were considered common, core, and important. Each interview averaged 40 minutes in length.
components: a range of items that could be key here. Firstly, students’ vocabulary will be essential. Importantly, rather than have a generic vocabulary here that may be useful for an admissions test of English such as the International English Language Testing System, or IELTS (Pilcher and Richards, 2017), what students will need is a vocabulary that is specific to shipping courses. Moreover, such a vocabulary will arguably be underpinned and be intertwined with key subject based elements specific to the shipping subject. In terms of their grammar, although undoubtedly clearly this will be important, but the level of grammar required might be different to that required in an admissions test if the subject takes primacy. Ultimately, students will need to have speaking and lexical ability, but to be able to demonstrate these within the subject. Analogously, if students are studying in the subject area of physics, they would need to be proficient in English in the field of physics (cf. Pilcher and Richards, 2016). Further, if students are studying a general admissions test on English such as IELTS they will need to be proficient in the English for this test, and not for shipping studies (Pilcher and Richards, 2017).

2.2.3 Teachers’ Characteristics

Teachers’ characteristics relates to teachers’ background in terms of English level (including listening, speaking, reading, writing, etc.), shipping professional shipping knowledge (including related teaching subjects), and teachers’ past experience of EMI teaching (Pan, 2007; Costa and Coleman, 2013; Goodman, 2014; Huang and Singh, 2014; Dafouz and Camacho-Miñano, 2016). As with the students’ knowledge of English, in this case, the teachers’ knowledge of English will need to be operational within the subject of shipping studies. Similarly, this may involve a different range of vocabulary and knowledge to physics (cf. Pilcher and Richards, 2016), and be different to the English required for a more general test (Pilcher and Richards, 2017) or for conversation and small talk. In other words, teachers’ knowledge of English is closely intertwined with their subject knowledge, and provided they are proficient in their subject, this subject knowledge will take primacy over elements such as grammatical accuracy (Richards and Pilcher, 2017). Thus, this means in practice is that teachers’ level of English may be more than sufficient if they can be able to answer questions at the end and during the lecture. However, to have sufficient English to hold a fluent conversation about the weather at the end of the lecture may not be needed.

2.2.4 University Resources

The category of university resources includes useful learning and teaching resources provided by the university, and these resources also include potential incentives used for students and teachers with the aim of improving learning and teaching effectiveness. In this paper, based on past studies (Hu, 2007; Hellekjær 2009; Kirkgöz, 2009; Costa and Coleman, 2013;
Tong and Shi, 2012; Hellekjær 2009; Kirkgöz, 2009; Agai-Lochi, 2015; Hu, 2007; Tong and Shi, 2012), university resources include classroom facilities, availability of resources, incentives for teachers, and incentives for students. Resources could relate to facilities aspects such as translation tools, microphones, recorders and standard teaching related technology, but also human resources such as and support staff in the form of such as academic advisors. Incentives for teachers could relate to aspects such as opportunities to attend overseas courses, salary increases, and favourable workload calculations. For students, incentives could relate to, for example, employability, and the fact that they can add their experience to a curriculum vitae, and it can help improve their attractiveness to employers.

After these four indicators and their sub-indicators were developed, face-to-face personal interviews with senior shipping practitioners were implemented to ensure the content validity of the questionnaire.

3. Methodology

AHP is a multi-indicator decision making method and is used to solve complex problems (Saaty, 1980; Yang et al., 2014). However, classical AHP may not accurately represent the ideas of the decision makers’ ideas. Consequently, Zadeh (1965) defined a fuzzy set as a class of objects with a continuum of grades of membership ranging between zero and one. Based on Zadeh (1965), fuzzy linguistic variables and corresponding fuzzy triangular numbers can be used for comparison among the elements included, and help solve vague and uncertain problems in decision-making. Therefore, fuzzy logic, using fuzzy pairwise comparison matrices, is introduced to reduce the uncertainty of AHP method (Chang, 1996). In this paper, we used a two-stage methodology to conduct Fuzzy AHP in order to identify the key indicators and sub-indicators. Firstly, we used AHP method to identify indicator and sub-indicator weights using expert choice 11.5 software. Secondly, we introduced fuzzy set theory with triangular fuzzy numbers (Zadeh, 1965; Buckley, 1985) and combined this with our AHP analysis results. A triangular fuzzy number, as it is used as the member function in fuzzy AHP, is

---

4 We interviewed two directors, one who worked for Evergreen Marine Corp. and one worked for Yang Ming Marine Transport in Taiwan. These two companies are the number one and number two shipping companies in Taiwan and their global rankings were respectively, 6th and 8th as of September 2017, respectively (Alphaliner, 2017). These directors, two interviewees each have more than 30 years’ practical working experiences and have been continuously engaged with university education over this for a long time. Based on these background data, it is believed that these experts constitute effective interview samples. Expert interviews were conducted in December 2016. Interviews took place in interviewees’ offices and used several questions (e.g. “What do you think about the English Medium Instruction in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education?”, “Do you have any improvement suggestions to enhance English Medium Instruction in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education?”, “Could you provide your comment or feedback about our initial questionnaire content?”) and questionnaire content formed the focus for ensuring the content validity of the questionnaire expert review. We further revised our questionnaire based on interviewees’ comments and feedback, in terms of what aspects were considered common, core, and important. Each interview averaged 40 minutes in length.
expressed in Fig. 1. Its membership function is defined by the triplet \( (l, m, u) \), as in Eq. (1) (Zadeh, 1975).

\[
U_{M(x)} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{x-l}{m-l}, & l \leq x \leq m \\
\frac{u-x}{u-m}, & m \leq x \leq u \\
0, & \text{others}
\end{cases}
\]

Where \( M(x) \) is a triangular fuzzy number, \( m \) is the highest possible value of the fuzzy number, and \( U_{M(x)} \), \( l \), and \( u \) respectively represent the lower and upper bounds.

The operational laws for \( M_1= (l_1, m_1, u_1) \) and \( M_2= (l_2, m_2, u_2) \), as two fuzzy numbers, are

\[
M_1 + M_2= (l_1+l_2, m_1+m_2, u_1+u_2)
\]

\[
M_1 \times M_2= (l_1 \times l_2, m_1 \times m_2, u_1 \times u_2)
\]

\[
\beta \times M_1= (\beta l_1, \beta m_1, \beta u_1), \quad \beta > 0, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}
\]

\[
M^{-1} = (l, m, u)^{-1} = \left( \frac{1}{l}, \frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{u} \right)
\]

Such a method is designed to provide decision support for uncertain valuations and priorities, and also to overcome the inability of the AHP to represent handling linguistic variables (Kabir and Hasin, 2011; Chiu et al., 2014; Nazari et al., 2017).

Questionnaire samples for this paper were collected from the perspectives of three groups key to EMI: university English teachers, university shipping teachers, and shipping practitioners. All samples in the questionnaires were recruited by the method of convenience.
and snowball sampling (Bryman, 2015), since the experts who are familiar with EMI teaching in the shipping courses of higher education are not easily found in Taiwan. Before sending the questionnaire, the backgrounds of potential samples participants in the samples (including university English teachers (12), university shipping teachers\(^5\) (12), and shipping practitioners (12))—backgrounds were reviewed to ensure they were appropriately experienced and qualified to answer our questionnaire. Then we made contact with these potential participants samples to enquire whether they could participate in the survey by email or telephone. In the questionnaire survey, questionnaire participants samples were individually asked to respond to a series of pairwise comparisons in order to establish the relative importance of the different elements. A nine-point rating scale\(^6\) was designed to measure the participants’ samples’ perceptions of what the relative importance of each pair of indicators (sub-indicator) in the same hierarchy was. Scale number “1” means equal importance and scale number “9” extreme importance.

Based on Saaty (1980), a consistency index (CI) was used to capture any inconsistencies within judgments in each aggregate pair-comparison matrix as well as in the overall decisions structures. Then, a consistency ratio (CR) was used to measure how a given matrix compares to a purely random matrix in terms of the CI. The CI and CR were formulated as follows:

\[
\text{CI} = \frac{\theta_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \quad (6)
\]

\[
\text{CR} = \frac{\text{CI}}{\text{RI}} \quad (7)
\]

Where CI is the consistency index; \(\theta_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum eigenvalue; \(n\) is the number of elements in the judgement matrix; RI is the consistency index of a randomly generated reciprocal matrix from the nine-point scale, with forced reciprocals. For matrixes larger than 3 \(\times\) 3, a value of the CR \(\leq 0.1\) is considered acceptable, while larger values of the CR require the decision-maker to revise their judgements (Saaty, 1980). Based on section 2.2, four indicators (including syllabus design, students’ characteristics, teachers’ characteristics, and university resources) and thirteen sub-indicators were developed (see Table 1).

\(^5\) They were required to have EMI experiences of shipping courses in the universities in the past three years.

\(^6\) The nine-point rating scale is widely used in the AHP or Fuzzy AHP based studies (e.g. Chiu et al., 2014; Kabir and Hasin, 2011). Such a scale was introduced by Thomas Saaty (1980), the original developer who was the founder of AHP.
Table 1: Key indicators and sub-indicators influencing EMI Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Sub-indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning strategies (A2)</td>
<td>Suitable subjects and implementation processes to attract student’s interest and motivation.</td>
<td>Poon (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning assessment (A3)</td>
<td>Providing effective assessment tools and inspectors/examination authorities to maintain equitable assessment method.</td>
<td>Clegg and Simpson (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ characteristics (B)</td>
<td>Students ‘English’ level (B1)</td>
<td>Vocabulary, speaking (oral), grammar, lexical abilities.</td>
<td>Byun et al. (2011); Dalton-Puffer (2007); Kim et al. (2014); Başbèk et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student’s shipping knowledge (B2)</td>
<td>Ship, port, cargo, charter contract, shipping company, agency, freight forwarder, etc.</td>
<td>Byun et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning habits (B3)</td>
<td>Student’s learning motivation, learning preparation and review, taking notes skill, etc.</td>
<td>Byun et al. (2011); Evan and Morrison (2011a; 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Characteristics (C)</td>
<td>Teachers ‘English’ level (C1)</td>
<td>Vocabulary, speaking (oral), grammar, lexical abilities.</td>
<td>Pan (2007); Costa and Coleman (2013); Goodman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results

4.1 Data Collection

With regard to our personal interviews\(^2\), our interviews included questions included those such as “What do you think about the English Medium Instruction in the shipping

\(^2\) We interviewed two directors who work for Evergreen Marine Corp. and two who work for Yang-Ming Marine Transport in Taiwan. These two companies are the number one and number two shipping-companies in Taiwan and their global rankings were 6 and 8 in September 2017, respectively—(Alphaliner, 2017)). These two interviewees have more than 30 years’ practical working experiences—and have been continuously concerned with university education for a long time. Based on these background data, it is believed that these experts constitute effective interview samples. Expert interviews were conducted in December 2016. Interviews took place in interviewees’ office and used—several questions regarding EMI teaching. Source: Alphaliner, (2017)—https://alphaliner.axsmarine.com/PublicTop100/, access 20 September 2017.
courses of Taiwan’s higher education?”, “Do you have any improvement suggestions to English Medium Instruction in the shipping courses of Taiwan’s higher education?”. “Could you provide your comments or feedback about our initial questionnaire content?” Based on interviewees’ response on the content, we further asked follow-up questions, which were important and related to our research topic. The use of interviews in this way allowed us to explore in-depth (Silverman, 2010) with experts whether our intended questionnaire content was appropriate and in line with our conclusions from the literature and our own experience of the key aspects related to EMI teaching in shipping management courses. We considered that interviews at this stage were most appropriate to explore these aspects as they allowed for dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981) and negotiation, and this in turn allowed us to focus and strengthen our questionnaire.

Questionnaires were sent to 36 participants (including university English teachers (12), university shipping teachers (12), and shipping practitioners (12)) in Taiwan on 22 February 2017. In this survey, university English teacher and university shipping teacher samples consisted of individuals who all have experience in EMI teaching in general universities in Taiwan. With regard to shipping practitioners, they all come from shipping companies in Taiwan. By 27 February, 2017, 28 questionnaires had been received. For each questionnaire, the consistency index (CI) was tested to confirm the consistency of its pairwise comparison matrix. Results showed that four questionnaires were highly inconsistent (CI>0.1) (Saaty, 1980) and these were consequently discarded. Therefore, the overall response rate was 69.4% (25/36). The profiles of the 25 participants’ characteristics (including eight university English teachers, nine university shipping teachers and eight shipping practitioners) are shown in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4. Results showed that most of the participants respondents were senior experts with at least 10 years working experience in university or shipping industries, thus illustrating the reliability of the survey findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


9 In the first page of the questionnaire, it was stated that the EMI shipping courses considered are shipping management related courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th></th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41~50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51~60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>10~15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16~20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21~25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Profiles of the university shipping teachers samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41~50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51~60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>10~15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16~20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21~25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Round up figures to an approximate.
11 Round up figures to an approximate.
Table 4: Profiles of the shipping practitioners samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior deputy director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41~50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51~60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10~15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16~20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21~25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Fuzzy AHP Analysis

In this paper, the fuzzy extent values of indicators and sub-indicators is shown in Table 5. As shown in Table 5, all consistency ratio (CR) values are less than 0.1, and thus fit the consistency test (Saaty, 1980; Kabir and Hasin, 2011). The local weights of each indicator and sub-indicator are shown in Table 5. The results indicate that teachers’ characteristics (0.262) is the most important indicator influencing the implementation of EMI, followed by syllabus design (0.256), university resources (0.244), and students’ characteristics (0.239). With regard to rounding figures:

- Round up figures to an approximate.
- Round up figures to an approximate.
- Round up figures to an approximate.
to sub-indicators, learning strategies (0.350), students ‘English’ level (0.386), teachers ‘English’ level (0.374), and availability of assistance (0.347) were perceived to be the most important sub-indicators with respect to each indicator in relation to syllabus design, students’ characteristics, teachers’ characteristics, and university resources, respectively.

Further, the global weights were synthesized from the second level, and were arrived at drawn by multiplying the local weights and the corresponding indicator in the level above, and then adding them to each element in a level according to the indicator affected. The results show reveal that the top three most important indicators influencing the implementation of EMI are teachers ‘English’ level (0.0979), students ‘English’ level (0.0923) and learning strategies (0.0894), respectively.

Table 5 Fuzzy extent value of sub-indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Sub-indicator</th>
<th>Fuzzy extent value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus Design</td>
<td>Course material</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning strategies</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning assessment</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ characteristics</td>
<td>Students ‘English’ level</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student’s shipping knowledge</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning habits</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Characteristics</td>
<td>Teacher’s shipping knowledge</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s past experience with EMI teaching</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Resources</td>
<td>Classroom facilities</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of assistance</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives for teachers</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives for students</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Fuzzy AHP results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Local weights</th>
<th>Consistency ratio (CR)</th>
<th>Sub-indicators</th>
<th>Local weights</th>
<th>Global weights</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.0172</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussions and Conclusions

The above results show the relative importance of factors in the implementation of EMI in a Taiwanese context. Using 25 effective samples, teachers’ characteristics are shown to be the most important indicator, but these were closely followed by syllabus design, university resources, and students’ characteristics. Arguably, all these indicators are key and must all be in place, but the lead indicator needs to be the teachers’ characteristics. This being the case, it is arguable that the other factors can play a supporting role. Thus, institutions in Taiwan arguably need to help support teachers in their approaches and roles, possibly through providing incentives, but also through providing assistance and resources. This strategy approach is confirmed by the second level results. These show that teachers’ ‘English’ level is the key factor, but this is closely followed by students’ ‘English’ level, and learning strategies. Arguably, this would suggest that participants in the sample felt that students needed to have both a good level of English, and also a good range of learning strategies to be able to help them understand the content, particularly perhaps when their level of English did not enable them to do so.

With regard to improving teachers’ English level, it is suggested that professional English teachers in the university can work alongside subject lecturers on EMI courses. For example, English teachers can help guide students’ communication in the subject regarding their
assessments and term projects. Non-English professional EMI teachers could gradually improve their English teaching skills over time and by considering the guidance given to their students by the English teachers. In addition, university authorities could provide incentives (e.g. extra teaching pay) to invite more English teachers to join EMI programs and to work alongside subject lecturers. We would suggest that such teachers have some of their time allocated to being part of the Shipping department and gain familiarity and confidence with the subject context. Although there are cost implications with these suggestions, we would argue that their benefits in terms of improved student work and learning, and lecturer confidence and ability more than compensate for any costs."

With regard to low global weights ranking, four sub-indicators (classroom facilities, availabilities of assistance, incentives for teachers, and incentives for students) are viewed as being relatively unimportant indicators. Such a result might be attributed to the fact that some experts might think university resources are a prerequisite for antecedent factor of EMI, and this could have affected their decision identification when completing the questionnaires. Such a situation constitutes a limitation to our study and is an aspect that could be investigated in future research in terms of potential solutions.

Arguably, our results would suggest that EMI instruction needs to be given more space and time than subject instruction in the first language instruction, and that this in turn needs more support from the teachers and students. This clearly has a number of implications in terms of resources and time. Firstly, from a timetabling perspective, it is arguable that EMI instruction needs to be given more spacetime in the timetable. This could either be done on a weekly basis by according more time to each lesson, or it could be done over a lengthier time by extending the number of weeks of the course. Our results suggest that, given the importance of learning strategies, a key factor for the students and the teachers to help in explaining the concepts may be to allow more time for questions and answers at the end of the session to allow for dialogue.

Interestingly, our results do not show that shipping knowledge was considered to be a key factor. This could be because such knowledge is taken for granted, or it could be because the focus of the study was on EMI instruction. If the latter is the case, it could be assumed that participants in the samples felt that when they were responding in relation to questions about the samples ‘English’ level, they were doing so within the perception that this ‘English’ related to their ability to express themselves in the subject area in ‘English’, i.e. their ability to deliver subject knowledge in ‘English’.
Further research would be useful to study aspects such as how participants felt about assessments being conducted in English, about students’ perceptions of EMI, about how the effectiveness of such programs in delivering knowledge can be judged, or more specific research about the exact type of support that would help students and teachers deliver EMI, about students’ perceptions of EMI, about how the effectiveness of such programs in delivering knowledge can be judged. It is possible, we would argue, that such questions are key for any policy makers, particularly if the policy of introducing EMI has the implications in terms of resources and timetabling that our results suggest. We note, however, that in order to be successful, such a change to EMI will indeed require support and assistance as our results would suggest, but that, given this, it will help develop Taiwan’s graduates for employability, and help Taiwan recruit more international students to study there. Indeed, it is arguable that the costs of implementing EMI could be offset by these benefits.
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