科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告
期末報告

探討台灣高等教育英語授課教師專業認同之敘事研究

計 畫 主 持 人 ： 黃怡萍

計 畫 參 與 人 員 ： 碩士班研究生-兼任助理人員：柯婷軒
　　　　　　　　　大專生-兼任助理人員：王姿雯

報 告 附 件 ： 出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處 理 方 式 ：
1. 公開資訊：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2年後可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考：否

中 華 民 國 105 年 04 月 09 日

中 文 摘 要 ： 雖然國內外高等教育的英語授課受國際化影響而蔚為風行，但相關研究卻常侷限於探討英語授課在政策、課程、教育、與學習方面的看法、影響、與施行效益，極少針對大學英語授課教師的專業認同進行研究。這類專業認同的研究多半針對自然科學教師，鮮少對人文社會科學教師進行探討。因此，本文採用質化個案研究方式，針對四位台灣在文史社會學科任教的大學教授，探討其言談的自我定位。資料收集以訪談與字卡分類方式為主，初步採用比較與對照方法分析，其後採用後結構主義分析。初步研究結果顯示，這些教授並沒有受害者的言談，也沒有如理工科教師視英語授課為理所當然，而是使用新自由主義、學術文化、儒家文化與台灣文化來討論自己以英語授課的定位。筆者以為採用言談的自我定位，探討台灣人文社會科學大學教授英語授課經驗，此研究結果呈現專業認同的多樣性，提醒英語授課政策需考量學術專業、儒家與臺灣文化的影響，據此，文末將討論未來研究方向。本計畫案在研究設計與執行上有所更動，文中也將解釋調整的必要性，並提供未來相關研究的建議。

中 文 關 鍵 詞 ： 英語授課、專業認同、教師認同、定位、言談

英 文 摘 要 ： Despite the global and local outburst of English-medium instruction (EMI) in higher education, most EMI research has focused on its effect, effectiveness, or perceptions of EMI. Little is understood about the influence of EMI on university teachers' professional identity, especially those who teach in humanities and social sciences. As such, this paper reports on a qualitative case study that explored discursive positioning of four Taiwanese university instructors in humanities and social science by using discourse theory. Data were gathered from interviews and card-sorting activities and analyzed initially via Lincoln and Guba's (1985) comparison and contrast method and then via poststructuralists' perspectives on discourse. Preliminary results showed that unlike the previous research findings (Moate, 2011; Soren, 2013), the university instructors in humanities and social science did not victimize themselves and had different subject positions with the use of discourses of neo-liberalism, academic, Confucius, and Taiwanese cultures as ways to rationalize their use of EMI and/or their self-positioning in the EMI context. Such results, we believe, to add to current EMI research on professional identity the diversity of discourses adopted in identity construction rather than simply the victim position in Moate (2011) or the naturalization of EMI in life science in Soren (2013). Direction for future research will be provided. Also, change of the original research design and plan for future research will be discussed.

英文關鍵詞：English-medium instruction (EMI), professional identity, teacher identity, positioning, discourse

Exploring Professional Identity: Narrative Research of Taiwanese University Teachers'
Adoption of English-Medium Instruction

INTRODUCTION

During the last ten years, many non-English speaking countries have adopted the use of English as a medium of instruction in non-language subjects in higher education due to global student mobility and English as a lingua franca. In response to this significant educational trend is a growing body of research on policy making, curriculum design, effect, and effectiveness of English-medium instruction (EMI) (e.g., Huang, 2009, 2012, 2014; Byun et al., 2011; Hüttner, Dalton-Puffer, & Smit, 2013; Sert, 2008; Tatzl, 2011; Yeh, 2013). Among these EMI studies, one significant under-researched topic, I believe, is professional identity, an understanding of who one is and who others are as professionals while engaged in adopting EMI. Although Soren (2013) showed no influence of EMI on university instructors' professional identity, Moate (2011) revealed that negative self-images may be established due to their lack of confidence in English, positive feedback from students, and openness in revealing language problems (see also Tange, 2010). Such discrepancy motivated the researcher to conduct this project to explore the relationship between the change in the medium of instruction and university instructors' (senses of) professional identity.

To fill the gap and in line with Neumann's (2001) call for more research on the influence of disciplinary differences on teaching, this research project aimed to explore why and how Taiwanese university instructors in both soft and hard sciences define, perceive, and construct their professional identities using narrative inquiry design (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Yet, while carrying out the study, the researcher had the original plan changed: First, the researcher discovered it difficult to balance between revealing individuals' narratives and remaining their anonymity and hence re-thought about the purpose of this project, thereby a case study approach—a focus on understanding a phenomenon rather than an individual—being adopted. Second, due to the large amount of data and time limits, the researcher decided to report on the initial analysis of partial data from humanities and social science. The same data analysis method will be adopted to analyze the rest of datasets. (Further explanations about research design will be provided in the sections of Method and Limitations and Direction for Future Research.) As such, this paper reports on a qualitative case study that explored discursive positioning of Taiwanese university instructors in humanities and social science by using discourse theory. In so doing, the researcher hopes to add to current EMI research on professional identity the diversity of discourses adopted in identity construction rather than simply the victim position in Moate (2011) or the naturalization of EMI in life science in Soren (2013).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This research project explored the experiences of university instructors adopting EMI in Taiwan from the perspective of professional identity construction. Identity, according to Danielewicz (2001), is defined as "our understanding of who we are and who we think other people are" (p. 10). Professional identity is often related to "teachers' sense or perceptions of their roles or relevant features of their profession, or … their perceptions of themselves as an occupational group" (Beijjard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004, p. 118). Regarding EMI in higher education, only Soren (2013) explored how life science instructors defined professional identity and even differentiated it from teacher identity. Professional identity includes both teachers' knowledge bases (i.e., disciplinary, pedagogic, and pedagogical content knowledge) and their acknowledgment by others as professional authorities, while teacher identity combines one's professional identity, personality, and self-positioning in institutions. Her study has shown that professional identity involves not only the personal aspect of being language learners or users, but also the professional aspect of being experts, language teachers, and subject-matter teachers. To allow freedom for exploring the content of professional identity, this project defines professional identity as how teachers view themselves as an occupational group and how they view the occupational group to which they belong.

Influenced by Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, and Johnson (2005), this research project adopted the notions of identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice to analyze and interpret EMI instructors' construction of professional identity.

Identity in Practice

Varghese et al. (2005) highlight the need of exploring identity in context, or more specifically in practices. In particular, Lave and Wegner (1991) conceptualize identity formation as "legitimate peripheral participation" in a "community of practice," defined as "groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, p. 4; See also Wegner, 1998); that is, one's professional identity arises from his/her gradual movement from the legitimate peripheral position to attain full participation in a professional community where his/her competence is recognized and legitimized.

Identity in Discourse

Identity-in-discourse highlights that identities are discursively constructed (Varghese et al., 2005). Poststructuralists argue that identity claims are made "by the individual with particular subject positions within discourses" (Weedon, 1997, p. 108). "A subject position," according to Davies and Harre (1999), "incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a

location for persons within the structure of rights for those that use that repertoire" (p. 35). Assigning one or others a subject position is called positioning, a "discursive process whereby people are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced storylines" (Davies & Harre, 1999, p. 37). Positioning may reflect "normative texts which reference modes of activities that are tacitly understood as unities with different levels and layers" (Huang, 2008, p. 11; see also Carspceken, 1996); that is, one's positioning may be revealed by explicit evaluation markers (e.g., good, bad, and desirable), the use of modality, and implicit value statements assumed by the participant.

Several principles of identity formation are also useful in this project. First, identity can acquire meaning through indexicality—"the creation of semiotic links between linguistic forms and social meanings" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 594). The indexical process entails:

(a) overt mention of identity categories and labels; (b) implicatures and presuppositions regarding one's own or others' identity position; (c) displayed evaluative and epistemic orientations to ongoing talk, as well as interactional footings and participant roles; and (d) the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups. (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 594)

Second, identity is social and relational; that is, subject positions are made in relation to others, especially via "similarities/difference" and "authority" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 598). Identification can be made through differentiation. In particular, borrowing Lacan's notion of "master signifiers," Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) propose "nodal points of identity" (p. 42) to indicate an identification having different discourses to fill in different content. Here discourse refers to "*a way of speaking which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective*" (pp. 66-67). Man, an example of nodal point of identity, signifies strength and power in contrast to women, passive and weak (discourse). As such, discourses are recontextualised to denote nodal points of identity. In this project, nodal points of identity and their associated discourses were sought.

It is also important to understand the legitimatization of such a position. Informed by van Leeuween (2008), this research project will consider four types of legitimatization: authorization, moral evaluation, rationalization, and mythopoesis. Authorization allows one to rely on tradition, law, and regulations; moral evaluation, value systems; rationalization, institutionalized social action or knowledge; and mythopoesis, narratives that reward legitimate actions and punish illegitimate ones.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

With the assumption of identity as discursive positioning in specific context, the following research questions guide this research project:

1. How do the Taiwanese university instructors in humanities and social science

self-position in the EMI context? What nodal points of identities are used and for what meanings?

2. What discourses are drawn to legitimatize their positions?

Answering these questions, we believe, benefits future EMI research from understanding the hybridity of professional identity.

METHOD

Contexts and Participants

A case study approach was adopted because this approach helps the researcher "investigate a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context" (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Research was situated in private and public universities that offer EMI courses and recruit international students in Taiwan. Until the end of 2015, a total of 34 university instructors were recruited, with 13 from humanities and social science, 13 from science and technology, and 8 from commerce[1]. These participants were contacted through recruitment email and/or the researcher's colleague. All of these participants taught courses using EMI, but not all of them taught international students. Nor did they all enjoy or agree with the use of EMI.

Due to large amount of data and time limits, only four participants' data were analyzed for this report. These participants' information is presented in Table 1. To protect their identity, only general information will be provided.

Table 1. Four participants in humanities and social science

	University	Gender	Discipline
Th1	Public	M	Religion
Th2	Public	M	Law
Th3	Public	M	Vernacular language
Th4	Private	M	Chinese Literature

Data Collection Methods

Multiple sources of data were collected, including interviews and card-sorting activities. It has become popular for qualitative researchers to adopt interviews "to investigate participant's identities, experiences, beliefs, and orientations" (Talmy 2010, p. 111). In this project, all of the instructors were interviewed one to two times in Mandarin from October 2014 to December 2015. Mandarin was used because participants may not feel comfortable using English to tell their stories. Each interview lasted approximately two hours and was

---

[1] Based on purposeful sampling, some participants' data will be excluded because theirs did not provide rich information.

conducted based on the guideline of Carspecken (1996). Interviews included the following topics: previous English-learning and teaching experiences, current teaching experiences and opinions, teacher training experiences (if any), and perceptions of EMI. These interviews aimed to understand instructors' senses of who they were in the EMI context and their attitudes toward EMI, as well as to identify critical events and significant others. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim for further analysis.

After the interview, a card-sorting activity (cf. Soren, 2013) was conducted. It functions as triangulation to increase trustworthiness. This card-sorting activity invited instructors to define "professional identity," "teacher identity," "professional expertise," and "professional authority" using their own words, provide adjectives (e.g., humorous, confident, secure, insecure, etc.) for each term, and reflect on the change of adjectives across time and context.

Data Analysis

All of the interview data and card-sorting activity data were transcribed verbatim. Data were analyzed initially by Lincoln and Guba's (1985) Constant Comparison Method; that is, the researcher read through a participant's interview transcripts several times and then compared them with card-sorting data before analyzing the second participant's data set. At the beginning, initial codes were used for line-by-line coding. After common themes were identified, the initial codes were rearranged to generate specific codes and a coding scheme. Then the specific codes were compared with Soren's (2013) framework of teacher/professional identity.

The use of Soren's (2013) framework did not yield fruitful results and hence the researcher began to search for other frameworks or explanations, leading to the current use of the notion of discursive positioning (as explained in Literature Review). Due to the restricted time, only four participants' data were used for the initial analysis. The preliminary coding scheme will be modified after more data sets are analyzed in the future.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Self-positioning in the EMI context

The four Taiwanese university instructors in humanities and social science, despite their concerns over the initial heavy workload of EMI, never victimized themselves as teachers did in Moate's (2011) research—worrying about how their English proficiency may challenge their authority and refuse to seek help. Table 2 presents the nodal points of teacher identity.

First, all the instructors self-positioned as a professional or a responsible university instructor with duties of teaching and researching and hence it is their responsibilities to promote their fields or expertise, with T1 the transmission of religion culture and research, T2 critical thinking in students, T3 the preservation of vernacular languages and cultures, and T4 the cultivation of students as gentlemen. As T1 explained, "Because we teachers have to

research and teacher- and I think as a professional scholar, you should be responsible for this field and even you need to promote it…. We think it's our obligation to pass it (religion) down to next generation" (IN2). As responsible university instructors, the participants had their own missions in teaching.

Table 2. Four participants' discursive positions

Nodal points of identity	Examples
responsible researcher/researcher (professional)	It's our mission to promote (religion) (T1) I'm responsible and confident (T2) Native language is important (T3) Rethinking/testing Chinese culture (T4)
approachable teacher	Our students are close to us (T1); interactive (T2); flexible (T3); flexible and students will talk to you (T4)
not a traditional teacher	Active, interactive, and liberal (T2)
responsive teacher	Our strategy is to introduce culture of religion (to international students); We'll think about market (T1); we teach differently according to students' needs (T2) (T3)(T4)

In addition, all the participants believed that they were approachable, flexible, and understanding. These adjectives labeled as personality or personal identity in Soren's (2013) study were also interpreted in the same way by the four participants. But T2 particularly differentiated such positioning from "a traditional teacher" and "an old teacher" in his own field in Taiwan; that is, in the field of law in Taiwan, teachers were often perceived as serious knowledge transmitters with a high status and a less interactive way of teaching. In other words, "an approachable teacher" can be both personal and social—or to be more specific, academically related.

Last and the most important of all, all the instructors indexed themselves as responsive teachers in immediate contexts of teaching; that is, they planned and adjusted their instructional practices according to needs and wants of target students and thus the sense of who they are is also generated from their positioning with students. In this respect, they differentiated their positions from different target students. For example, T4 tore between teaching Chinese to local students and international students, since students' background knowledge and purposes of learning Chinese Literature differed. As such, he could not be as serious and authoritative as his teacher used to be while teaching international students. Similarly, T2 felt it easier to teach doctoral students in English because he viewed his students as apprentices who had sufficient knowledge and motivation to study in English, whereas undergraduate law students were conceptualized as if they were "lay persons" who required the instructor to explain basic professional terms in plain English. Indeed, although

they did not think the adoption of EMI have influence on their teacher identity, the university instructors' subject positions may change in relation to different student groups and so it reasons that some (change of) identity positions may not be recognized by the participants.

Discourses used for legitimization

Unlike Soren's (2013) findings that the instructors in life science (hard science) legitimized the use of EMI by reference to English as a common and popular medium of academic communication (rationalization), the initial analysis of the four participants in humanities and social science showed diversity of discourses and modes for legitimization of EMI and their positioning in the EMI contexts. Table 3 summarizes the popular discourses and ways for legitimization.

Table 3. Discourses and modes for legitimization

Discourse	legitimization	Examples
Neo-liberalism	Rationalization	The influence of low fertility rate on recruitment (T1)(T4)
Academic culture	Rationalization	We have advantages; we emphasize language abilities (T1); Commerce law can be taught in English; we need to think about the goals of EMI (T2); We need to have good language abilities so EMI is important (T3); I use EMI because I was young, and I use it to test Chinese Literature (T4)
Confucius culture	Rationalization	A teacher is to teach us the fundamental relationship between oneself and the society, the knowledge and skills to live in the society, and to help us answer questions in the learning process. (Han, Yu in Tang dynasty) (T1) (T2) (T3)(T4)
Taiwanese culture	Rationalization	Mosaic culture and flexible (T3) (implied in T1, T2, T4)

All the participants recognized neo-liberalism of education that presupposed the purpose of education is to help students find a place in the competitive world. The marketization of higher education and the low fertility rate compelled instructors to design different curricula or recruit international students or learners from Mainland China. The ways such neo-liberal trends influence academic fields affect university instructors' self-positioning in the EMI context. Such positions often adopted discourses of academic culture situated in Taiwan, Asia, and the globe. For example, T2 usually positioned himself in law to justify his pedagogy. Situated in the context of Taiwan, he expressed that law is "local," and in the university settings in Taiwan, law students were taught Taiwanese laws and trained for getting the license of an attorney or other law officials. In this respect, he was self-positioned as Taiwanese law instructors who were obligated to teach local law to local students for the certification exams in Mandarin, worrying the low English proficiency levels of these

students. In this context, such subject matter for examinations as Labor Law, Civil Law and Criminal Law should be taught in an L1. What is more complicated is that not only English but also Germany and Japanese can become a significant tool for academic communication in Law; therefore, T2 believed that it is not necessarily to teach law via English. But some sub-areas, such as Economic and Financial Law, are considered "universal," and so it is possible to advocate teaching law via English for these subjects, which are also T2's expertise. Being experts in these areas, T2 differed himself from professionals in other types of law in need of other languages as a medium of academic communication (e.g., Germany and Japanese). Indeed, academic culture would be adopted to rationalize the use of EMI and one's positions in the EMI context.

Despite the emphasis of teachers as transmitters in neo-liberalism of education, all the instructors adopted Confucius discourse and discourse of Taiwanese culture to justify their instruction. For example, T4 was required to teach degree-seeking international students who were also required to take the required course of Chinese Literature. The combination of local and international students within a class and the requirement of them to take the standardized test of Chinese Literature confused T4 and compelled him to generate different purposes of teaching and tests for two student groups. Teaching Chinese Literature to local students aimed to cultivate them to become "gentlemen" with their own views, while for international students, the focus of teaching would be on everyday Chinese language and culture. What he has learned about Chinese Literature can be used to test against the international students. As a Taiwanese scholar, T3 emphasized the primacy of valuing our own culture without sacrificing English. For him, the more languages, the better, but vernacular languages and cultures are foundations for language learning. In this respect, although he was concerned about the low status of vernacular languages and publish materials to promote vernacular languages and cultures, T3 did not oppose to EMI. Neither did he think the spread of EMI have negative influence on vernacular languages. Similarly, T2 cautioned that the notion of democracy appeared to be the appropriation of fruit of the West due to the defeats of China in the early 1900s and hence the inferiority complex seemed to haunt the Chinese. Such negative self-images and praise for the West should be challenged. In this fashion, education for T2 is to influence and so teaching international students law via English in Taiwan is also a way to influence these students to learn alternative perspectives—a perspective that honors who we are. As such, the purposes of using EMI were justified mostly by rationalization and situated in neo-liberalism, academic, Confucius and Taiwanese cultures.

IMPLICATION

In the recent literature, only has three EMI studies are directly related to teacher/professional identity, with Preisler's (2008) description of three prototypes of professional identity contingent on contexts, Moate's (2011) caution of the negative effect of

EMI on teachers' integrity, and Soren's (2013) findings of life science university instructors' definition of teacher/professional knowledge and their pedagogical change. None of them used poststructuralist perspectives on teacher/professional identity to explore EMI university instructors' construction of teacher identity, especially in the field of humanities and social science—a field providing fewer EMI courses and often assumed to require better English abilities to argue, explain and negotiate (to teach well) than hard sciences. Drawing on four Taiwanese university instructors' discursive self-positioning and the use of discourses for legitimization, this study attempts to shed light on the EMI studies on teacher identity in the following ways.

First, extending Moate's (2011) research findings of disadvantages of that the use of EMI, the preliminary analysis showed that despite the difficulties university instructors encountered, they never victimized themselves. Instead, their positions as responsible professionals and approachable teachers foregrounded their positive self images. Even T4 who expressed the most problems in adopting EMI had a sense of achievement after teaching for three years. In this respect, the victim discourse of using EMI can be transformed to a hero(ine) discourse where individuals win victories after series of defeats.

Second, unlike the recent research findings of no influence of EMI on teacher identity (Soren, 2013), this study discovered indexicality of subject positions particularly in immediate teaching contexts; that is, instructors' senses of who they are and how to teach students were contingent on who their students are and how they respond to instruction. The change of pedagogy according to student groups is "naturalized" as a responsive and responsible teacher. Such naturalization may be related to the provision of customized service in marketization of higher education, which deserves to be further examined.

Third, extending Soren's (2013) research on EMI instructors' "naturalization" of teacher identity in life science as a "natural" medium for academic communication in hard science, this study revealed no such naturalization. Instead, rationalization is used by the four university instructors in humanities and social science for legitimatization of EMI use. In particular, although they recognized and even were compelled to conform to neo-liberalism of education, their ambiguous attitude toward EMI was influenced by their rationalization drawn from discourses of Confucian, Taiwanese, and academic cultures. Such results add to the current caution of the negligence of disciplinary differences in knowledge structures (Kuteeva & Airey, 2014) an alternative perspective—that is, discourses of academic, ethnic, and Confucius cultures are recontexualized to point to Taiwanese university instructors' unique positions in the glocal context.

The current research diversifies the negative portraits of EMI university instructors in NNES nations by drawing on discursive positioning of Taiwanese university instructors in humanities and social science. Such results caution disciplinary differences in use of EMI and hence underscore the importance of flexible language management. Future pedagogy of

teacher development should also take into consideration disciplinary differences. Future research will benefit from further analysis of university instructors from fields other than law, religion, and languages to gain in-depth understanding of factors shaping their construction of teacher identity.

LIMITATIONS

The researcher began with a narrative inquiry design and aimed to gather 36 instructors. Not until she started to gather data did she find it an unrealistic goal. Several factors not taken into consideration in research design will be discussed so that future researchers can have better research designs. First, if a narrative inquiry approach is adopted, the researcher should carefully choose participants because from my interview experiences not all the instructors are story tellers. Nor do they have enough time for doing so. Second, a small sample size (e.g., four to six participants) would be sufficient for narrative inquiry. For one-year project, gathering data from four to six participants in one field (homogeneous sampling) would be more practical than my original design of 36 participants. Third, since teaching in English is not popular in humanities and social science, it is difficult to protect participants' identity if we need to retell participants' stories in details. It is suggested that the researcher should take it into consideration when adopting a narrative inquiry approach. Fourth, some adjectives related to Chinese culture can be added to card-sorting activities, such as responsible（負責的）and hard-working (認真的).

CONCLUSION

Given the small sample size and the qualitative nature of the study, this paper does not argue for generalizability. Instead, it attempts to reveal the complexity of teacher/professional identity in EMI and point out directions for future research and discussions on the construction of teacher/professional identity. Due to time limits, this paper only drew on four Taiwanese university instructors' discursive self-positioning and the use of discourses for legitimization in humanities and social science. My next step would be to finish analyzing all the data from humanities and social science instructors and modify the coding scheme. Then, data from hard science and commerce will be analyzed to seek disciplinary differences. In the future studies, the identity of those who resist EMI can also be explored, with a particular focus on identity formation. Such research will benefit EMI university instructors recognizing and increasing their identity options.

REFERENCES

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(2), 107–128. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education, 62*, 431-449. doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9397-4

Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide.* New York: Routledge.

Clandinin, J. D., & Connelly, M. F. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research. S*an Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Davies, B., & Harre, R. (1999). Positioning and personhood. In R. Harre & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory* (pp. 32–52). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. Boston: Addison Wesley.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Huang, Y. P. (2008). *Understanding international graduate instructors: A narrative critical ethnography.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Huang, Y. P. (2009). Effectiveness of English-Only Instruction in Postsecondary Education in Taiwan. Voices from Students. *Hwa Kang Journal of English Language and Literature, 15,* 23-135.

Huang, Y. P. (2011). English-medium instruction (EMI) content-area teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of scaffoldings: A Vygotskian perspective. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 8*(1), 1-32.

Huang, Y. P. (2012). Design and implementation of English-medium courses in higher education in Taiwan: A qualitative case study. *English Teaching and Learning, 36*(1), 1-51.

Huang, Y. P. (2014). Teaching content via English: A qualitative case study of Taiwanese university instructors' instruction. *Foreign Language Studies, 20,* 27-62.

Hüttner, J. Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013).The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(3), 267-284. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.777385

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.

Kuteeva, M. & Airey, J. (2014). Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: Reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education, 67,* 533-549. doi: 10.1007/s10734-013-9660-6

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Moate, J. M. (2011). The impact of foreign language mediated teaching on teachers' sense of professional integrity in the CLIL classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(3), 33-346. doi: 10.1080/02619768.2011.585023

Neumann, R. (2001). Disciplinary differences and university teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, *26*. doi: 10.1080/03075070120052071

Peirce, N. (1995). Social identity, investment and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9-29. doi: 10.2307/3587803

Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System, 36,* 156-171. doi:10.1016/j.system.2007.11.006

Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. Berlin: Mouton.

Soren, J. K. (2013). *Teacher identity in English-medium instruction: Teacher cognitions from a Danish tertiary education context.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Copenhagen.

Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 128–148. doi: 10.1017/S0267190510000085

Tange, H. (2010). Caught in the Tower of Babel: university lecturers' experiences with internationalisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *10*(2), 137–149. doi: 10.1080/14708470903342138

Tatzl, D. (2011). English-medium masters' programmes at an Australian university of applied sciences: Attitudes, experiences and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*, 252-270. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2011.08.003

Trent, J. (2012). The discursive positioning of teachers: Native-speaking English teachers and educational discourse in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(1), 104-126. doi: 10.1002/tesq.1

van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of language, Identity, and Education*, *4*(1), 21–44. doi: 10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Cambridge, A:Harvard Business Review Press.

Yeh, C. C. (2013). Instructors' perspectives on English-medium instruction in Taiwanese universities. *Curriculum and Instruction Quarterly, 16*, 209-232.

科技部補助專題研究計畫項下出席國際學術會議心得報告

<div align="right">104 年 04 月 30 日</div>

報　告　人姓　　　名	黃怡萍	服　務　機　關及　　職　稱	政治大學英文系 副教授
會　議　時　間地　　　點	104/03/24-104/03/26 Toronto, Canada	本　會　核　定補　助　文　號	MOST 103-2410-H-004 -121
會　議　名　稱	American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) 2015		
發　表　論　文　題　目	Learner Resistance to English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education: A Qualitative Case Study		

一、 參加會議經過

　　美國應用語言學協會(AAAL)，於1977年創立，每年會為應用語言學界，舉辦為期四天的大規模學術會議，一般都在三月份舉行，主題大分為17大領域(如下)，學術討論以4種方式進行。

　　表一　17領域及4種學術討論方式

領域	學術討論
Assessment and evaluation (ASE) Bilingual, immersion, heritage, and language minority education (BIH) Language cognition and brain research (COG) Corpus Linguistics (COR) Analysis of discourse and interaction (DIS) Educational Linguistics (EDU) Language, culture, socialization and pragmatics (LCS) Language and ideology (LID) Language maintenance and revitalization (LMR) Language, planning and policy (LPP/POL) Second and foreign language pedagogy (PED) Reading, writing, and literacy (RWL) Second language acquisition, language acquisition, and attrition (SLA) Sociolinguistics (SOC) Language and technology (TEC) Translation and interpretation (TRI) Text analysis (written discourse) (TXT)	Individual Papers Posters Roundtable Discussions Colloquia

2015年的美國應用語言學協會，所舉辦的研討會於2015年03月21日至24日，在加拿大多倫多舉行，從1800篇論文中，筆者的文章「Learner Resistance to English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education: A Qualitative Case Study」，探討台灣與外籍學生在臺灣英語授課的抗拒行為與想法，有幸在眾多文章中，被接受發表。雖然這不是本人第一次參加AAAL研討會，卻是第一次與國內有志一同的學者同行，得以深度研討論文，建立學術交流與合作的機會。

➢ 會議前一天 03/20

本人跟其他同事於會議前一天凌晨抵達多倫多，完成辦理住宿手續後，便就寢。並於會議第一天早上，熟悉會場與周邊環境，於下午領取大會議程，與同事研究場次。

➢ 會議第一天 03/21

本人只有聽2個場次的演講，第一場了解翻轉教育的進行，第二場了解台灣師培生的社會化過程，會後並與其他相關學者一同聚餐，討論未來研究方向，下午時間大多用來準備隔天上台的內容。

表二 第一天場次

Time	Saturday, March 21 08:35 a.m. – 09:05 a.m.	Place	Montebello Room 20 First Floor
Speaker	Nishimura, Kagata		
Title	The Content-Focused Flipped Classroom: Enhancing English Speaking Skills for EFL Learners		
Time	Saturday, March 21 10:45 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	Place	New Brunswick Room 11 Mezzanine
Speaker	Lin		
Title	Socialization of Prospective English Language Teachers in Taiwan: A Discourse Analytic Study		

➢ 會議第二天 03/22

這一天本人發表論文，主要從批判角度，強調學生於英語授課中，有很多的抗拒，值得我們思考，會中發現很多學者都對英語授課感到興趣，大家對於提供老師與學生的incentive有眾多討論，有些學者甚至已經組成研究團隊，或已到過臺灣/針對臺灣教師進行教師專業發展，因此，會後學者們交換聯絡方式，本人與其他國際學者，也進行相關議題的討論，深入了解理論架構與跨國合作的可能性，對方也想知道在教學上，是否有合適的模式可採用。然後，大家志同道合地再一起去聽其他跟英語授課、英語為國際共通語等相關主題的場次。

表三 第二天場次

Time	Sunday, March 22 11:30 a.m. – 12:35 p.m.	Place	Algonquin Room 18 Table 2 Mezzanine
Speaker	Huang		
Title	Learner Resistance to English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education: A Qualitative Case Study		
Time	Sunday, March 22 10:45 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	**Place**	Algonquin Room 18 Table 4 Mezzanine
Speaker	Murata, Iino		
Title	From Marginality to the Mainstream : Evolving Identities through Four-year English-Medium Instruction and Study Abroad Experiences		
Time	Sunday, March 22 10:10.m. – 10:40 a.m.	**Place**	Banff Room 22 First Floor
Speaker	Gleeson, Davison		
Title	Subject Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching English Language Learners: What Do They Know and How Did They Learn It?		
Time	Sunday, March 22 2:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.	**Place**	Whistler Room 23 First Floor
Speaker	Park		
Title	A Pedagogical Framework for English-Medium Instruction: A Contextualized Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) for Higher Education		
Time	Sunday, March 22 2:35 p.m. – 3:05 p.m.	**Place**	Whistler Room 23 First Floor
Speaker	Kim, Kwon, Kim		
Title	Code-switching strategies in English-medium instruction (EMI) for Korean engineering students		
Time	Sunday, March 22 3:10 p.m. – 3:40 p.m.	**Place**	Whistler Room 23 First Floor
Speaker	Li		
Title	Cross-border Students' Stories: A Look into Mainland Chinese Students' Adaptation to English-medium Postsecondary Education		

➢ 會議第三天 03/23

會議第三天，本人把重點放在另一項研究議題 identity，尤其是跟teacher development 相關的場次，都是本人參加的重點，會後，許多國內外學者也參與討論。最後，也找機會購書。

表四　第三天場次

Time	Monday, March 23 8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	Place	Canadian Room 1 Convention
Speaker	Mackey (Organizer), Block, Darvin, Norton, Flowerdew, Wang, Leeman, Trofimovich, Thorne, Sauro, Smith		
Title	Invited Colloquium: "Identity in Applied Linguistics"		
Time	Monday, March 23 9:10 a.m. – 9:40 a.m.	Place	Algonquin Room 18 Table 4 Mezzanine
Speaker	Kling, Park, van den Hoven		
Title	Challenges and Implications of English-medium Instruction		
Time	Monday, March 23 2:00 a.m. – 2:30 a.m.	Place	Algonquin Room 18 Table 4 Mezzanine
Speaker	Wolff (Organizer), De Costa (Organizer), Golombek, Mercer, Wolff, Varghese, Kubanyiova, Barkhuizen, Norton, De Costa		
Title	Colloquium: "Advancing the Teacher Identity Research Agenda: Theoretical and Methodological Innovations"		

➤ 會議第四天 03/24

搭機回台

二、與會心得

　　本次參加美國應用語言學協會的研討會，除讓本人能有機會發表研究成果，獲取各項建議之外，同時參加各項的演講場次，著實令人獲益匪淺。尤其透過這次研討會，更認識從事相關領域(英語授課及身分認同)的國內外專家學者，除瞭解各地英語授課實施的狀況外，大家也一起討論未來研究的方向與合作的可行性，本人第一次看到這麼多學者對於英語授課教學及研究的重視，讓本人反思此領域的意義與價值，並思考未來跨校/領域/國家合作的機會。另外，本次與會也跟志同道合的夥伴同行，得以討論激盪研究方向，交換心得，彼此勉勵，促進跨校合作。

　　本次會議的主辦單位相當用心安排，大會手冊變薄，主要是因為摘要都變成從網路上下載，而取消的場次也改由當天宣布，大致上來說，都沒什麼問題，也很環保，值得效法。

三、考察參觀活動(無是項活動者略)

無

四、建議

無

五、攜回資料名稱及內容

1. 大會會議議程、期刊、與講者的講義、名片

六、其他

無

科技部補助專題研究計畫項下出席國際學術會議心得報告

報　告　人姓　　　名	黃怡萍	服 務 機 關及　職　稱	政治大學英文系副教授
會　議 時　間地　點	104/04/16-104/04/20 Chicago, Illinois, USA	本 會 核 定補 助 文 號	MOST 103-2410-H-004-121
會　議　名　稱	American Educational Research Association (AERA) 2015		
發 表 論 文 題 目	Student Resistance in an English-Taught Program in Higher Education		

一、 參加會議經過

美國教育研究協會(AERA)每年為教育界舉辦一次大規模的學術會議，一般分為12大領域(如下)與約150個Special Interest Group (SIG)，學術討論以約10種不同方式進行。

表一 十二大領域及十種學術討論方式

領域	學術討論
Division A - Administration, Organization and Leadership Division B - Curriculum Studies Division C - Learning and Instruction Division D - Measurement and Research Methodology Division E - Counseling and Human Development Division F - History and Historiography Division G - Social Context of Education Division H - Research, Evaluation and Assessment in Schools Division I - Education in the Professions Division J - Postsecondary Education Division K - Teaching and Teacher Education Division L - Educational Policy and Politics	Demonstration/Performance Fireside Chat Invited Session Off-Site Visit Paper Session Poster Session Roundtable Session Symposium Working Group Roundtable Workshop

這次的AERA於2015年04月16日至20日在美國芝加哥舉行，本屆主題為「Toward Justice: Culture, Language, and Heritage in Education Research and Praxis」，主要關注如何

透由教育研究與教學達成正義公平，多達14000學者參與，超過2600場次，共計13000 篇論文投稿，筆者的文章「Student Resistance in an English-Taught Program in Higher Education」，討論台灣的學生在英語授課的抗拒行為與想法，有幸在眾多文章中，審查者認為研究方法適切，研究結果有其貢獻，而被接受發表。本人曾多次參加此會議，這次除發表論文與聽演講外，也與海內外學者相聚討論，並參加專業發展訓練的工作坊。

　　本人跟其他同事於會議前一天(04月15日)抵達芝加哥，完成辦理住宿手續。大會第一天(04月16日)通常為行前會議(Pre-conference session)，先領取大會議程等資料後，參加Professional Development and Training工作坊，因為筆者希望能透由Critical Discourse Analysis (CTD)的方式分析後續研究資料，因此，這次參加的場次主題為「Applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CTD) in Education Research: Theory, Rigorous Method and Possibilities for Application」，由Mary Ryan、Margaret Kettle、與Jennifer Alford (Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia)主持，她們先簡單講解Discourse analysis的理論背景、意義與批判，接著舉media text的例子說明，最後，則以自己研究計畫為例(其主題分別為: Teacher identity、International students; the concept of home、Teacher knowledge; critical literacy)，教導大家如何以CTD分析研究資料與寫作，最後，讓學員分析自己的研究資料並討論提問。

Applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CTD) in Education Research: Theory, Rigorous Method and Possibilities for Application

Abstract: This course provides participants with hands-on experience of conducting rigorous critical discourse analysis (CDA) on texts of interest to educational researchers and teachers as researchers. In a series of lectures and hands-on workshops, participants will learn about: discourse theory; methods of CDA with different types of texts, for example education policy, teaching resources, and classroom interaction; how to apply the methods to their own small data sets; and how to write up their own analysis. On completion of this course, participants should be able to: demonstrate knowledge of discourse theory; understand the synergies of narrative inquiry, socio-spatial theory and reflexivity with discourse theory; understand some of the critiques of CDA and how to mitigate them in research; apply methods of critical text analysis (linguistic and spatial) to their own texts; understand how to write up their own analysis and begin to design future possibilities for applying CDA in their own classroom practice and research. The target audience is anyone interested in CDA, in particular graduate students and early career scholars. Teachers interested in exploring the

workings of power in classroom discourse and in school settings are also encouraged to participate. Participants are required to bring laptops and a small data set (e.g., transcript of talk; course materials; a policy statement; a media text) that they would like to explore. Time will be allowed for planning potential projects based on areas of interest.

第二天(04月17日)起，會議便正式展開，並以不同的論文發表型式呈現。每天平均都有專家學者進行專題演說與評論，並有跨國組成的研究團隊分享研究成果，另外，也有論文的發表及海報展覽等，在不同時段與不同會場進行，各廠商的新書則在地下室會議廳內設專區展示，供學者瀏覽與訂購。這天，筆者參加New Literacies in Teacher Preparation的場次，參與幾場與期刊主編的座談，並與國內外學者相聚，分享研究心得。

第三天(04月18日)，除與國外學者相聚，商量合作研究事宜外，筆者也在「Division G - Section 2: Education in Mulitcultural Contexts Within and Across Subject Areas」中，發表論文，其題目為「Student Resistance in an English-Taught Program in Higher Education」(NSC 102-2410-H-004 -059)，主要探討臺灣學生對於ETP的抗拒行為與想法，與會學者提出很多關於臺灣國際化與學生學習的問題，討論相當熱烈。筆者亦參加「Embedded Talk: Navigating Unwritten Rules About Race and Language in Higher Education」場次。

第四天(04月19日)，主要是參觀國際書展，但很多書都在AAAL/AILA買了，所以，這次並沒有再購書；另外，筆者也與指導教授(Dr. Flinders)見面，交流學術研究與期刊撰寫心得；最後，還跟Dr. Pawan見面商討，2015年10月擔任政大文山國際研討會的主講者，及邀請其留在台灣參訪等相關事宜。

第五天(04月20日)，筆者一早搭機返台。

二、與會心得

本次參加美國教育研究協會所舉辦的學術會議，主要的收穫並不在於讓本人能有機會發表研究成果，獲取各項建議，或是參加各項的演講場次，筆者主要的收穫是跟國內外學者私下進行的非正式學術討論與心得交流，讓學術成果得以相互交流激盪，並擴展學術人脈，筆者也藉此敲定國際學者來台訪問的行程，並爭取與外國友人合作發表的機會。另外，本次參加專業發展訓練的工作坊，因為有學者的分享與示範，讓筆者對於Critical Discourse Analysis (CTD)的分析方式有更進一步的了解。

本次會議主辦單位相當用心安排參與會議的學者可以選擇不要大會手冊，直接以

APP或網路方式搜尋與下載，比較環保與便民。

三、考察參觀活動

無

四、建議

以後國內會議可與時俱進，考量以APP或網路方式搜尋與下載方式，提供大會手冊。

五、攜回資料名稱及內容

1. 參與各場次的講義

2. Professional Development Workshop 的講義

六、其他

無

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱: 探討台灣高等教育英語授課教師專業認同之敘事研究
	計畫主持人: 黃怡萍
	計畫編號: 103-2410-H-004-121-　　　　學門領域: 英語教學研究

無研發成果推廣資料

103年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：黃怡萍	計畫編號：103-2410-H-004-121-

計畫名稱：探討台灣高等教育英語授課教師專業認同之敘事研究

成果項目			量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）
			實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比		
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	1	1	100%		Evolving English Teaching and Research Identities: Journeys taken by five Taiwanese scholars. Invited Symposium in the 33rd International Conference on English Teaching and Learning, 2016.
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（本國籍）	碩士生	2	2	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	1	1	100%		
		研討會論文	1	1	100%		Huang, Y. P. (2016). Teaching in English: Exploring Content and

						Frameworks of Teacher Identity. Paper accepted by the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) Conference.
	專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
	已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
	權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
參與計畫人力（外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
	博士生	0	0	100%		
	博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
	專任助理	0	0	100%		

其他成果（無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。）	無

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科教處計畫加填項目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與（閱聽）人數	0	

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

---

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估
   ■達成目標
   □未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）
      □實驗失敗
      □因故實驗中斷
      □其他原因
   說明：

---

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：
   論文：□已發表 □未發表之文稿 ■撰寫中 □無
   專利：□已獲得 □申請中 ■無
   技轉：□已技轉 □洽談中 ■無
   其他：（以100字為限）
   Huang, Y. P. (2016). Teaching in English: Exploring Content and Frameworks of Teacher Identity. Paper accepted by the AAAL Conference.
   ----NNES University Instructors' Identity in the English-medium Instruction Context: A Frames Perspective. Paper submitted to Psychology of Language Learning 2 (or PLL2).

---

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以500字為限）
   雖然國內外高等教育的英語授課受國際化影響蔚為風行，但相關研究卻常侷限於探討英語授課在政策、課程、教育、與學習方面的看法、影響、與施行效益，極少針對大學英語授課教師的專業認同進行研究。這類專業認同的研究多半針對自然科學教師，鮮少對人文社會科學教師進行探討。本文採用言談的自我定位，探討台灣人文社會科學大學教授英語授課經驗，初步研究結果顯示，這些教授並沒有受害者的言談，也沒有如理工科教師視英語授課為理所當然，而是使用新自由主義、學術文化、儒家文化與台灣文化來討論自己以英語授課的定位。筆者以為此研究結果呈現專業認同的多樣性，提醒英語授課政策需考量學術專業、儒家與臺灣文化的影響而更應有彈性。