THE JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

VOLUME 12 ISSUE 1 2017

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE
VOLUME 12 ISSUE 1 JUNE 2017

The Forgotten Voices in Higher Education: Students' Satisfaction with English-medium Instruction

Ali Karakas
Mehmet Akif Ersoy Univeristy, Burdur, Turkey

Abstract

This study explores how satisfied Turkish students are with English-medium instruction (EMI) in the context of higher education in an era when EMI universities operate as international brands capitalizing on English as a commodity to vie for more customers, that is, national and international students. Data were collected through a questionnaire administered to a large group of students enrolled in a private EMI university in Turkey's capital, Ankara. The data were further complemented through qualitative data obtained from open-ended email discussions with students. The analysis done by computing descriptive statistics and content analysis addressed EMI in terms of students' satisfaction with (1) teaching, (2) content teachers' English, (3) their institutions, and (4) their institutions' English language policies and practices. The results show that the majority of the students were satisfied with EMI in general and the four components, but it was their institutions' language policies and practices with which students were less satisfied compared to other EMI components for some reasons. Pedagogical implications of the findings are discussed in light of the findings of previous studies.
Keywords: English-medium instruction, higher education, internationalization, language policy and practice

Introduction

In recent years, universities worldwide have begun to offer content courses through the medium of a foreign language, unsurprisingly English. Therefore, the number of courses delivered through English-medium instruction (EMI), has grown at an exponential rate across the world, especially sweeping across Europe (Dearden, 2015; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). The main factor leading to EMI's being the current practice in teaching content courses is the process of *Englishization*, that is, an increased use of English in different forms and for particular purposes (Kirkpatrick, 2011). One can also find the Bologna Declaration initiated by the European Ministers of Education (1999) behind the adoption of EMI policies. This is because the Bologna process, viewed as a covert symbol for internationalization (Phillipson, 2012), has increased student and staff mobility, alongside competitiveness within the member countries, necessitating the use of a common language. Through shifting to EMI, universities have made financial gains, attracted international students and staff, contributed to the modernization and development of the country, and suitably prepared students for the global labour market (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2011; Wilkinson, 2013).

EMI in Turkey is not a new craze. The origins of EMI date back to 1956 when a state-run EMI university was established to serve Turkish students in pursuing scientific advances. The EMI trend in Turkey can be divided into two phases. The first phase spans the period between the 1950s and the 2000s when there were only a few

EMI universities that strived to raise qualified human resources for the country. According to the Official Gazette of 1984, the chief purpose of EMI courses then was to aid "students who are registered in an English medium department to access scientific and technological information published in English in their related departments" (Kırkgöz, 2005, p. 102). As regards the initial EMI universities, Karakaş (2016) noted that "these first generation EMI universities were far from being international in today's terms, for they principally sought to serve Turkish students, and thus did not have many students of other nationalities" (p. 5).

The second phase began after the 2000s when the then-government empowered private universities to decide upon their own medium of instruction. Unlike the first phase, the second phase was generated by external factors, such as marketization and internationalization of higher education. Being a member of the Bologna process, Turkey has desired to make its higher education competitive, with high intake of international students and academic staff (Collins, 2010). One way of doing this was to make a change in the language of instruction so that all students from different linguistic backgrounds can study in Turkish institutions. Although Turkey is behind its European counterparts in terms of the number of EMI programs offered, a recent survey indicated that about 20% of the undergraduate degree programs are delivered fully or partially in English in Turkey (Arik & Arik, 2014). Added to that, there has been a rapid escalation in the number of international students, which exceeded over 100,000 in the 2014-2015 school year (Kılanç, 2014, May 12).

The transition to EMI has led to several issues worldwide, ranging from students' linguistic readiness, teachers' linguistic and pedagogical preparedness, to concerns about cultural erosion. Among them, research into students' satisfaction with EMI is particularly important and should be regarded as critical because students prefer EMI programs over Turkish-medium programs with high expectations (e.g., to study at a prestigious university, to improve their English, to have better career prospects). However, what they have expected before and what they have experienced after the placement can be mismatched. Currently, little is known about to what extent students are satisfied with EMI and its sub-components. This study, thus, attempts to explore this issue by seeking answers to the following questions: How satisfied are students with the EMI phenomenon in terms of:

a. content teachers' expertise?
b. content teachers' English ability?
c. the EMI status of their institution?
d. their institution's English language policies and practices?

Theoretical framework

Language policy and planning

Language policy is "the combination of official decisions and prevailing public practices related to language education and use" (McGroarty, 1997, p. 67). This research builds its theoretical grounds on Spolsky's (2004) language policy framework, composed of three interrelated components: language practices, language beliefs and language management. These components act as interpretative tools in identifying issues related to institutions' avowed language policies and actualised practices, policy makers' and stakeholders' (i.e. lecturers and students) beliefs about the use of English, and any particular institutional attempts to manipulate people's practices via interventions (e.g. Hu, 2015; Jenkins, 2014, Karakaş, 2016).

The component of language practices is often manifested as the use of English in all academic activities, e.g. research, workshops, thesis defences, and examinations, on paper, but not always in practice (Turner & Robson, 2008). As for the manifestation of language beliefs, one can find that choosing English over the local language(s) or other international languages is an ideological decision that views English only as fit-for-purpose, i.e. instruction (Karakaş, 2016). This decision also pertains to the manifestation of language management in which EMI is legislated as a policy rule, overtly pronounced in the universities' policy papers (e.g., strategic plans) and mostly on their websites.

Several implementations evidently stand out as the mechanisms that can affect EMI shareholders' practices (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014) such as the English language requirements, language support programs, and academic writing trainings. Finally, there is also a teacher recruitment mechanism in which lecturers are supposed to meet the language standards of the institutions before they are recruited. For this, they are linguistically assessed through various measures, e.g. a certain amount of English (C1 in the CEFR framework), one-to-one interviews and a micro teaching before a jury (Ball & Lindsay, 2013; Karakaş, 2016; Lasagabaster, 2015). However, the teacher recruitment mechanisms are not implemented in the same light at institutions across the world. Particularly, those universities which have recently converted to EMI attempt to improve their existing staff's English through training sessions instead of recruiting new staff with high English proficiency (Ball & Lindsay, 2013; Klaassen & Graaf, 2001).

Students' experiences with English-medium instruction

Despite the scarcity of research directly addressing students' satisfaction with EMI, the existing studies partly offer glimpses into students' EMI satisfaction from different angles. One particular matter was students' learning. The results indicated that students' experiences with EMI education can be positioned at the two opposite ends of the EMI satisfaction continuum. At the negative end, students were displeased with EMI for several reasons. Take, for example, the study with the Finnish students who experienced difficulty in comprehending some of the lectures (Suviniitty, 2010). Among the factors negatively affecting students' experiences were students' difficulty in explaining themselves in English, slower rate of speech, problems with note-taking and reduced interaction with lecturers (Airey, 2009; Inbar-Lourie & Donitsa-Schmidt, 2013; Karabınar, 2008). However, concerning the positive end of the continuum, students in some locations, such as in Macau, were found to be quite pleased with EMI teaching, deeming that the more EMI courses are offered, the more international their institution becomes (Botha, 2013). Moreover, students supported EMI over instruction in their own language for its instrumental, for example, career development, boosting English skills and intrinsic values, e.g. socialising via English, reading in another language (Botha, 2013; Sert, 2008).

Another issue addressed previously was students' perceptions of lecturers' English. Largely, a deficit view prevailed among students towards lecturers' English, especially that of lecturers with whom they shared the same nationality. For instance, Korean students were seen to be displeased with their Korean professors' English, whereas they positively judged their native-English-speaking lecturers' English (Byun et al., 2010). To explain this dilemma, Byun et al. (2010) argued that "utilizing non-native English speakers as EMI instructors produced less interaction and intimacy between professors and students" (p. 433). This lack of intimacy probably led to the

emergence of a deficit view of lecturers' English. A study with Danish students demonstrated a parallel tendency among students, with more negative attitudes towards Danish lecturers' English compared to that of international academic staff (Jensen et al., 2013), despite Denmark's standing on the third place with the '*Very High Proficiency'* label in the ranking of countries by English skills (EF English Proficiency Index, 2015). This nationality contrast might have thus stemmed from the fact that students considered their Danish lecturers' English to be more tainted with Danish characteristics (e.g., vocabulary choice, pronunciation, accent) in comparison to the English of the international staff.

When exploring students' perceptions of EMI, researchers have obtained information on students' opinions about their institutions' EMI status. Although many students encountered difficulties in following EMI courses, they were quite satisfied with the benefits offered. For example, Karakaş (2016) observed that many Turkish EMI students described their institution as being superior to and more prestigious than Turkish-medium universities. Research also revealed students' contentment with studying in an academic environment together with international students and academic staff (Doiz et al., 2013).

Another line of inquiry pertains to language policies and practices in EMI universities. Policy studies (e.g. Karakaş, 2016; Kırkgöz, 2009) revealed that students were particularly dissatisfied with the language-support program as they found it unsatisfactory in terms of preparing students for disciplinary studies. Students argued that the EAP support was grounded in general English skills; therefore, students could not successfully respond to course requirements since they lack essential academic English skills to cope with academic tasks. Many students agreed, however, that attending the program improved their language skills (Karakaş, 2016). Students were displeased with some language instructors of the program who expected students to abide by standard English norms in productive skills (speaking and writing), with an emphasis on correctness (Karakaş, 2016). Also, while the majority of the students were positive about the teaching materials imported from the English as a native language (ENL) countries, a small minority were not since they believed that the ENL-oriented materials remain incapable of preparing them for real-world communication in and outside the campus where they use English mostly with non-native English speakers. These results agreed with recent studies conducted in other contexts, including the Anglophone context (e.g., Jenkins, 2014).

As discussed above, students' experiences with EMI show that their satisfaction with EMI has been somewhat addressed while exploring students' perceptions of and attitudes towards EMI, and that the extant results have been rather inconclusive and contradictory. Therefore, this small-scale study seeks to examine the students' experiences with EMI in the Turkish context in a more comprehensive manner so as to better understand students' satisfaction with the current state of EMI teaching in their own institution from different points.

Research process

Research context and participants

The research was undertaken at Bilkent University, located in Ankara, the capital of the country. There are currently 13,000 students studying at the university, about 10% of whom are international students. It offers a variety of degree programs in varied disciplinary fields. Its teaching staff consists of roughly 1,000 members, including

international staff from over 40 different countries. It also flies high in various university league tables. English is the official medium of instruction. Compared to other Turkish universities, its international outlook is far more noticeable. This positive outlook seems to allow the university to draw in the very highest calibre of academic staff, domestic and international students.

The participants were undergraduate and graduate university students enrolled in various disciplines of the Bilkent University. Altogether 184 students were involved in the questionnaire study; however, not all fully completed the questionnaires. Due to the drop outs, the number of surveys completed was 112, corresponding to 61% of the participants. A few participants skipped some items on the questionnaire due probably to the fact that those items were not totally relevant to their EMI experiences. A total of 33% of the students were male and 67% were female, with a mean age of 21.8 years. The sample represented students from a wide array of disciplines, including politics, industrial engineering, computer science, psychology and molecular biology and genetics, to name a few. The participants were in different years of study at the time of the study, ranging from first year to master's degree.

Research instrument and data analysis

The data was garnered via a survey questionnaire designed by the researcher. It consisted of five sections: a) personal/demographic information, b) satisfaction with EMI teaching, c) satisfaction with lecturers' English, d) satisfaction with the institution and e) satisfaction with the English language policies and practices of the institution. The questionnaire was transformed into an online platform, i.e. Qualtricks, for a quick distribution. It was administrated bilingually to let students respond to the items either in Turkish or English. The questionnaire was reviewed by two colleagues to assess its content and structure. After necessary modifications on the questionnaire items and its layout were made, a [1]link to the questionnaire was created and sent to the participants through private Facebook messages. The sampling was done randomly, aiming to recruit a subset of students from a larger set, i.e. the student body of the university. The questionnaire also included an item asking students to provide their email addresses if they wish to discuss their responses and answer further questions about the issues not addressed in the questionnaire.

The quantitative data were subjected to descriptive statistics to draw an overall picture of the students' satisfaction with EMI and its constituting sub-components. Qualitative data obtained from students' further comments on the questionnaire were collected through open-ended emails and then analysed via the categorical content method (Klassen et al., 2011). The qualitative data were subsequently merged with the questionnaire data wherever relevant considering the categorical content of the quantitative data.

Results and discussion

Students' satisfaction with content teachers' expertise

Table 1 indicates that the participants were fairly pleased with content teachers' expertise in their disciplines and qualifications for teaching disciplinary subjects. Additionally, the vast majority agreed that teachers have a considerable role in their academic growth. Another reason for students' satisfaction was the teachers' responsive-

ness to their needs, implying that their teachers are approachable. Overall, more than one-fourth (82.7%) were positive about their content teachers.

Table 1
Students' views about content teachers

Statements	SA	A	NA/D	DisA	SD
	%	%	%	%	%
	f	f	f	f	f
1. Content teachers are knowledgeable and professional.	41.8	53.2	1.6	3.2	0
	51	65	2	4	0
2. Content teachers are making a positive contribution to students' academic knowledge.	40.1	52.4	2.4	4.9	0
	49	64	3	6	0
3. Content teachers respond to students' inquiries in a timely manner.	34.9	50.4	11.3	3.2	0
	43	62	14	4	0
4. Overall, I'm very satisfied with content teachers.	31.1	51.6	9	6.5	1.6
	38	63	11	8	2

Note: SA: Strongly agree, A: agree, NA/D: Neither agree nor disagree, DisA: Disagree, SD: Strongly disagree

After contacting the students (N= 9) volunteering to provide additional information on their responses via emails, more elaborate responses on students' satisfaction with content teachers were attained. Specifically, the students reiterated that lecturers attempt to sympathize with them and back their content acquisition. For instance, a student remarked "indeed it depends on the individual lecturer. Some are really encouraging, especially when it comes to motivating students to speak English and participate in classroom activities" (S1). It was also reported by four students that content teachers often take on the role of language teachers by helping students with low language skills. This role-taking act was described by a student as follows:

> Some lecturers correct our mistakes on our assignments and even in the exams. They do this to help us improve our writing and they don't mark us down for such errors. They're really well-intentioned and student friendly. All they want is contribute to our learning in our respective discipline (S4).

One student (S7) expressed dissatisfaction with some of her lecturers. She recounted her experience with a female teacher who offended her before her classmates just because she could not clearly answer a question due to her limited English and shifting to Turkish in order to avoid faltering and making mistakes. As S7 said, switching to Turkish got the lecturer mad. S7 uttered what she felt afterwards as follows:

> I felt broken after that class. I still recall her shouting at me in front of my classmates. You know I was not a primary school student at that time. I found myself in a position like I'd say I would never speak in any of the classes again.

These results partially match those reported in earlier studies (e.g., Airey, 2009; Suviniitty, 2010) which revealed that not all students could successfully follow cours-

es, communicate their ideas and comprehend courses. One reason for this might be that students come from different linguistic backgrounds. Most are linguistically well-equipped to shoulder the burden of learning in English while others, despite being in minority, are not. Another factor involves students' socioeconomic status and educational background. Seeing as the study was conducted in a private university charging high tuition fees, many students are from families with high socioeconomic status. It is likely, thus, that students from such families have experienced EMI or been involved in language-study abroad before (Karakaş, 2016). However, the students awarded a scholarship to study in such universities are often from families with low income status and their educational background is limited to state schools where the quality of language education is fairly poor (Koru & Akesson, 2011).

Students' satisfaction with teachers' English

Table 2 reveals the existence of a great deal of satisfaction among students as to the aesthetic elements, e.g. accents and pronunciations. However, 12% was not as pleased with teachers' accents and pronunciations as the majority were. The highest degree of satisfaction was with teachers' intelligibility. This finding suggests that even if there are some students disliking teachers' accents and pronunciations, they still do find them comprehensible.

Table 2
Students' satisfaction with teachers' English

Aspects of teachers' English	VS	S	N	DisS	VD
How satisfied students are with	%	%	%	%	%
	f	f	f	f	f
1. with the accents of their content	5.9	66.1	14.4	10.1	3.3
teachers	7	78	17	12	4
2. with the pronunciation of content	8.47	63.5	16.1	10.1	1.6
teachers?	10	75	19	12	2
3. with the grammatical knowledge of	5.9	72	13.5	5.9	2.5
your teachers' English?	7	85	16	7	3
4. with the intelligibility of your con-	18.64	62.7	11	5.9	1.6
tent teachers' English?	22	74	13	7	2

Note: VS: very satisfied, S: satisfied, N: neutral, D: dissatisfied, VD: very dissatisfied

The email exchanges with students displayed the contrast between the perceptions of Turkish lecturers and international lecturers, and between the Turkish lecturers who have stayed in a native English-speaking environment before and those who have not. For example, a student stated "Teachers who have been abroad speak so good English. However, we have a teacher who did her master's degree in Spain. I don't find her English so good. She's trouble in expressing herself and lacks fluency" (S3).

Another student, S6, explained why he does not like Turkish teachers' English, noting "Their English has no variety in lectures. They keep using the same phrases and words again and again". Moreover, in a disapproving manner, a few students referred to Turkish-accented speech of some lecturers and the fact that few lecturers even use Turkish in classes. One student, for instance, stated "most of our classes are 98-99% in English, yet there're a couple of lecturers who switch to Turkish frequently" (S9). She further added "Some lecturers' English is not so bright because they

speak English as though they spoke Turkish. Their accents are too ear-splitting." Such harsh comments on lecturers English are not new as similar pejorative comments were reported in earlier studies (e.g. Byun et al., 2010; Jensen et al., 2013). Behind the harsh comments lies probably the fact that some lecturers keep retaining their own accents, as an identity marker without attempting to mimic native English accents. Students' pejorative remarks can be explained by citing the possibility that most students expect their content teachers to sound like a native speaker, yet the teachers who cannot meet this expectation seem to cause dissatisfaction.

Students' satisfaction with their institution

Table 3 provides evidence that the participants are reasonably pleased with their institution. This is also confirmed by the fact that merely few students reported repenting of choosing an EMI university. Only 12 students wished to study in a different EMI university and six were in favour of enrolling at a Turkish medium institution. However, once it comes to studying with international students and teaching staff, students' satisfaction level was considerably higher.

Table 3
Students' satisfaction with their institution

Statements (N= 113)	SA	A	NA/D	DisA	SD
	% f	% f	% f	% f	% f
1. I'm pretty satisfied with the university I chose.	53.1 60	37.1 42	6.1 7	2.6 3	0.8 1
2. I'm pretty certain that I made the best decision by choosing this university.	51.3 58	24.7 28	17 20	5.3 6	0.8 1
3. I feel regretful for choosing an English-medium university.	3.54 4	2.6 3	4.4 5	17.7 20	71.6 81
4. If I could take the university exam again, I'd choose a different English-medium university.	5.3 6	5.3 6	15 17	23.8 27	54.8 62
5. If I could take the university exam again, I'd choose a Turkish medium university.	1.7 2	3.5 4	7.9 9	20.3 23	66.3 113
6. I'm very satisfied that there are foreign students in the university.	47.7 54	32.7 37	14.1 16	3.5 4	1.7 2
7. I'm very satisfied that there are foreign faculty staff in the university.	71.6 81	22.1 25	6.1 7	0 0	0 0

Students particularised the questionnaire results in their emails by emphasising the underlying factors impacting on their satisfaction. For instance, one student (S2) established a connection between his institution and Oxford to illustrate his pride in studying at Bilkent, saying that "as I see it Bilkent is in a sense like 'Oxford' and 'Harvard' positioned in Ankara. Its use of a foreign language in teaching has a very influential role in its current position". Further, it became evident from the students' accounts that the approach embraced towards the international staff was instrumental-

ly prompted, as some students believed they could refer to them as a reference upon deciding to follow a graduate degree abroad. S5, for instance, noted that "Bilkent employs very prominent lecturers from abroad. It's an advantage to take courses with them, especially when we go abroad and such like".

Besides, the students favouring the intake of international students in their institution mentioned, first and foremost, the prospect of practising their spoken English and the positive impact of these students on the institution's international outlook (S5 and S8). Moreover, two students (S7 and S2) emphasized networking opportunities available in their institution, through which they can keep in touch with their international peers for future work-related and socio-cultural-based activities.

For students wishing to study in a different EMI university, the driving force was the claim that studying in Bilkent is quite a difficult process that not everyone can go through successfully. Confronted with repeated failures, as some students reported (S8 and S4), their friends prefer to move from Bilkent to another low-profile EMI university or to a Turkish-medium university. Speaking of this issue, S6 stated "Baskent university is filled with students from Bilkent who failed in its programs, particularly in the preparatory program". Another student (S3) similarly maintained that his "friends now can easily pass their classes in their new universities".

To recap briefly, the interview results indicated a high level of parallelism with the findings of previous studies in which students ascribed prestige and superiority to EMI universities (Doiz et al., 2013; Karakaş, 2016). Intriguing is the participants' overall orientation to EMI, which is typified by instrumental expectations, e.g. improving their speaking skills, expanding their international network, working with leading academics from abroad, which echoed the findings earlier work on EMI by showing how intrinsic and instrumental values enjoy a crucial part in guiding students' satisfaction with EMI (Botha, 2013; Sert, 2008).

Students' satisfaction with their institutions' English language policies and practices

Students' satisfaction with English language policies and practices were a bit lower compared to their satisfaction with the above components. Roughly 60% perceived policies and practice to be *good* or *very good*. Nonetheless, most participants chose a middle point, viewing English language policies and practices as being fair. Table 4 shows that about half were negative about the quality of the materials used in the preparatory school and the predictive value of the proficiency exam. The participants were most pleased with the quality of language support given in the preparatory school and their faculty. Additionally, their perceptions of language instructors' English was between *high* and *very high* (over 60%) and fair (32%).

Table 4. Students' satisfaction with English language policies and practices

Language policies/practices (N=107)	VP	Poor	Fair	Good	VG
How satisfied students are with	% f	% f	% f	% f	% f
1. Overall, the quality of language support in preparatory school is	1.92 2	4.8 5	35.5 37	38.4 40	19.2 20
2. Overall, the quality of faculty language support is	0.9 1	8.4 9	22.4 24	42.9 46	25.2 27

3. Overall, the predictive value of university English language proficiency test scores is	1.8 2	8.4 9	30.8 33	43.9 47	14.9 16
4. Overall, the quality of the materials used in the preparatory school is	2.9 3	6.8 7	39.8 41	36.8 38	13.5 14
5. Overall, the level of preparatory school language teachers' English is	0 0	0.9 1	32 33	40.7 42	26.2 27

Note: VP: very poor, VG: very good

Students' comments on the above issues in their emails were varied. Overall, students threw a focus on the insufficiency of the EAP support, which, as they claimed, paid no mind to academic English. Therefore, as put by S6, "just a few students can successfully comprehend the classes due to the majority's English being limited". Another student (S9) emphasized the fact that "studying in the prep school for one year is not enough to strengthen academic English skills". A possible explanation for such negative views on language support programs is the diversity in students' language proficiency levels. Some come to the university with desired levels of English, however, the majority do not because of the differences in educational background. However, students unanimously agreed that studying English intensively over a year helped them improve their English skills. Turning to the materials, some students mentioned the difficulty of following the textbooks used in the prep school. Especially, two students (S1 and S3) raised the issue of language focus in the books, which was, as they said, predominantly on grammatical structures. These results partially supported the previous research where some students were critical of their institutions' EAP support for similar reasons (Karakaş, 2016; Kırkgöz, 2009).

Concluding remarks

This paper canvassed students' satisfaction with EMI in the context of a private Turkish higher education institution. Being an initial study into students' satisfaction with EMI in Turkey, the investigation has shown that most students were pleased with their teachers' linguistic competence and subject-matter expertise as well as being an EMI student at their institution. From the findings, it can be concluded that students mostly have seen what they expected from their institution in the respective areas of EMI. Nevertheless, they were found not to have as much satisfaction with language policies and practices as they did with other components. It was perhaps because the curriculum followed in language support units are founded on general English skills rather than academic English skills. Additionally, some issues with language learning materials were raised by students to spotlight the inadequacy of such resources in preparing students for their disciplinary studies. This is probably because the disciplinary language use is fairly different from the general English students learn and practise in the language support units. One practical implication of these findings is that the EMI institution(s) should take an action to integrate a more academic-English-based curriculum into their language support programs rather than a general English skill-based curriculum, using materials which are fit-for-purpose.

Another aspect of this study consisted of identifying the way students orientated towards English and EMI in particular. The results made it clear that the leading factors behind students' overall satisfaction with EMI and its shareholders are largely

instrumental and intrinsic. It should be also noted that EMI institutions appear to be accorded prestige owing to the use of English in the instruction and the current status of English seen as a key that can open any door to students. Relating to English language teaching, this paper portrayed students' expectations of near-native-like performance of their teachers, especially in the area of pronunciation, giving evidence that the *nativeness* principle still matters for students even if they are mostly surrounded by non-native English-speaking students and staff. It is within the remit of language teachers to inform their students not only about the native speaker model but also about other alternatives (e.g., successful communicator, interculturally competent speaker, or skilled language user) without enforcing any of them on students. Students themselves should make a decision on the model they aspire to emulate in their linguistic behaviours.

This study has been concerned with one EMI university in Turkey. Nevertheless, further investigations can and should be made with other EMI universities using different versions of EMI in Turkey and other countries with similar characteristics because the implications of the present study go far beyond the Turkish context. Moreover, such investigations can pave the way for motivation research into why students make and have made a growing demand for EMI institutions.

Notes

[1]https://az1.qualtrics.com/jfe3/preview/SV_78JTLveeEp9bQXz

References

Airey, J. (2009). *Science, language and literacy: Case studies of learning in Swedish university physics.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.

Altbach, P. G. & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 290–305.

Arik, B. T. & Arik, E. (2014). The role and status of English in Turkish higher education. *English Today*, *30*, 5–10.

Ball, B. & Lindsay, D. (2013). Language demands and support for English medium instruction in tertiary education: Learning from a specific context. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (eds.). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp.44-61). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Botha, W. (2013). English-medium instruction at a university in Macau: Policy and realities. *World Englishes*, *32*(4), 461–475.

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., and Jung, J. (2010). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education*, *62*(4), 431-449.

Collins, A. B. (2010). English-medium higher education: Dilemma and problems. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 39, 97–110.

Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction – A growing global phenomenon*. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2011). Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes*, *30*(3), 345-359.

EF English Proficiency Index - Denmark. (2015). *Ef.com.tr*. Retrieved from http://www.ef.com.tr/epi/regions/europe/denmark/

European Ministers of Education. (1999). *The Bologna declaration of 19 June 1999* [PDF]. Retrieved from European Higher Education area Website http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION1.pdf.

Hu, L. (2015). *Exploring influences of on and orientations towards English as a medium of instruction in Chinese higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southampton University, Southampton, UK.

Inbar-Lourie, O. & Donitsa-Schmidt, S. (2013). Englishization in an Israeli teacher education college: Taking the first steps. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 151-173). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university. The politics of academic English language policy*. Abingdon, GB: Routledge.

Jensen, C., Denver, L., Mees, I. M., Werther, C. & Business, C. (2013). Students' attitudes to lecturers' English in English-medium higher education in Denmark. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 13(1), 87–112.

Karabinar, S. (2008). Integrating language and content: Two models and their effects on the learners' academic self-concept. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education* (pp. 53-64). Maastricht, Netherlands: Maastricht University.

Karakaş, A. (2016). *Turkish lecturers' and students' perceptions of English in English-medium universities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southampton: Southampton University.

Kılanç, B. (2014, May 12). *Üniversitelerimizin gözü yurtdışında [Our universities have their eyes on abroad]. Akşam Daily, Retrieved from http://www.aksam.com.tr/yazarlar/universitelerimizin-c2gozu-yurtdisinda/haber-307078*

Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 1*(1), 101-123.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Students' and lecturers' perceptions of the effectiveness of foreign language instruction in an English-medium university in Turkey. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 81–93.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). *Internationalization or Englishization: Medium of instruction in today's universities*. Hong Kong Centre for Governance and Citizenship Work, The Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Klaassen, R. & Graaff, E. D. (2001). Facing innovation: Preparing lecturers for English medium instruction in a non-native context. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(3), 281–289.

Klassen, R. M., Al-Dhafri, S., Hannok, W. and Betts, S. M. (2011). Investigating preservice teacher motivation across cultures using the Teachers' Ten Statements Test. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 579-588.

Koru, S., & Akesson, J. (2011). *Türkiye'nin İngilizce Açığı*. Ankara: Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı. 1-19, Retrieved from http://www.tepav.org.tr/upload/files/1329722803-6.Turkiye_nin_Ingilizce_Acigi.pdf

Lasagabaster, D. (2015). Multilingual language policy: Is it becoming a misnomer at university level? In S. Dimova., A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 115-134). Berlin: Mouton.

McGroarty, M. (1997). Language policy in the USA: National values, local loyalties, pragmatic pressures. In W. Eggington & H. Wren (Eds.), *Language policy: Dominant English, plüralist challenges* (pp. 67–90). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Phillipson, R. (2012). Some partner languages are more equal than others, in *Forum International de Bamako sur le multilinguisme*: "Une première étape vers un Sommet Mondial sur le Multilinguisme", Bamako, Mali, 19-21 janvier 2009, Actes du Forum. Bamako: Académie Africaine des Langues, 139-151.

Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System*, *36*(2), 156–171.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suviniitty, J. (2010). Lecturers' questions and student perception of lecture comprehension. *Helsinki English Studies*, *6*(1), 44–57.

Turner, Y. & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university*. London: Continuum Intl. Pub. Group.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (Eds.). (2014). *English-taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The State of Play in 2014*. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Bonn: Lemmens.

Wilkinson. R. (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch University: Challenges and pitfalls", in A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 3-24). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Appendix: Profile of students involved in email exchanges

Student ID	Gender	Year of study	Academic discipline
S1	M	1	Interior architecture
S2	M	2	Molecular biology and genetics
S3	M	4	Business administration
S4	M	1	Molecular biology and genetics
S5	F	3	Industrial engineering
S6	M	2	Computer engineering
S7	F	2	Mathematics
S8	F	1	Psychology
S9	F	4	Business administration

Note on Contributor

Ali KARAKAS graduated from English Language Teaching department of Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey. He earned his PhD in Applied Linguistics from Southampton University, UK. Currently, he is working as a research assistant at the English Language Teaching department of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey. His main research interests include Global Englishes, English as a lingua franca, Language policy and planning, and teacher education. Email: akarakas@mehmetakif.edu.tr