THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE MAIN STAKEHOLDERS OF

UNIVERSITIES REGARDING ENGLISH MEDIUM

INSTRUCTION IN TURKEY

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

ALEV SEZİN KAHVECİOĞLU

THE PROGRAM OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

JULY 2019

Eşsiz aileme, Simi ve Venüs'e,
ve en değerli varlığım olan eşime...

The Perceptions of the Main Stakeholders of Universities Regarding

English Medium Instruction in Turkey

The Graduate School of Education

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Curriculum and Instruction

Ankara

July 2019

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The Perceptions of The Main Stakeholders of Universities Regarding

English Medium Instruction in Turkey

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

July 2019

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit (Supervisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction.

Asst. Prof. Dr. İlker Kalender (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Perihan Savaş, METU (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Alipaşa Ayas (Director)

ABSTRACT

The Perceptions of the Main Stakeholders of Universities Regarding

English Medium Instruction in Turkey

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

M.A., Program of Curriculum and Instruction
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit
June 2019

This study aimed to investigate the perceptions of students, content professors and language instructors in 25 EMI (English Medium Instruction) universities in Turkey regarding EMI, and whether there is a significant difference between their perceptions. In this explanatory research, a survey research design was implemented by collecting the quantitative and qualitative data through surveys. 205 students, 81 content professors and 45 language instructors took part in the surveys, and content analysis was conducted to analyze the open-ended questions to obtain qualitative data. Major findings show that all participant groups have a positive perception of EMI, with the students showing the highest level and content professors the lowest. The Welch ANOVA test showed that there was a significant difference between the perceptions of students and content professors. The content analysis revealed that the necessity to have a high level of English language skills for EMI programs is seen both as an advantage for following recent literature, but also as an obstacle for academic success in courses both by students and content professors.

Key words: EMI, English medium instruction, main stakeholder perceptions

ÖZET

Türkiye'deki Üniversitelerin Önemli Paydaşlarının İngilizce Dilinde Öğretim

Hakkındaki Algıları

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tijen Akşit

Temmuz 2019

Bu çalışma Türkiye'deki eğitim dili İngilizce olan 25 üniversitenin öğrencilerinin, alan öğretim elemanlarının ve İngilizce hazırlık programı öğretim görevlilerinin, İngilizce dilinde öğretim hakkındaki algılarını ölçmeyi ve algılar arasında önemli bir fark olup olmadığını incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu açıklayıcı araştırmada karma bir anket araştırması deseni kullanılmış, anketler kullanılarak nicel ve nitel veri toplanmıştır. Anketlere 205 öğrenci, 81 alan öğretim elemanı ve 45 İngilizce hazırlık programı öğretim görevlisi katılmış, nitel veri toplama amacıyla açık uçlu sorularda içerik analizi yöntemi uygulanmıştır. Bulgular tüm katılımcı grupların İngilizce dilinde öğretim hakkında olumlu bir algıya sahip olduklarını göstermektedir. En yüksek düzeyde olumlu algı öğrencilere, en düşük seviyede ise alan öğretim elemanlarına aittir. Welch ANOVA testi öğrencilerin ve alan öğretim elemanlarının algıları arasında önemli bir fark olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. İçerik analizi hem öğrenciler hem alan öğretim elemanları için, İngilizce dilinde öğretim yapılan programlarda yüksek seviyede İngilizce yetenekleri olması gerekliliğinin yeni alanyazını takip etmek için bir avantaj olduğunu, fakat aynı zamanda akademik başarı için bir engel teşkil ettiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: İngilizce dilinde öğretim, önemli paydaş algıları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This chapter introduces the background of this research, as well as stating the problem, the purpose, the research questions and significance of this study. The definitions of key terms and ethical considerations are also given at the end of the chapter.

Background

English use has been expanding gradually since the second half of the 20th century. By the end of the century, it was declared to be the main language of communication, the *lingua franca*, since its use had started to exceed that of French. In turn, this affected the language use in many fields including technology and business. Adapting oneself to the use of technological devices, using software or communicating on the Internet internationally are becoming gradually impossible without having the proper skills in English. Likewise, English has become the ultimate medium of any kind of monetary affair in a world where free market dominates the international business. It is possible therefore to claim that English is one of the most fundamental means that has generated a common ground for individuals that enlarged the context of interpersonal relationships and affairs at a global level.

Indubitably, the spread and indispensability of English in various sectors has reflected itself also in academia. English has been the main language for academic texts and international conferences for the past few decades. Moreover, universities have started to be seen as a global free market where international quality education is in high demand by international students (Coleman, 2006). Students in the world search for education in other countries than their own, possibly for reasons that the experience abroad and a foreign education would contribute to their likelihood of employment. The programs these students prefer in general are in English (Gardt & Hüppauf, 2004), due to the fact that it is a common language they can use and understand easily. Moreover, a significant group of students that receive education in their native countries opt for programs that are in English for the same reason of employability (Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015; Kiliçkaya, 2006).

For universities, being able to respond to this demand requires establishment of programs in English, with English-speaking academics, and for some institutions, a preparatory program with language instructors of English for teaching this language to students before they commence their undergraduate studies. As for academics, a certain level of proficiency in English is not only a necessity for employment in these institutions, but it also allows them to broaden their academic range, in the number of research studies they have access to and can publish more globally. As a consequence, tertiary level education has had to pay more attention to English due to its international use and necessity.

This has led to an expansion of English-medium instruction (EMI) courses and programs in universities in the world (Doiz et al., 2011; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018). EMI is defined as "the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English" (Dearden, 2014, p.2). In other words, EMI is the use of English when teaching academic subjects other than English language (Zhao and Dixon, 2017). As a result, in the contemporary world, there is a growing interest in research in EMI needs analysis, and stakeholders' attitudes and perceptions of EMI to understand whether for institutions around the world it is necessary, advantageous or just the opposite, detrimental for countries' native language, culture and academic development.

The internationalization of education and English becoming the main language of communication, in business, technology and academia has also shown its effect in Turkey. Selvi (2014) discusses that for the educated in Turkey, English is a *sine qua non*. With the global competition of high-quality education standards, access to academic texts and conducting globally acclaimed research, and students' possibility of employment after graduation in a global business environment, Turkish universities have also begun to acknowledge the necessity of EMI in their institutions and therefore started to conduct courses and programs in the *lingua franca*, English (British Council & TEPAV, 2015; Kiliçkaya, 2006). As a result, EMI has also become a phenomenon to be explored in depth in the Turkish context.

Problem

Since the 1980s, the number of institutions that offer EMI has increased globally as a result of English becoming the *lingua franca*. Although many think that it is necessary in the growing global milieu, there are contradicting views, showing concern about the repercussions of this practice to the culture, technological development and language of their own country, or see it as an extraneous burden to the students (Coleman, 2006; Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015).

In terms of higher education (HE) in Turkey, many universities followed the examples of Middle East Technical University (METU) and Bilkent University, the former the first public and the latter the first foundation university that teach using EMI (Başıbek et al., 2014). The universities in this study constitute examples of these universities and they have adopted EMI in their institution as well for the benefit of their students, academics and their own. On the other hand, according to British Council and TEPAV's report (2015), although English used to be seen as a way to access information, it can constitute an obstacle in modern Turkey, where students are able to access textbooks and can publish research in Turkish. Due to these circumstances, the universities in this thesis become a valuable asset to conduct a survey research about the main stakeholders' perceptions of this implementation to understand what they perceive when it comes to the question of EMI.

In relevant literature, there are opposing views related to English medium instruction, and more studies need to be conducted to see the consequences of EMI implementation and the circumstances it constitutes in Turkey, and investigate whether or not EMI is a useful means for the main stakeholders of Turkish universities.

Purpose

The first aim of this study is to identify the background characteristics of the main stakeholders of 25 EMI universities in Turkey. Another purpose of this thesis is to investigate the perceptions of the main stakeholders, undergraduate students, content professors and language instructors, of EMI universities in terms of their general attitude towards EMI, reasons to favor and not to favor EMI, and whether there is a difference between stakeholder groups. Lastly, whether there was a difference between the perceptions of students and content professors regarding the influence of EMI on subject learning and language acquisition was investigated.

Research questions

This research aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the background characteristics of students, content professors and English language instructors of universities in Turkey where the main medium of instruction is English?

2. What are the perceptions of students, content professors and English language

instructors of universities in Turkey where the main medium of instruction is English, regarding their experience of EMI?

3. Is there a difference between the perceptions of undergraduate students, content professors and language instructors regarding their

   a. general attitude towards EMI

   b. reasons to favor EMI

   c. reasons not to favor EMI?

4. Is there a difference between the perceptions of students and content professors regarding the influence of EMI on

   a. subject learning

   b. language skill acquisition?

Significance

Being a quickly growing phenomenon around the world, questions towards EMI have been rising since the end of the 20th century. To exemplify, there is research establishing the benefits of using EMI for the institutions and the students around the world, which also reveals that it constitutes a threat for minority languages, stating that more statistical data is needed in this end (Coleman, 2006). On a different note, Hu et al. (2014) claim that they found adopting EMI creates and highlights inequalities in society and in Chinese universities. According to Doiz et al. (2011), it also creates a divide between professions, as some programs' availability in EMI is more widespread internationally than others, and a conscious effort is necessary to

protect the native language. They also assert that it is necessary to explore how English plays a role in education in European countries. These problems highlight the importance of conducting more in-depth research on EMI in higher education around the world.

Similarly, EMI in Turkey has been introduced in foundation universities "in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir as well as the elite state universities" (Dearden, 2014, p.14). The importance of the perceptions of the students, content professors and English language instructors about the institutions' adoption of EMI is twofold. First, the data collected from the universities in Turkey, which have adopted EMI in their institution can help other universities and their administration in deciding whether they should increase their EMI percentage, or make the decision to change the medium of instruction completely (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018). In Turkey, 25 universities out of 206 have all or majority of their programs with EMI approach in their institutions, which makes approximately 12% of all universities in the country (ÖSYM, 2018; Yükseköğretim Kurulu, 2018). According to the results of this thesis and other similar research (Atik, 2010; Dearden, 2014; Tarhan, 2003), universities may consider EMI as a useful method of instruction, or the opposite. As a result of this, the percentage of institutions using EMI may increase or decrease in the future. Second, it can also be useful to see how such practice has an effect on the main stakeholders' perceptions. In addition, students may benefit from the present research to see the perceptions of other fellow students in EMI universities in the country and

the variation of perceptions according to their backgrounds to evaluate their own situation and options.

Studies on EMI are popular internationally (Coleman, 2006; Doiz et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2014; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018), yet such research conducted for stakeholder perceptions are relatively new and few (Hu et al., 2014; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018), especially in the Turkish context. Moreover, Macaro and Akincioglu (2018) state that more and deeper attention needs to be given to institutional variables such as gender and school type in "different socio-economic and cultural contexts" (p. 256). Therefore, it is essential to add to the EMI studies in Turkey (Kiliçkaya, 2006), since it is presently a phenomenon that is liable to rapid change.

Definition of key terms

In this research, the definition of EMI is accepted as "the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English" (Dearden, 2014, p.2). In higher education institutions (HEIs) of Turkey, the medium of instruction is Turkish (TMI) for some departments, whereas others have varying percentages of English medium instruction (EMI).

This present research accepts universities that are listed in the national Center of Assesment, Selection and Placement's (ÖSYM) 2018 university selection guidebook

and have two or fewer faculties that did not contain the special condition indicating that the language of education is English as "wholly EMI". Two faculties that include one or more departments that use TMI in one or more departments are allowed due to the fact that the majority of these faculties are law or medical studies, and it is contextually acceptable to have these faculties' medium of instruction in the native language of the country. For this reason, two faculties were set as the limit of acceptability and on this basis; only 25 universities out of 206 fit this definition.

Ethical considerations

When the focus of the study was finalized, a valid and reliable survey was chosen as the data collection instrument (Atik, 2010), due its parallelism with the purpose of this thesis. Regarding the use of this instrument, approval of the Ethics Committee of Bilkent University was sought and obtained.

As indicated in the Ethics Committee application, the participants of this thesis are undergraduate students who are over 18 years old, content professors and language instructors of 25 EMI universities in Turkey.

Because the participants were legal adults, their own permission was requested for the use of their replies to the surveys, and their data. Before they began answering the survey the participants saw a form for giving information and requesting their consent, where they were informed of the purpose of the study, my name and email

address, and my supervisor. The form indicated that the results would be published

only in this thesis. In the forms, it was emphasized that their identification would not

be disclosed. They were assured that the results or their answers would not be shared

with anyone else or their university, and would not affect their performance

evaluation at the institution.

The data was stored only on my personal computer and only I had access to the data.

The participants were also informed that participation was voluntary, that they could

leave the survey any time they wanted to, and a box they could select was present

indicating that they could prohibit the use of their data if they did not want me to.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter aims to present a literature review on the effects of English-Medium Instruction (EMI) on higher education and to provide a detailed discussion of what the perceptions of students, language instructors, and content professors about EMI are and whether there is a significant difference in the perceptions of these groups, which constitute the research questions of this thesis.

In this respect, firstly, effects of globalization on higher education in the world context will be scrutinized, which provides a basis for discussing its effects in Turkish higher education. Following, global and contextual effects of EMI will be discussed. The literature will be analyzed with specific focuses on language instructors', content instructors', and undergraduate students' perceptions about EMI.

Globalization and English as a *lingua franca*

The use of English as a medium of instruction in many higher education institutions (HEIs) all over the world is an output of a long process of the convergence of geographical and cultural differences.

The literature suggests that English medium instruction is a result of globalization and consequently of English becoming the *lingua franca* (Coleman, 2006;

Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018). The term *lingua franca* basically refers to "a vehicular language used by speakers who do not share a first language" (Mauranen, 2012, p.8).

One set of literature specifically focuses on this very relationship between globalization and English as the *lingua franca*. Gray (2002) suggests that three aspects of global development are effective in this process: (1) the rise of transnational corporations (2) the spread of world organizations and (3) the Internet. Coleman (2006), with a reference to Clyne (1984, 1995), also emphasizes that the wider use of English stems from many factors such as "economic, political and strategic alliances, ...scientific, technological and cultural cooperation, ...mass media, ...multinational corporations, ...improved communications, and ...the internationalization of professional and personal domains of activity" (p. 2).

Flowerdew (2013) also draws attention to the relationship between English becoming lingua franca and internationalization, which is a certain output of globalization. He emphasizes the bond between English as a lingua franca and having "a (critical) international perspective on the world" (p. 191). Similarly, Jenkins et al. (2011) state that English is intertwined with globalization process and therefore English should be grasped as "fluid, flexible, contingent, hybrid and deeply intercultural" (p. 284).

Considering the literature, one might argue that globalization created a world in which individuals have the opportunity to interact with each other, and more importantly they are obliged to share the same space in their economic, cultural or political activities. It is reasonable therefore to claim that a common language is necessary as a medium to enable individuals to communicate with each other, which is supported by the fact that there are more speakers of English as a second language than as their mother tongue (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018).

However, this does not explain why English, but not any other language, has become the *lingua franca*. Crystal (2003) answers this question by proposing two explanations: the first one is a geographical-historical explanation by which he interrogates the movements of English in history between different geographies; and the second one is socio-cultural explanation through which he indicates how English "has penetrated deeply into the international domains of political life, business, safety, communication, entertainment, the media and education" (p.30), whereas Kerestecioğlu and Bayyurt (2018) explain that among the languages that are commonly used in the world, English is the easiest to learn.

It is for sure that globalization is not discussed in the literature solely within the context of its effects on the fact that English is now the *lingua franca,* but also its influences on language teaching and learning. With this purpose, some studies attempt to show the links between these two concepts. To exemplify, Block and

Cameron (2002) argue that the conditions of language learning and teaching are strongly shaped by globalization itself. They specifically draw attention to the economic motivations, technological change and linguistic imperialism, stating as a result of globalization, languages are treated as "economic commodities", and that in this sense "English has a higher value" than some other languages (p. 7). As a result, English has become the main language in HE (Brumfit, 2004).

English in higher education and the Turkish context

Considering the abovementioned discussion, the literature suggests that the developments in terms of globalization indubitably show their effects on higher education as well, which leads to a growing interest in EMI as a *lingua franca* and makes it a "fast-growing trend around the world" (Tsou & Kao, 2017, p. 3).

English has become the main language of research, publication, passing information and education (British Council & TEPAV, 2015). Therefore, it is no surprise that English is the main instruction language in a lot of institutions in Europe and other countries (Björkman, 2011; Jensen & Thogersen, 2011), and thus it has become an aspiration for all higher education institutions (HEIs) to become international (Doiz et al., 2011). On this basis, for instance, Brumfit (2004) reasonably claims that it is impossible to "deny the fact that for the first time in recorded history all the known world has a shared second language of advanced education" (p. 166).

Since the 1990s EMI has been growing exponentially, and according to Coleman (2006) more and more universities have started offering wholly or partially EMI programs in English. As a result of this, higher education institutions understand the significance of becoming international, which is connected directly to beginning to use English-medium instruction in higher education (Coleman, 2006). Policies of the European Commission such as the Bologna Process, which calls for a standard of quality in European HEIs, and Erasmus programs, which are exchange programs for students and academics to visit other HEIs in Europe, in order to make Europe an appealing destination for European and non-European students (Doiz et al., 2011). These policies, added to other reasons make HEIs "almost require" to teach in English (Jensen & Thogersen, 2011, p. 19).

Coleman (2006) notes that this is also due to English facilitating the recruitment of international students and staff, and receiving funding for research and development, increases the prestige of the institution, and raises the employability rates of graduates. This in turn benefits the university by receiving a higher rating, having academic staff who depend on publishing research, and students who need a better proficiency in English for their professional endeavors (Coleman, 2006).

English has become the language of science and "the need to teach some subjects in English, rather than the national language, is well understood in the sciences" due to research and text-books being more accessible in this language rather than in other

languages (Graddol, 1997, p. 45). Despite the *status quo* of English being the *lingua franca* of education even in countries where English has no official status (Coleman, 2006; Crystal, 2004), there are some concerns regarding its expansion. The official policies of European Union and Council of Europe promote plurilingualism and multilingualism, and the Bologna Process indicates that it is an advocate of linguistic diversity, yet they may be contributing to the problem of English domination, leading to lesser use of other European languages.

Since the aim of Bologna Process is to have a standard quality of education throughout Europe (British Council & TEPAV, 2015), one of its results may be that it might help HE in Europe become an economic, marketized entity, which can be exported by developing countries (Coleman, 2006; Jensen & Thogersen, 2011; Osam et al., 2019). Coleman (2006) holds responsible the "young, mobile, educated élite, the leaders of social change" for the global shift in language (p. 10). He warns that in the contemporary world, the students are customers and the universities are brands, mentioning the billions of pounds that his country expects in the form of tuition fees, and concludes that higher education has become a "marketized and globalized commodity" (p. 10). He also suggests that English cannot be deemed a foreign language because of its importance in social roles. He also likens the use of English in higher education to 'the Microsoft effect', saying, "once a medium obtains a dominant market share, it becomes less and less practical to opt for another medium, and the dominance is thus enhanced" (p. 4). Coleman (2006) categorizes the reasons

why higher education institutions choose to teach using English as a medium into seven categories: "CLIL, internationalization, student exchanges, teaching and research materials, staff mobility, graduate employability and the market in international students" (p. 4). For Coleman, learning a foreign language itself is not the fundamental motivation for institutions that prefer EMI, but rather owing to the relationship between the abovementioned seven factors, institutions adopt English as a medium of instruction.

In particular, Coleman draws attention to the efficiency of CLIL (Content and Language Integrating Learning), which refers to a learning and teaching system by which a foreign language is taught and learned within a context. In this way, students do not endeavor to learn a foreign language by focusing solely on it, but instead they learn the language while practicing it in a specific content. In addition to CLIL, internationalization is underlined as an indicator of modernization, and willingness to provide exchange programs is emphasized in order to prepare students for better career plans. These are, no doubt, strong reasons for universities so as to adopt English as a medium of instruction. Likewise, universities choose to adopt EMI, because it provides common and vast literatures that can be available only for students and academics that can speak English, encourages the mobility of academic staff internationally, and furnishes wider opportunities to be employed after graduation.

By the same token, Ellili-Cherif and Alkhateeb (2015) assert that some researchers believe that an international language is needed to access modern ideas and innovations in technology, and being proficient in English is a benefit for occupational purposes and believe that a high level of English is also needed because most reference and textbooks are in English, and has economic benefits for HEIs and occupational benefits for students (Jensen & Thogersen, 2011).

However, not all views grasp the impact of EMI positively in an unequivocal way. For instance, Ellili-Cherif and Alkhateeb (2015) emphasize that most graduate programs' being offered in English causes a limitation of academic purposes if a lack of EMI is present. Doiz et al. (2011) believe that the dominance of English in HE is pervasive, and indicate that although EU's policies seem to support multilingualism in programs, English speaking countries and programs in Europe use English as the most common medium of instruction. Research in China has concluded that not all students are able to benefit from EMI, due to only an advantaged few being able to utilize its benefits, and speaking English shows social privilege (Graddol, 1997; Hu , 2014).

Jensen and Thogersen (2011) also suggest that expansion of English in academia is a democratic problem due to the fact that it might lead to a situation where only English speakers will have access to new knowledge. This is regarded as an important controversial issue because of the traditional perception that EMI is used

mostly in foundation universities, in comparison to state universities (Macaro, 2015),

which coincides with Graddol's (1997) and Hu et al.'s (2014) view that proficiency in

English is a marker of status. Another reason for concern seems to be that adoption

of an international language leads learners to internalize the culture of the target

language, drawing them further from their own culture (Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb,

2015). Considering both positive and negative sides in the context of culture, on the

one hand, EMI provides an opportunity to get familiar with the international culture,

but on the other hand, it results with a so-called alienation to one's own authentic

values.

Regarding the issue of globalization and how English has become the main language

of higher education as mentioned above, Turkey is not an exception. Turkey is one of

the countries in the world that attributes English an important role in its education

system and makes it compulsory in all levels of education (Kırkgöz, 2009). As Atik

(2010) argues, globalization significantly affected the language policies adopted in

Turkey and it is possible to observe the instances of these policies such as Foreign

Language and Education and Teaching Act or the Higher Education Act during the

1980s, during which time the reasons why Turkish students learned English were

mostly for educational reasons such as studying in a graduate school, becoming a

research assistant so on so forth or for more appealing professional opportunities

(Sebüktekin, 1981). Considered in this way, Atik (2010) elucidates that "all the

reviews in English language policy and planning in Turkey can be argued to be

implemented to achieve political and socioeconomic goals in the globalization process" (p. 26).

Likewise, Güler's (2004) study discusses that several developments in economic, political and technological areas led to the outcome that in the 21st century, English has gained a more prominent place in the educational system of Turkey. Since the level of competition in business has increased gradually, the author argues that Turkey made some amendments concerning education and English accordingly, which engendered an increasing demand for getting education in institutions that teach in English (Güler, 2004).

In a similar vein, it is stated in the British Council and TEPAV's (2015) report that since Turkey is trying to become one of the best 10 economies in the world by 2023, Turkey needs universities with global standards, and since the majority of published articles in higher education are in English, there is a necessity for the Turkish researchers to obtain an academic level in this language. Macaro and Akincioglu (2018) have also confirmed that internationalization of HE creates the need for English medium instruction.

EMI in the world

Many universities around the world have been adopting English as a medium of instruction due to various historical and economic factors (Jensen & Thogersen, 2011;

Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018), and this is becoming a reason for concern, since the main and only foreign language of education has become English, especially in Europe. (Coleman, 2006; Doiz et al., 2011; Kiliçkaya, 2006; Phillipson, 2003). Some Arab countries such as Qatar, UAE, Lebanon and Jordan have also adopted the use of EMI (Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015). Despite some resistance these countries offer preparatory school programs for students (Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018).

There is also a growing set of literature that focuses on EMI in Asian countries. For instance, in his book on Japanese higher education system and the use of English, Toh (2016) examines more complicated questions instead of straightforward ones by suggesting analyses of the relationship between Japanese politics and the introduction of EMI and the motivations of institutions to prefer English rather than Japanese. In a country where modernization has not built itself by totally fighting with the traditional values, such co-existence of English and Japanese education system is quite interesting. In another research, Im and Kim (2015) examines Korean HE and its internationalization process through students' perceptions. In this way, scholars attempt to present an analysis of the introduction of EMI in the country and its practical reflections in higher education institutions. On the other hand, in a book edited by Tsou and Kao (2017), Taiwan's EMI experience is inquired in different respects such as the design of EMI courses and programs, practices of EMI and EMI teaching strategies, the use of EMI materials and the evaluation and progress of EMI instructors.

In addition, EMI is an important concern for some South American countries. To exemplify, Martinez (2016) tries to understand EMI practices around the world in order to suggest how Brazil can learn from other countries and how those countries' systems can be adapted in Brazilian education institutions appropriately. Torres-Olave (2012), with a totally different academic concern, questions the influence of EMI on the identities of students in Mexico whose mother language is not English. Despite different problems and questions of various research this growing set of literature all around the world proves that EMI is gradually becoming a more salient concern in the academia at a global level.

EMI is seen as inevitable for the orientation of the students towards the international market for occupations (Jensen & Thogersen, 2011; Osam et al., 2019). Yet according to Coleman (2006), the increase of EMI in European institutions causes a decrease in contact using other languages than English, although there are more opportunities to do so than in the past. The situation has come to such a point that there are universities that have deliberately reduced the EMI percentage in their programs to maintain their language in the academic field. In Qatar, policy makers believed that adoption of EMI would bring development and progress, whereas others from Qatari society viewed it as "a threat to the mother tongue, local culture and national identity" and believed that it would lead to low achievement of students (Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015, p. 207). This view is parallel to Jensen and Thogersen's article (2011) in that they also mention the argument that their native

language Danish, and cultural heritage of Denmark might be threatened by the increase in English use, and they add that if Danish "is no longer used in prestige domains like higher education, it will lose prestige and in time degenerate to a second-rate language only used in the home and not for serious business" (p.20). Another example is Germany, who has faced resistance in terms of offering EMI programs, but they have done so in order to remain active in the international education market (Gardt & Hüppauf, 2004). As a result, it has been seen that governments that are in favor of the protection and promotion of the language and culture of their nation are hesitant to make EMI legal in their state institutions, but it is legal in foundation universities (Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018).

EMI in Turkey

English is not an official language or the second language in Turkey, yet it is widely utilized and accepted in educational and the private sector fields, and the number of programs using EMI is gradually increasing (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018; Kiliçkaya, 2006). The strategical decision to employ EMI programs is under the authority of universities' higher administrations (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018; Osam et al., 2019).

According to Başıbek et al. (2014) the first higher education institution that has adopted English-medium education (EME) in Turkey is Middle East Technical University in 1956. Due to the question of "effective learning of one's professional

knowledge", the Higher Education Council has issued a policy in 1996 for

universities that have adopted EME to "establish a foreign language centre" (p. 81).

Students who succeed in entering an EMI program have the choice to receive

General English (GE) courses. Some universities also choose to teach basic English

for Academic Purposes (EAP) skills to higher level students in these centers before

they begin their departmental studies (Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018) These centers

help students to reach the required level in order to follow their English-medium

lessons (Kiliçkaya, 2006). On the other hand, if students are able to prove their

English proficiency, they can be exempted from these centers called prep schools

(Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018).

Language of instruction in higher education has since been an ongoing debate in

Turkey, because due to integrative and instrumental reasons, and as Kiliçkaya (2006)

asserts, many students choose universities that teach in English. He claims that

English is "in competition with Turkish as the medium of instruction, especially in

the institutions of higher education" (Kiliçkaya, 2006, p. 2).

Moreover, according to British Council and TEPAV's report (2015) since Turkey is a

signatory state of Bologna Process, the higher education institutions in the country

are required to have a standard level of quality in order to increase the motivation,

compatibility and internationality of institutions throughout Europe. The reason for

this endeavor is to increase the number of international students in Turkey, and

because these students would not be interested in Turkish programs, the number of

EMI courses need to increase. As a result, there are many students starting their HE

with a variety of backgrounds and English levels, which can affect their preference in

an EMI program. In other words, while students from private high schools have a

higher level of general English, students from public high schools are mostly lower

in level. (Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018).

Another reason for signing the Bologna Process was to internationalize HE in the

Turkish context, which adds to the advantages that EMI programs provide, and can

be exemplified as preparing the youth for an international economy, gaining more

prestige for the universities. (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018; Macaro & Akincioglu,

2018). Therefore, students can learn the *lingua franca* in their academic context,

which will help them communicate with other cultures, and will make it easier for

Turkish students who would like to conduct academic research abroad

(Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018).

Yet, some research have revealed that in the modern context, switching to EMI might

be unnecessary (British Council & TEPAV, 2015) or worrisome in terms of its

effects on home language and culture of the country, according to some critics

(Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018), and may create some problems especially if the

reason behind adoption of EMI is not understood and accepted (Osam et al.,2019). In

a similar way, Arkın (2013) shows in his case study that the use of English as the

medium of instruction in higher education institutions may negatively affect the quality and quantity of instructional materials.

Also, EMI may lead to an insufficient realization of the aims if it is conducted with instructors and students whose English levels are incompetent (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018). Another study (Macaro et. al 2016) analyzing teachers' experiences in EMI universities in Turkey indicates that the use of English can create some language obstacles for students in the learning process. For this reason, they show that students are eager to speak in their native language in class, as they are not capable of using English in order to express their views or participate in discussions. British Council and TEPAV's report (2015) concludes that mixed-medium instruction should stop in undergraduate education, explaining that the results show it would be easier to progress lessons if they were in the native language, which are in accordance with the results of Ellili-Cherif and Alkhateeb's (2015) research in Qatar. According to Kırkgöz (2005), some students worry about the impact of English on the Turkish language. On this note, the Turkish parliament has conducted some research to find the effects of EMI on Turkish, which revealed various problems especially in terms of the students' experience. Therefore, the arguments against EMI in Turkey can be summarized as that it prevents Turkish from becoming a language of science, it is relatively more expensive than TMI, it creates an extraneous cognitive burden for students and the graduates automatically become unequal in qualifications. (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018; Osam et al., 2019).

Perspectives of stakeholders

The literature shows that stakeholder perspectives vary in terms of their attitudes and perceptions towards EMI in HEIs. To exemplify, Jensen and Thogersen (2011) have found that teachers in the largest Scandinavian university, teachers who are younger and those who have more hours to teach in English have a more positive attitude towards EMI. Generally, teachers find their English level to be sufficient. In contrast, some instructors reported problems regarding EMI, some of which are that teaching in English requires more preparation, causes classes to be less interactive, expression of ideas becomes more difficult and thus, teaching becomes more demanding (Jensen & Thogersen, 2011).

Another concern of the stakeholders is whether the decision of employing EMI in programs belongs to the institutions or the government (Jensen & Thogersen, 2011), which shows that there is a confusion about EMI in other countries as well (Osam et al.,2019). In Nothern Cyprus, it was found that students have very low motivation in EMI contexts during their first year of studying, but this motivation increases on the second year because they have learned to cope with EMI in their own way, which leads to problems for students such as not being able to understand and follow the courses, or having a rather shallow understanding of the input (Osam et al.,2019).

In terms of present literature in the context of Turkey regarding EMI, there are opposing views of the stakeholders. To exemplify, Kiliçkaya (2006) has found in his

study that Turkish instructors would prefer to use Turkish as a medium of instruction in higher education, although they have some concerns about resources, students' proficiency level and their participation, and that it would not make a difference whether the instruction would be in English or Turkish in these issues. In his study, he has concluded that instruction in Turkish can benefit the learning of students more effectively.

Research has also revealed that most of the teachers that are conducting their lessons in EMI have been teaching in English for less than 5 years and have not attended any certification program for teaching in English (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018).

In terms of positive views in Turkey, Atik (2010) reveals in her study that students in a foundation university in Ankara were in favor of EMI, and that there is a positive relationship between their perceptions towards EMI and their English proficiency levels. Similarly, Macaro and Akincioglu (2018) have found that students' motivation for choosing an EMI program was to improve their GE level and for their subject of undergraduate studies, and that the students believe studying through EMI is beneficial for their professional life and are motivated. They also found that private university teachers use more English in lessons than the teachers in state universities and their students learned more easily through EMI, and that state university teachers' English levels were lower than those in private universities. From a different point of view, Kiliçkaya (2006) reveals that parents' main concern is

economic, and that they want a broad education for their children, which will help them find a well-paying position.

Notwithstanding, Atik (2010) also states that students admitted to having difficulty in learning the content lessons in English. This might be a problem due to the fact that it is difficult for students to have the necessary language skills by the end of their preparatory school education if they start as zero beginners (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018). British Council and TEPAV's (2015) study reveals that although EMI has had valid advantages in the past, due to the availability of sufficient sources of Turkish course books in most areas and students not having to publish in English, it is not a convincing necessity in modern Turkey. Also, some studies conducted in engineering education have revealed that there is no effect of different usages of medium such as conducting the lesson using English or Turkish completely, or making a summary in Turkish after a lesson in English, on the success rate of students (Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018).

Taking into consideration all the literature discussed above, this thesis aims to contribute in this or that way to the literature pertaining to the perceptions of the main stakeholders in the universities using EMI. The literature consists of research analyzing EMI perceptions in Turkey by conducting surveys in only one university or one group of stakeholders, but lacks research conducted in the all universities that use EMI with the main stakeholders. This research tries to fill this gap by presenting

a comprehensive picture of EMI perception of the main stakeholders, which will

contribute to the academic knowledge about the effectiveness and significance of

EMI use in higher education institutions.

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Introduction

In this chapter the methodology of this research will be outlined in terms of the research design, context, participants, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis used.

Research design

The purpose of this research is to investigate the perceptions of the undergraduate students, the English language instructors, and the content professors towards English medium instruction (EMI) in 25 universities in Turkey that have adopted EMI wholly, and to find out whether there is a significant difference between their perceptions. The research questions that this thesis addresses are;

1. What are the background characteristics of students, content professors and English language instructors of universities in Turkey where the main medium of instruction is English?

2. What are the perceptions of students, content professors and English language instructors of universities in Turkey where the main medium of instruction is English, regarding their experience of EMI?

3. Is there a difference between the perceptions of undergraduate students, content professors and language instructors regarding their

   a. general attitude towards EMI

   b. reasons to favor EMI

  c. reasons not to favor EMI?

 4. Is there a difference between the perceptions of students and content

   professors regarding the influence of EMI on

   a. subject learning

   b. language skill acquisition?

In order to address my research questions, a survey study design is used to collect

both quantitative and qualitative data to fully answer the research questions. This

design was chosen due to the purpose of the study, which is to produce quantitative

statistics or descriptions about the population by asking questions to a sample

(Fowler, 2014). As Fowler (2014) states, surveys help researchers obtain data about

behaviors and situations of the population by asking the sample about themselves.

For the present thesis, firstly quantitative data, analyzed by using descriptive and

inferential statistics, is utilized and afterwards qualitative data, analyzed using

content analysis, helps to enrich the numerical findings and add depth to the results.

According to this design, this thesis adopts Likert scale questions in the survey to

collect data for its quantitative method, and the open-ended questions in the survey

for the qualitative.

Context

This study is conducted in the HE institutions of Turkey that use EMI wholly.

Turkey houses a total of 206 foundation and state HEIs listed on the website of the

Higher Education Council (Yükseköğretim Kurulu, 2018). I have chosen to conduct this research with HEIs due to the fact that in these, an increase in the percentage of adoption of English medium instruction can be observed through the years (Başıbek et al., 2014; Kırkgöz, 2005). In Turkey, all universities are under the rule of the Higher Education Council (Başıbek et al., 2014). Since the mid-20th century, many institutions have adopted EMI, which is partly due to Turkey's willingness to become a member of the European Union, and partly to various benefits both for the students and the institutions (Başıbek et al., 2014; Kerestecioğlu & Bayyurt, 2018; Kırkgöz, 2009).

This research considers universities that are listed in the national Center of Assesment, Selection and Placement's (ÖSYM) 2018 university selection guidebook indicated as having at most two faculties where the medium of instruction is not English as being "wholly EMI". Two faculties that include one or more departments that use TMI in one or more departments are included in the list due to the fact that the majority of these faculties are law or medical studies, and it is contextually acceptable to have the first language of the country as the medium of instruction in these faculties. For this reason, two faculties were set as the limit of acceptability and on this basis; only 25 universities out of 206 fit this description. Today, there are 8 universities throughout Turkey that completely use EMI and 17 that use it in the majority of their faculties (ÖSYM, 2018), and all of these 25 are referred to as wholly EMI universities in this thesis. The main stakeholders of these institutions

were chosen as the target population of this thesis due to the fact that they experience EMI directly.

Participants

The target population of this research is the main stakeholders of universities that use English as a medium of instruction in Turkey. The main stakeholders of universities that have adopted EMI fully were chosen with a purposeful sampling strategy as participants. They represent the target population for this research because they primarily engage with the use of EMI.

The data of this very research were simultaneously collected from:

- undergraduate students,

- English language instructors,

- and content professors of 25 wholly EMI universities in Turkey.

It was expected for this survey to reach 139.143 undergraduate students and 11.239 academic members from 25 fully EMI universities in Turkey (YÖK, 2018; YÖK, 2018). These groups are the main stakeholders of higher education and therefore, their perceptions towards English medium instruction provide crucial information for all universities that have adopted EMI, or considering adopting EMI in the Turkish context.

Students of the EMI universities are the most immediate stakeholder group of this study. A high majority of students in universities in Turkey are Turkish native students from around Turkey (Kiliçkaya, 2006). In addition to native students, there are also international students from various countries, which constitute 2.5% of public and 5.85% of foundation university student populations in 2015 (British Council & TEPAV, 2015). Since the majority of students consist of native Turkish students, assessing EMI perceptions of these students is a necessary endeavor. The graduate students were excluded because the regulations regarding medium of instruction in graduate programs may differ from the undergraduate programs, or even within departments of the same institution. Similarly, preparatory school students were excluded due to their lack of experience with EMI.

English language instructors working in the English language preparatory programs are included in this thesis because their primary aim is to prepare students for the EMI departments. Their perceptions play an important role in the sense that they have a mediatory role between the students and content professors, as they instruct the students with an insufficient level of English before the students are exposed to the EMI system by their content professors. This is why their general perception regarding EMI shows an important aspect of the situation: whether the students are ready to face EMI or not.

Content professors comprise the last group in the present research owing to the fact that they are the immediate participants of EMI contexts and observers of the implications and the effects EMI has on students. While the students' perceptions constitute a self-reflection quality to the survey results, content professors' results constitute an external perspective on how their students are affected by the implementation of EMI in their institution.

Instrumentation

My research questions are mainly about the perceptions of the main stakeholders regarding the use of EMI. In order to answer these questions, I used a survey.

A survey research is the best method in terms of its practicality with the data collection and analysis of large numbers. According to Saris and Gallhofer (2014) the researcher needs to ask questions to "large groups of a population... about a topic" for the study to be named a "survey research" (p. 4). Surveys use standardized surveys in order to provide the researcher with a general view of the information the data presents. Survey research designs are useful to obtain data from the aggregates, as opposed to data provided by an individual (Presser, 1984). They are conducted in order to inform the audience and give a voice to certain groups in the public as Saris and Gallhofer (2014) put it.

What type of information surveys can collect is threefold. Firstly, gathering information on attributes, such as age, sex and marital status is possible. Secondly, a survey may direct behavioral questions in terms of when or how often an action happens. Lastly, it may ask questions on opinions, beliefs, preferences and attitudes in order to probe a general point of view from the sample (Aldridge & Levine, 2001). In this context, I have collected information regarding the participants' background and their perceptions regarding the use of EMI in their institution.

The advantage of survey research for this study is to be able to collect as much data as possible in a short time. Also, preparing a separate survey for each group of stakeholder has assisted with asking the participants certain customized questions about the research questions at hand. Survey research is the most feasible method due to the restrictions of time and resources, considering the scope of the questions.

Asking perception questions to different participants provides the perceptions of the main stakeholders towards EMI in higher education in Turkey. The Likert scale survey questions provide quantitative data, which was analyzed in the light of the research question. The open-ended questions in the survey were used to add depth and support the quantitative findings with qualitative data.

For the purpose of this thesis, Atik's (2010) survey, which she conducted with students of a foundation university to learn about perceptions of the students in that

institution. She uses an adaptation of Tarhan's (2003) questions, which were used for secondary level education students. Since Atik's survey was tested for validity and reliability in a higher education institution with students, I have chosen her survey as my primary source due to the similarities of our aims. In her research piloting, the Cronbach's Alpha statistic had an alpha coefficient of .925 for the first scale of the survey and .918 for the second.

As I conducted the study in 25 different universities and with not only students but with English language instructors and content professors as well, I adjusted the survey questions accordingly. For the sub-question of general attitude towards EMI in this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.73 for students, 0.85 for content professors and 0.80 for language instructors. These scores are at a good range, according to Taber (2017). For the second sub-question of reasons to favor EMI, students' responses showed an alpha coefficient of 0.58, content professors were 0.64 and language instructors had a coefficient of 0.84. This range is acceptable (Taber, 2017). In terms of reasons not to favor EMI, students' coefficient was 0.67, content professors' was 0.75 and instructors' was 0.50, which is again within the acceptable range (Taber, 2017).

When it comes to the fourth sub-question of the instrument which is about influence of EMI on subject learning, students had an alpha coefficient of 0.91 and content professors 0.89, which fall under the ranges of strong and reliable (Taber, 2017).

Lastly, for the sub-question concerned with influence of EMI on language skill acquisition, students had a coefficient of 0.65 and content professors 0.86, which fall under the ranges of adequate and reasonable (Taber, 2017).

The survey used for this study has two parts in all three of the surveys. The first part consists of background questions in all surveys, whereas the second part has two scales in the Student Questionnaire (Appendix A) and the Content Professor Questionnaire (Appendix B). In the second part, the first scale has questions about general attitude towards EMI and the second scale has questions about course experience. Therefore, in the Language Instructor Questionnaire (Appendix C), the second scale of the second part was omitted due to language instructors' lack of experience in undergraduate EMI courses. Participant groups and the item numbers in the survey can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1
Number of survey items for each participant group

Participant group	Demographic items	Likert scale items	Open-ended items	Total
Undergraduate students	21	37	3	61
Content professors	15	37	3	55
Language instructors	14	18	1	33

The first part requests background information and information concerning the participants' current university, with a Likert scale section in the background questions to indicate the participants' perceived level of English proficiency. The

background questions were adapted so that it would be applicable to the different participant groups, from different universities and with diverse backgrounds. To illustrate, the questions that Atik (2010) posed specifically for the university students in one institution, such as the item asking for the student's proficiency exam score was adapted to be more general.

In the survey of this research, which examination the students used to prove their proficiency, and their self-evaluation of their score were requested. The item asking for the students' GPA was omitted because it was believed that it did not serve the purpose of this research. Also, the question asking for the students' high school type was made more general by asking whether the students attended a public or private high school, and if private whether it was an EMI or TMI high school. Additionally to Atik's (2010) background questions, because this research is more extensive in terms of sampling, the students were asked to specify the city of their university, whether their university is a foundation or public university, in which region they attended high school, in which semester they were, their academic discipline, whether they have attended the preparatory school program or not, whether they can communicate in any other foreign language than Turkish, whether they have lived abroad and the duration.

For the content professors' and language instructors' surveys, the questions that were not applicable, for example the specific questions asked to students, were

omitted or changed, such as the questions asking for high school information, information regarding preparatory school and proficiency exams and their reasons for choosing an EMI university. Instead, in addition to their university's location and type, information specific to their context were requested, such as their academic position, how long they have been teaching in an EMI context, and whether English was their native language or not.

Academic discipline was requested from content professors and students, but not from language instructors for the obvious reason of all samples of the group belonging to the foreign language schools and departments of their universities. The questions of gender, knowledge of another foreign language, whether they have lived abroad and the length of their stay, and self-evaluation of their English skill proficiency were kept as they were all relevant to all parties. For students, the items asking for their parents' education level were also kept unchanged.

The second part requests the participant's general perceptions concerning EMI, using 18 Likert scale positive and negative statements. There is also one open-ended question to give the participants a chance to reflect upon the questions, and add any positive or negative ideas concerning the second part.

The third part, to which only the undergraduate students and content professors replied, is comprised of 19 negative and positive Likert scale statements about their

experience in an EMI context, focusing on the instruction process and whether EMI courses help with language acquisition. Additionally, there are 2 open-ended questions to give participants a chance to reflect on the positive and negative sides of EMI courses.

The survey was conducted in Turkish for students to make sure they understand the items clearly and respond easily. Some questions were added to the background questions, such as the academic discipline of students, and whether they are attending a public or foundation university, in order to identify the differences in participant backgrounds. Students were also asked about the region of their high schools and education levels of their parents.

For the content professors and language instructors, questions regarding high schools, proficiency exams and parents' level of education were omitted. Some questions were added to the background questions, such as for how long they have taught in an EMI context. Secondly, the survey items were slightly adapted to make them applicable to the experience of a professors or instructors, instead of students. In language instructors' version of the survey, "Instruction Process" questions were omitted because they do not experience content lessons using EMI in departments, and the statements would not be applicable for them. Lastly, the whole document was translated into English because of the possibility that EMI universities might have a significant number of professors and instructors who may be non-native

speakers of Turkish, and it is assumed that the professors and instructors that are

Turkish would be able to understand the items on the survey easily since they teach

in an EMI context. The survey was then translated back to Turkish by an expert and

compared with the current version, and no major differences were found in meaning

that would lead to misunderstandings.

Data collection

For the purpose of data collection, the main stakeholders, i.e. the students, content

professors and language instructors of EMI universities in Turkey were selected as

the main unit of analysis due to the fact that an increase in the number of EMI

programs can be observed in HE institutions in Turkey (Başıbek et al., 2014;

Kırkgöz, 2005). To this end, all state and foundation universities were identified

through evaluating the national Center of Assesment, Selection and Placement's

(ÖSYM) 2018 university selection guidebook, which includes information regarding

all undergraduate programs available for that educational year. Within the scope of

this guidebook, as mentioned previously in the definition of the key terms, the

universities that have two or fewer faculties that did not contain the special

condition indicating that "the language of education is English" (ÖSYM, 2018),

were considered as wholly EMI.

On this basis, only 25 universities out of 206 fit this definition. Therefore, the

research was conducted in 25 universities that wholly use EMI in Turkey. This holds

great importance for the fact that the main stakeholders in these universities experience first hand the consequences of the practice. Obtaining information from students, content professors and language instructors shows their background characteristics, perceptions towards EMI, and whether there is a significant difference in the perceptions of these three participant groups.

For the collection of data I asked for the approval of the Bilkent University Ethics Committee for the use of the instruments for my research. After permission was given, a list of faculty deans, vice deans and department heads was created for 25 wholly EMI universities, and their names and email addresses were found on their official websites. Although most of the universities provided this information, there were a few that did not disclose either their academic staff, or their positions.

The email was sent to the deans, vice deans and department heads of 4 year undergraduate programs whose e-mails were disclosed on their institution's official website. The number of academic staff reached can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Number of academic staff reached via email

Title	Total	No information found	Reached
Dean	113	10	103
Vice Dean	133	27	106
Department Head	574	43	531
Preparatory School Head	26	1	25
Total	846	81	765

As a result, the email was sent to 765 administrators who were then asked to forward

the surveys to academic staff and undergraduate students in their domains.

Within the allocated two weeks, 220 students, 83 content professors and 46 language

instructors completed their respective surveys. Yet for ethical reasons, in the terms

was a box that they could select if they did not want me to use their data. 15 students,

2 content professors and 1 language instructor prohibited my use of their data by

selecting this box, and these numbers are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Number of participants that completed the survey

Participant group	Replied	Prohibited data use	Total usable data
Student	220	15	205
Content Professor	83	2	81
Language Instructor	46	1	45
Total	349	18	331

The participants were allocated two weeks' time for the completion and submission

of the surveys. Upon receiving the email, the participants needed to click the link to

first read the terms and then click 'Continue' to start the survey if they consented to

the terms. In the terms was a box that they could select if they did not want me to

use their data. 15 out of 220 students, 2 out of 83 content professors and 1 out of 46

language instructors prohibited my use of their data by selecting this box.

Then, they needed to fill out the first part of the survey with items for background information, and then the 40 perception questions for students and content professors, 3 of which are open ended and 37 Likert scale items. The first open-ended item asks whether the participants have any further comments on the subject, the second one asks for positive sides of EMI and the third asks for the negative sides. Language instructors replied 19 Likert scale items with only the first open-ended item.

Data analysis

In this research, the quantitative data was analyzed using various tests such as descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA, and independent samples t-test to investigate the perceptions of the main stakeholders, and the differences between participant groups. Content analysis was utilized to analyze the qualitative data.

Quantitative data

The responses to the first part of the survey were transformed into quantitative data, and descriptive analysis was utilized to describe the background characteristics of the sample groups.

To analyze the perceptions of the sample groups, parallel to Atik's (2010) research, perceptions were divided into 3 sub-questions (General attitudes towards EMI, Reasons to favor EMI and Reasons not to favor EMI) in the first scale and 2

sub-questions (influence of EMI on subject learning and influence of EMI on language acquisition) in the second scale, and constituted the dependent variables of the analyses. The participant groups of students, content professors and language instructors were the independent variables. Only the items that were clearly indicated in Atik's (2010) research as a part of the sub-questions were taken into consideration in this thesis. The items that were grouped for analysis and their respective sub-questions of the first and second scales can be seen in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4
The items of sub-questions in Scale 1, replied by all participant groups

Sub-questions	Item numbers
General attitudes towards EMI	item # 1
	item # 3
	item # 5*
Reasons to favor EMI	item # 10
	item # 11
	item # 14
Reasons not to favor EMI	item # 13
	item # 15
	item # 17

Note: Items with an asterisk (*) were reversed.

Table 5

The items of sub-questions in Scale 2, replied by students and content professors

Sub-questions	Item numbers		
Influence of EMI on subject	item # 1	item # 6	item # 11*
learning	item # 2*	item # 7*	item # 12*
	item # 3*	item # 8	item # 13*
	item # 4*	item # 9*	item # 14*
	item # 5*	item # 10*	
Influence of EMI on language	item # 15	item # 17	item # 19*
skill acquisition	item # 16	item # 18	

Note: Items with an asterisk (*) were reversed.

Then, all responses were entered into the SPSS program in order to run the analyses.

Some questions, as also indicated in Atik's (2010) research, were worded negatively,

and therefore values of their responses were reversed for the analysis to work

correctly. The 5 sub-questions were grouped together on SPSS in order to calculate

their average as the perception score under that sub-question.

Firstly, descriptive statistics were used to reveal the perceptions of undergraduate

students, content professors and language instructors about each of the respective

sub-questions, and the means of sub-questions were taken into account. As Atik

(2010) has determined the test value as 3, the means of the sub-questions for each

group was evaluated accordingly. Next, Levene's test was conducted to see whether

equal variances could be assumed. As variances and sample sizes were not equal,

and there was no normality, Welch ANOVA statistics were used to analyze the

mean difference between students, content professors and language instructors in terms of the sub-questions of (1) general attitudes, (2) reasons to favor EMI and (3) reasons not to favor EMI, since Welch ANOVA is seen as a valid procedure in cases of non-homogeneity of variances, and if the distributions are not normal (Gamage & Weerahandi, 1998), which is acceptable because in the field of education, non-normal distributions are commonly used (Bono et al., 2017). Then, Games-Howell post-hoc test for unequal variances was conducted to understand between which groups the differences are. Games-Howell test was chosen for post-hoc test because it works best with large and different sample sizes that lack homogeneity of variances (Shingala et al., 2015).

Lastly, after checking normality in sub-questions concerning influence of EMI on (4) subject learning and (5) language skill acquisition, it was found that variances were not normal, upon which independent samples t-test was utilized to analyze the mean difference between students and content professors for the sub-questions of influence of EMI on (subject learning and language skill acquisition.

This provided me with the answer to whether perceptions of the three groups of stakeholders from the universities in Turkey that have fully adopted EMI differ significantly.

Qualitative data

Afterwards, the open-ended questions were analyzed to add more depth and to understand the quantitative results better. In order to do this, content analysis method was used for the first open-ended question that all three groups responded, which asks whether the participants have any further comments on the subject of EMI. Then, the second and third open-ended questions only students and content professors responded, which asks respectively the positive and negative sides of EMI, were analyzed. The process followed for this analysis can be seen in Table 6, which was adapted from Dey's (2005) suggested procedures to follow.

Table 6
Procedures followed for content analysis of open-ended questions (Adapted from Dey, 2005, p.8*)*

Procedures	Process
Managing data	Data were collected in writing
Reading and annotating	Data were sorted
Categorizing data	Data were categorized for coding
Linking data	The codes were compared and linked
Connecting categories	The codes were connected with implications
Producing an account	Implications were generalized

In order to achieve this, firstly, the responses were inspected to be able to categorize them and make coding possible. Afterwards, the codes were decided on and linked between responses.

For this end, a theme was annotated for each response. It was then clear that all responses from students, content professors and language instructors to the three questions could be collected under 8 themes. These themes are "personal reasons", "English language", "social effect", "effectiveness of lessons", "reaching sources", "academic development", "employment" and "globalization".

For example, if the participant mentions personal aspects such as cognitive improvement, or the cost of education, it fell under "personal reasons". If they mention the English language, a language barrier or how EMI affects the Turkish language, the comment fell under "English language". The comments that mention social status or the future of the country, they were seen as "social effect" comments.

On the other hand, if they mentioned a course context or student-teacher understanding, they fell under "lesson effectiveness". The comments that mention sources and academic literature were under "reaching sources". If the comment is about graduate school or the academic opportunities, they are under "academic development", but if they mention business life or occupational situations and opportunities, they were under "employment". Lastly, if they mention globalization, internationalization, and an international need, then they fell under "globalization".

Because it was a more general question, the first question was also annotated for being either a positive response towards EMI, a negative one or a neutral one. Lastly,

the implications of the data were discussed in the thesis for generalization. All the themes that a comment touched upon were counted, due to some very long comments and comments that concern more than one theme. To illustrate, if a comment is about how having a better level of English makes it easier to understand the lecture, then this was counted both under "lesson effectiveness" and "English language".

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter will present the results of the data analysis for each participant group and will respectively give the results for the background characteristics, participant group perceptions, mean differences between participant groups and results for the open-ended questions.

Background characteristics

Students

Of the 205 undergraduate students, 56.6% are female ($n=$ 116) and 43.4% are male ($n=$ 89) which shows an almost even distribution. On the other hand, 83.4% of this group is students of foundation universities ($n=$ 171), whereas the remaining 16.6% is from public universities ($n=$ 34). Also, a large majority of the universities of the participants is located in Ankara (84.4%, $n=$ 173), 14.6% in İstanbul *(n=* 30), and only 1% in Kayseri ($n=$ 2). In the following table, the undergraduate students' semesters can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7
Distribution of students' semesters

Semester	n	%
1-3	104	50.7
4-6	56	27.3
7-9	30	14.6
10-12	9	4.4

Table 7 (cont'd)
Distribution of students' semesters

12+	6	2.9
Total	205	100

From this table, it can be clearly seen that most of the students in the study are in their first or second year of their university life (78%). In terms of whether the students attended preparatory school or not, 60% have stated that they have studied in their university's preparatory program (*n*= 123) and 40% have stated otherwise (*n*= 82). In Table 8 below, the academic disciplines of the students can be viewed.

Table 8
Distribution of students according to their academic disciplines

Discipline	*n*	%
Engineering	85	41.5
Social and Administrative Sciences	68	33.2
Education	10	4.9
Natural Sciences	16	7.8
Art	12	5.9
Other	14	6.8
Total	205	100.0

To prove their proficiency to continue studying in their departments, a high majority of students took their university's institution English proficiency examination (*n*= 184), whereas only 10.2% stated that they passed by using other standardized proficiency exams, such as TOEFL, IELTS or FCE. In terms of their performance self-evaluation in these tests, 43.4% stated that they received a high score (*n*= 89), 33.7% said they passed with a very high score (*n*= 69) and the remaining 22.9%

believed they barely received the minimum required score to pass ($n= 47$). In terms of reasons to favor EMI programs, the most common reasons are to understand research done in their field ($n= 150$, 73.1%), to receive quality education ($n= 138$, 67.1%), and because the students believed it would help them find employment easily ($n= 118$, 57.5%).

As for comfortable communication in another foreign language, 15.6% said they could communicate comfortably in a different foreign language *($n= 32$)*, and the most common languages declared were German, French, and Russian, whereas the other 84.4% said they could not express themselves in any other foreign language ($n= 173$).

Additionally, 76.6% of the students indicated that they have not lived in a foreign country ($n= 157$), the rest indicated that they have, 15 of which said they lived in a country where the native language was English (7.3%), 26 (12.6%) said they lived in a country where the language was not English and 7 (3.4%) of the students stated that they have lived in both an English native country and a country where the native language was not English.

As to the students' high schools, 54.1% stated that they studied in a public school ($n= 111$), 24.4% in a TMI private school ($n= 50$) and the remaining 21.5% in an EMI

private school (*n*= 44). The distribution of the regions of these students' high schools

can be seen in Table 9 below.

Table 9
Distribution of high schools

Region	*n*	%
Central Anatolia	111	54.1
Marmara	36	17.6
Aegean	25	12.2
Mediterranean	14	6.8
Black Sea	9	4.4
Eastern Anatolia	4	2.0
Abroad	4	2.0
Southeastern Anatolia	2	1.0
Total	205	100.0

Lastly, the students were asked their parents' education levels, the distribution of

which can be seen in Table 10. More than half of the students' mothers (*n*= 108,

52.7%) and fathers (*n*= 104, 50.7%) attended university.

Table 10
Parents' education levels

	Mothers		Fathers	
Education level	*n*	%	*n*	%
University	108	52.7	104	50.7
High school	45	22.0	35	17.1
Graduate school (Master's/PhD)	24	11.7	46	22.4
Middle school	15	7.3	11	5.4
Elementary school	11	5.4	8	3.9

Table 10 (cont'd)
Parents' education levels

Didn't finish school	2	1.0	1	0.5
Total	205	100.0	205	100.0

In terms of the students' perceived levels of English across skills, it can be observed in Table 11 that approximately half of the students believe that they are very good at reading (52.2%, $n= 107$) and listening (53.7%, $n= 110$), whereas this percentage decreases for writing (35.1%, $n= 72$) and even more so for speaking (29.3%, $n= 60$).

Table 11
Students' perceived level of English across skills

Perceived profeciency	Reading		Listening		Writing		Speaking	
	n	$\%$	n	$\%$	n	$\%$	n	$\%$
Very good	107	52.2	110	53.7	72	35.1	60	29.3
Good	86	42.0	73	35.6	82	40.0	74	36.1
Average	11	5.4	19	9.3	44	21.5	56	27.3
Poor	1	0.5	3	1.5	7	3.4	15	7.3
Total	205	100.0	205	100.0	205	100.0	205	100.0

Content professors

In terms of the 81 content professors in this research, the gender distribution was almost even with 50.6% being female ($n= 41$) and 48.1% being male ($n= 39$), with 1 invalid response. On the other hand, the distribution of university type was not even, with 81.5% working in a foundation university ($n= 66$) and the other 18.5% ($n= 15$) in a public university. Table 12 can be seen for the city distribution of the content professors' universities.

Table 12
City distribution of content professors

City	n	%
Ankara	47	58.0
İstanbul	20	24.7
Adana	6	7.4
İzmir	5	6.2
Antalya	3	3.7
Total	81	100.0

As can be seen from this table, a large majority of the content professors were from

Ankara ($n= 47$, 58%), whereas a fair portion was from İstanbul ($n= 20$, 24.7%). The

academic rankings of the content professors of this group are given below in Table

13.

Table 13
Academic rankings of content professors

Academic position	n	%
Assistant Professor	26	32.1
Professor	21	25.9
Associate Professor	17	21.0
Instructor	17	21.0
Total	81	100.0

As can be seen from the table, the distribution of academic ranks in this group is

almost equal. On the other hand, the academic discipline question (See Table 14)

shows that the professors of Social and Administrative Sciences were the ones with

the highest number ($n= 32$, %39.5).

Table 14
Academic discipline of content professors

Discipline	n	%
Social and Admin. Sciences	32	39.5
Engineering	16	19.8
Other	15	18.5
Medicinal Sciences	7	8.6
Education	4	4.9
Natural Sciences	4	4.9
Art	3	3.7
Total	81	100.0

When it comes to experience of the content professors in an EMI context as shown in

Table 15, the majority of content professors have more than 10 years of experience

($n=$ 48, 59.3 %), whereas 16% have worked in an EMI context between 7 to 10 years

($n=$ 13, 16%).

Table 15
Experience of content professors in an EMI context

Experience	n	%
More than 10 years	48	59.3
7-10 years	13	16.0
4-6 years	11	13.6
1-3 years	7	8.6
Less than 1 year	2	2.5
Total	81	100.0

According to the background questions, only 9.9% of the participants in this group

were native speaker of English ($n=$ 8), whereas the remaining 90.1% were non-native

speakers ($n=$ 73), most of whom are presumably Turkish. In terms of whether they

could communicate comfortably in any other foreign language, it was discovered that 60.5% could not (*n*= 49) whereas 39.5% could (*n*= 32), and the most common foreign language was French (*n*= 14), with German being the second (*n*= 10).

In terms of living abroad, 28.4% have lived in a country where English is the native language and countries where it is not (*n*=23), 40.7% lived in an English-native country (*n*= 33), 18.5% lived in a country where the native language was not English (*n*= 15), whereas 12.3% have never lived abroad (*n*= 10). For those who have lived abroad, the duration of their longest stay can be observed in the table below in Table 16.

Table 16
Duration of content professors' longest stay abroad

Duration	*n*	%
1-3 years	13	16.0
No response	11	13.6
7-11 months	5	6.2
0-3 months	4	4.9
4-6 months	3	3.7
More than 3 years	45	55.6
Total	81	100.0

As can be seen in Table 17, content professors believe that they are best in reading and comprehension skills with 82.7% stating that their proficiency is very good (*n*= 67), whereas only 59.3% believe that they are very good at speaking (*n*= 48).

Table 17

Content professors' perceived level of English across skills

Perceived profeciency	Reading		Listening		Writing		Speaking	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Very good	67	82.7	54	66.7	54	66.7	48	59.3
Good	6	7.4	16	19.8	19	23.5	22	27.2
Average	0	0	2	2.5	0	0	3	3.7
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	8	9.9	9	11.1	8	9.9	8	9.9
Total	81	100.0	81	100.0	81	100.0	81	100.0

Also, the table shows that 1 in 3 content professors do not view their listening and writing skills to be very good (for both cases, *n*= 54, 66.7%). It should also be noted that 8 professors did not indicate their reading, writing and speaking skills proficiency and 9 professors did not indicate their listening skill proficiency.

Language instructors

Within the 45 language instructors, 71.1% are female (*n*= 32) and 28.9% are male (*n*=13). On another note, a vast majority, 88.9%, of the language instructors work in a foundation university (*n*=40) and 11.1% in a public university (*n*=5). These instructors work in the cities of Ankara (*n*=32, 71.1%) and İstanbul (*n*=13, 28.9%).

Regarding their years of experience in an EMI context, Table 18 shows that more than half (*n*=25, 55.6%) had experience of more than 10 years.

Table 18
Experience of language instructors in an EMI context

Experience	*n*	%
More than 10 years	25	55.6
7-10 years	9	20.0
4-6 years	6	13.3
1-3 years	5	11.1
Total	45	100.0

The number of native English speakers was 14 (31.1%) with the remaining 31 (68.9%) being non-native English speakers. As for whether they could speak any other foreign language, 31.1% could (*n=14*), and 68.9% could not (*n=31*). The most common foreign languages spoken by language instructors were French (*n=5*) and German (*n=3*).

In terms of whether they lived in a foreign country, 14 did not live in a different country (31.1%), 9 lived in a country where the native language was English (20%), 7 lived in a foreign country where the native language was not English (15.6%) and 14 lived in both an English-native country and a country where the native language was not English (31.1%), with 1 person who did not. The duration of their longest stay in a foreign country can be seen in Table 19.

Table 19
Duration of language instructors' longest stay in a foreign country

Duration	*n*	%
More than 3 years	14	31.1
No response	13	28.9

Table 19 (cont'd)
Duration of language instructors' longest stay in a foreign country

1-3 years	7	15.6
0-3 months	4	8.9
7-11 months	3	6.7
4-6 months	3	6.7
Total	45	100.0

Language instructors' perceived proficiency of skills in English can be seen in Table

20. According to this table, consistent with students and content professors, the

highest number of language instructors believe that their reading is 'very good' ($n=$

29, 64.4%), and the fewest number of instructors think their speaking is 'very good'

($n=$ 25, 55.6%).

Table 20
Language instructors' perceived level of English across skills

Perceived proficiency	Reading		Listening		Writing		Speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Very good	29	64.4	28	62.2	27	60.0	25	55.6
Good	2	4.4	3	6.7	4	8.9	6	13.3
Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	14	31.1	14	31.1	14	31.1	14	31.1
Total	45	100.0	45	100.0	45	100.0	45	100.0

Stakeholder perceptions

Perceptions of the students, content professors and language instructors regarding sub-questions of general attitude towards EMI, reasons to favor EMI, and reasons not to favor EMI can be seen in Table 21.

Table 21
Perceptions of main stakeholders regarding sub-questions 1, 2 and 3

Sub-question	Participant group	n	M	SD
General attitude	Student	205	4.49	0.66
	Content Professor	81	3.92	1.16
	Language Instructor	45	4.29	0.98
	Total	331	4.32	0.88
Reasons to favor EMI	Student	205	4.10	0.75
	Content Professor	81	3.76	0.93
	Language Instructor	45	4.12	0.89
	Total	331	4.02	0.83
Reasons not to favor EMI	Student	205	3.51	0.99
	Content Professor	81	3.25	1.14
	Language Instructor	45	3.58	0.80
	Total	331	3.46	1.01

When the means of perceptions regarding general attitudes towards EMI was taken into consideration, the descriptive statistics have shown that students have the highest mean average (M= 4.49, SD= 0.66) compared to the test value of 3, which means that they have a very positive attitude towards EMI. The next highest perception belongs to the language instructors (M= 4.29; SD= 0.98) and the lowest among the three groups belongs to the content professors (M= 3.92; SD= 1.16). In

64

terms of reasons why these groups favor EMI, it can be seen that instructors have the

highest mean average (M=4.12; SD= 0.89), whereas content professors have the

lowest again (M=3.76; SD= 0.93), although once more, they have all responded

positively.

As for reasons not to favor EMI, but since the statements were reversed during entry

of the values, a mean higher than 3 still indicates a positive perception of EMI. Even

so, it is apparent that this is the most debatable area, since the total mean of three

groups combined is close to the test value (M=3.46; SD= 1.01), with instructors

showing the highest perception (M=3.58; SD= 0.8) and content professors the lowest

(M=3.25; SD= 1.14).

Perceptions about influence of EMI on subject learning and language acquisition

only concern the students and content professors, and their means can be seen in

Table 22.

Table 22
Perceptions of students and content professors regarding sub-questions 4 and 5

Sub-question	Group	*n*	Mean	SD
Influence of EMI on subject learning	Student	205	4.27	1.01
	Content Professor	81	3.14	0.96
Influence of EMI on language acquisition	Student	205	4.36	0.72
	Content Professor	81	4.10	1.04

In the table, it can be seen that students think EMI influences their learning of subjects more positively (M=4.27; SD= 1.01) than content professors do (M=3.14; SD= 0.95).

The same principle is applicable to whether EMI influences the students' English acquisition, in which items the students show a slightly higher level of positivity (M=4.36; SD= 1.01) than the content professors (M= 4.1; SD= 1.04). However, it is worth to note that both groups are positive overall with a mean higher than 4.0.

Differences between stakeholder perceptions

General attitude, reasons to favor and reasons not to favor EMI

In order to measure whether there is a significant difference among perceptions of students, content professors and language instructors, Welch ANOVA was used, the results of which can be observed in Table 23.

Table 23
Results of Welch ANOVA

Sub-question	df_1	df_2	F
General attitude	2	91.08	8.89*
Reasons to favor EMI	2	99.53	4.45*
Reasons not to favor EMI	2	113.92	2.06

* $p < 0.05$

The results show that in terms of general attitude, there is a statistically significant mean difference between the three stakeholder groups (p= 0.00). In order to see where the mean difference is, Games-Howell post-hoc test was conducted, and it shows that there is a mean difference between content professors and students (p=

66

0.00). For reasons to favor EMI, the Welch ANOVA shows that there is also a

statistically significant mean difference here (p= 0.01), and the post-hoc test shows

that it is again between content professors and students. For reasons not to favor EMI,

no significant mean difference was found between stakeholder perceptions (p= 0.13).

Influence of EMI on subject learning and language acquisition

Because only students and content professors responded the second scale,

independent samples t-test was conducted to see the mean difference between these

two groups for the influence of EMI on subject learning and language acquisition,

which are shown in Table 24.

Table 24
Mean difference between students and content professors for sub-questions 4 & 5

Sub-question	F	Sig	t.	df	p
Influence of EMI on subject learning	0.48	0.49	8.8	154.69	0.00
Influence of EMI on language acquisition	7.11	0.00	2.32	284	0.04

The fourth sub-question was whether EMI influences the learning of subjects by

students, and it was revealed that there was a statistically significant mean difference

between students and content professors' perceptions regarding this question (p=

0.00). Lastly, in the question of whether EMI influences the students' English

language acquisition, the t-test revealed that there was also a statistically significant

mean difference between the perception of students and content professors (p= 0.04).

Open-ended questions

The first open-ended question asks if the students, content professors and language instructors have any further comments on the subject of EMI, which was asked after the first scale of the survey. To this question, there were 14 responses by students, 15 responses by content professors and 9 by language instructors.

The number of positive, negative, neutral and irrelevant responses can be seen in Table 25.

Table 25
Number of comments about EMI

Group	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Irrelevant	Total
Students	6	3	3	1	14
Content professors	4	4	2	6	15
Language Instructors	2	1	2	4	9
Total	12	8	7	11	38

Also in Table 26, the frequencies of the recurring themes can be found. As can be seen, the theme mentioned the most by students is improving their English language skills ($n= 9$), whereas the most common theme mentioned by content professors was lesson effectiveness ($n= 6$) under their general attitude towards EMI.

Table 26
Theme distribution for comments about general attitude about EMI

Theme	Students	Content Professors	Language Instructors
Improving English	9	3	3
Reaching sources	2	1	2
Lesson effectiveness	2	6	1

Table 26 (cont'd)
Theme distribution for comments about general attitude about EMI

Academic development	0	5	1
Personal development	2	0	0
Globalization	0	1	0
Employment opportunity	0	1	0
Social effect	3	2	0

The comments that support EMI about this theme focus on the idea that Turkish terminology in science and technology is not necessary, are not used even if created, and therefore EMI cannot be blamed for this. To illustrate, a comment indicates, "I do not think that it is important to produce Turkish words in areas of science and technology. I think that staying within national boundaries will limit the development of science and technology. Therefore, I find the use of romance words more logical", another one states "I do not think that Turkish words are produced, or used even if they are produced. Therefore, I do not think English medium instruction has an effect on this".

The negative comments focus on how difficult it is to understand lessons, the difficulty English terminology creates in understanding Turkish sources, and how English affects the Turkish language because of the way it is seen as an indicator of status. For example, a student said "Education in English can be very difficult for individuals whose English is not good. There should be a better education in preparatory school, or these students should be tolerated in lessons". Another claims, "I think English leads to corruption due to society's perspective (glorifying English

and seeing it as an indicator of status rather than a means of communication)".

Content professors' most recurrent theme in this question was lesson effectiveness. The positive comments under this theme include the view that EMI helps students to communicate with foreigners and that it helps them "extend their knowledge and skills". Comments include one stating "Chances of being accepted by universities abroad for graduate studies are obviously higher if the student has a decent level of English (plus other foreign languages). If the student is a graduate of a university which does not offer English-medium education, the exact opposite is the case", whereas another indicates "Instruction in English is a must, whether we like it or not. Because worldwide communication of science and technology in in English, we cannot avoid English".

Content professors' negative comments suggest that there are some insufficiencies such as instructors that are not proficient in English. One comment mentions "English level of many academicians are not sufficient to teach in English. This eventually affects understanding of the students". A content professor indicated that he/she is "interested in teaching [his/her] field, not furthering or assessing the use of English". There is also the idea that when native speakers of Turkish come together to discuss an academic subject in English, it affects the depth of the conversation negatively.

Language instructors focused mostly on English language as well, stating the positives as its facilitation of cultural exchange. On the other hand, the negatives were stated as students believing they can succeed in an EMI program with an intermediate level of English and therefore not paying attention to preparatory school lessons. A positive view states that it is necessary "to meet global academic standards", but others believe otherwise since in Turkey "there is little to develop" their English level outside the classroom, it is not a successful system. The comment also specifies "Given the right conditions it is likely to be positive for students (i.e. access to contemporary material, facilitate cultural exchange etc.) but in many cases it is a complete fantasy, especially in a national context like Turkey".

The second and third open-ended questions asked about the positive and negative sides of EMI, which were only posed to students and content professors. For the positive sides, there were 91 responses by students and 49 responses by content professors, whereas for the negative, 80 students and 49 content professors responded. In Table 27, the recurrence frequency of themes can be found for the two questions.

Table 27
Theme distribution for positive and negative sides of EMI

Themes	Positive sides		Negative sides	
	Students	Content Professors	Students	Content Professors
English language	42	21	40	22
Reaching sources	32	17	4	0

Table 27 (cont'd)
Theme distribution for positive and negative sides of EMI

Lesson effectiveness	0	3	41	20
Academic development	16	5	2	3
Personal reasons	11	10	4	4
Globalization	9	7	1	1
Employment opportunity	15	7	3	3
Social effect	2	1	1	1

From this table, it is apparent that in both questions the themes that students and content professors are mostly concerned with are regarding English language, lesson effectiveness and reaching sources. It is clear that English language is equally an advantage and a drawback of EMI according to both students and content professors. The positive comments on this are mostly about being able to practice it, and that if a student's English develops, their understanding of the concept also develops.

It is interesting that students did not mention lesson effectiveness in the positive sides at all ($n= 0$), but there were many comments about it in the negative sides of EMI $(n= 41)$, parallel to content professors' responses, where they only mentioned it a few times as a positive ($n= 3$), but many times as a negative ($n= 20$). To illustrate, a student suggested "I have difficulty in focusing during the lesson", whereas another states "It creates a barrier in understanding the subjects. Even if a person's language skills are high, even if they get used to using a foreign language, because some concepts are shaped in the mother tongue, it can be difficult to connect the newly learned information with these concepts".

On the other hand, reaching sources was mentioned frequently ($n=32$) and also academic development was mentioned as a positive side of EMI by a considerable number of students ($n=16$). To illustrate, a student stated "Science and technology are developed in English, so it is easier to follow the developments". Also, as advantages, it can be seen that students believe EMI will give them the opportunities for employment and "makes it possible to work in international projects in the future" ($n=15$), and personal development ($n=11$) such as being able to think in a different language, cognitive development and having a wider perspective of their area and the world.

The negative side that was most heavily mentioned as a drawback was lesson effectiveness both by students ($n= 41$), and also by content professors ($n=20$). A student claimed that a negative side is "not understanding the main point of the lessons, memorizing", and a professor stated that students "are unable to give feedback and communicate in class. They understand less". These comments were mainly connected to the theme of language as well, because they were mostly about how EMI creates a language barrier, which makes the students try to understand the language first before being able to focus on the concept or the course itself.

It was also mentioned both by students and content professors that because of a lower level of English, students were reluctant to speak in lessons, and content professors mentioned that they do not feel genuine when instructing in a different

language than their native one. A professor stated that they "cannot talk about the local concepts (philosophy, jokes) as you wish in a foreign language".

Many students and content professors agree on the idea that English language should be taught more effectively before undergraduate education, so that students can reach a sufficient level early on. Content professors and students also mentioned that content professors with a low level of English affect the course and their understanding even more negatively, as in the words of a professor stating "If the instructor's English is not sufficient, the course material may not be understood properly".

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter overviews the research question, its significance for the literature and

main findings pertaining to the perceptions of main stakeholders who work or study

in a university that uses English as the language of instruction in Turkey, and the

difference between their perceptions of EMI. Finally, the chapter reports the

implications of the present study for practice and further research, and its

limitations.

Overview of the study

The purpose of this research was to discover the perceptions of undergraduate

students, content professors and language instructors of EMI universities in Turkey,

and whether there was a significant difference in the perceptions between these

groups. After conducting a survey to obtain quantitative data and asking open-ended

questions within the survey for qualitative data, the analyses were conducted. This

research attempted to find answers for the questions below:

1. What are the background characteristics of students, content professors and

   English language instructors of universities in Turkey where the main

   medium of instruction is English?

2. What are the perceptions of students, content professors and English

   language instructors of universities in Turkey where the main medium of

3. instruction is English, regarding their experience of EMI?

4. Is there a difference between the perceptions of undergraduate students,

    content professors and language instructors regarding their

    a. general attitude towards EMI

    b. reasons to favor EMI

    c. reasons not to favor EMI?

5. Is there a difference between the perceptions of students and content

    professors regarding the influence of EMI on

    a. subject learning

    b. language skill acquisition?

Discussion of major findings

Perceptions of students, content professors and language instructors

It was found in this research that all groups have a positive perception towards EMI,

the highest belonging to students and the lowest belonging to content professors.

Some students' comments resemble Flowerdew's (2013) views on English and

having a global perspective of the world, such as one suggesting that being able to

think in English as well "provides a wider perspective", whereas a content professor

has mentioned that "speaking, understanding, thinking in another language makes

people interested in other 'worlds'. So [EMI courses] can help students to widen their

horizons", or another who believes it contributes to "advancing thinking skills

[because] English is the *lingua franca*".

Also, the participants' perceptions are in line with the idea that English has become the common language of education and academic sources (British Council & TEPAV, 2015; Brumfit, 2004; Graddol, 1997). On this topic, content professors have indicated that "mostly, scientific papers are in English" and that "if they know English well, they can research more from international resources". A language instructor also noted "it is good when the majority of the literature is in English".

It can also be established that studying an EMI program will make the students have less trouble academically in different contexts worldwide (Coleman; 2006; Doiz et al., 2011; Jensen & Thogersen, 2011). As a language instructor put it "[EMI] is necessary to accommodate international students and faculty, and to meet global academic standards," and a student suggests "I think it will be very effective for those who aim to progress academically", and a content professors state it creates a "chance to work abroad" and "preparing students for an international graduate school and job market, equipping them with the necessary skills for competition in such market".

In the light of these results, it can be suggested that the findings of this research are not in accord with Osam et al.'s (2019) findings, who have indicated that students in their first year of university have a low level of motivation due to EMI because slightly more than half of the students that took part in this study were in their first year of study (50.7%), and they have a very high perception regarding EMI. Also,

the results negate those of British Council and TEPAV's (2015) report in that the majority of students do not believe that EMI can be an unnecessary burden. Yet, the finding of Kiliçkaya (2006), who suggests that instructors would rather teach in Turkish and they are concerned about students' proficiency and participation level in an EMI lesson can be seen as parallel to this research.

Perception differences between participant groups in terms of general attitudes towards EMI, and reasons to favor and not to favor EMI

The second result of the study was that in terms of general attitudes towards EMI, reasons to favor EMI, significant differences were found between the perceptions of students and content professors. The third sub-question, which is concerned with reasons not to favor EMI, does not show a statistically significant mean difference between groups. The open-ended questions also reveal that students see many positive sides and reasons for choosing an EMI program, which include reaching sources, following improvements and being a part of an international standard. A student has stated that studying in an EMI university is advantageous because "we carry the quality of an international university, and therefore we are seen as ahead of others in our careers". Although all participant groups' means show a positive perception of EMI, the significant mean difference may be because of the negative ideas of content professors regarding EMI, and their experiences in lessons.

According to content professors' reply to negative sides, one noted that "English may damage the local language" which is also mentioned in the literature (Doiz et al., 2011; Jensen & Thogersen, 2011), another stated that "In a context where you create a personal relationship with a Turkish-native student, like in a design studio, speaking in English turns into acting in a theater play. While giving examples from daily life and supporting them with idioms, sayings etc. in daily life makes it easier for the student to feel the problem beyond understanding it, in a foreign language it causes them to only think about the problem only in its primary meaning". Moreover, the fact that it is more expensive than TMI has been stated by Kerestecioğlu and Bayyurt (2018), and also by content professors in open-ended questions.

On the other hand, Jensen and Thogersen (2011) have suggested that younger instructors' perceptions are more positive, and according to this result, the lower perception level of the content professors in this research might be due to the fact that the majority of the participants have been teaching in an EMI context from 7 to more than 10 years.

Perception differences between students and content professors in terms of influence of EMI on subject learning and language acquisition

In terms of influence of EMI on subject learning and acquisition of the English language, significant differences were found between the perceptions of students and content professors. From the responses, it was seen that conducting lessons in

English was seen both by students and content professors as a facilitator and a door to global literature and technological development. These results are also in line with the ideas that are supported by many researches (Coleman, 2006; Doiz et al., 2011; Jensen & Thogersen, 2011).

On the other hand, the responses to open-ended questions show that students and content professors see EMI as a barrier between the students and academic success in the courses, and an extraneous burden on the students. For example, a student states that "[Students] have trouble not because of the subject but because they cannot succeed in [understanding] the subject in English".

British Council and TEPAV have also suggested this in their report (2015), and Macaro and Akincioglu (2018) have indicated that the students' different levels of English language may affect their preferences negatively, and Macaro et al. (2016) have asserted that foreign language use becomes an obstacle in terms of lesson learning. Yet this "language barrier" can be bilateral. The background information results show that the lowest skill in content professors' self-evaluation seems to be "Speaking". This can be problematic since content professors are expected to speak during the lessons in English, and it this problem has been mentioned in the open-ended questions by both content professors and students. To illustrate, one content professor stated, "Not all academicians have a sufficient level of English. So they can't teach properly, and students cannot understand fully because of this

language barrier", and another suggesting "If the instructor's English is not sufficient, the course material may not be understood properly". On this topic, a student indicated, "Everybody's English can be different, as in, a professor who cannot teach the subject in English can be very fluent and systematic in Turkish. This is not about the lesson being specifically in English but about the professor's personal situation". This problem has also been mentioned Kerestecioğlu and Bayyurt (2018), who warn that if the instructors' and students' English levels are not sufficient, the aims of the lessons may not be met.

Implications for practice

This study shows that students' level of English was not sufficient to comfortably focus on their content lessons without trying to improve their English. This situation decreases the effectiveness of the content lessons and therefore forces students to memorize. To solve this issue, policy makers, such as the Ministry of National Education or HEC, can focus on English language education before undergraduate education, and create or change policies so that students graduate high school with a higher level of English. This will let students have a sufficient level of English before they reach the age to attend their departments in the university, even if they still study in English language preparatory programs to learn/improve academic English.

Another implication of this study can be for English language preparatory programs to consider giving students more time to reach a higher level of English, and make revisions to better the quality of education in the preparatory schools, for the same purpose to ensure that students start their departments with sufficient skill levels, making them reap the benefits of their EMI content lessons more effectively.

Another issue that was mentioned in the results is that the content professors do not feel genuine in speaking a foreign language during their instruction, or their own level of English may not be sufficient to give effective instructions. As an implication to solve this issue, institutions may consider offering in-service training for their academic staff to make them more accustomed to teaching lessons in English as suggested by content professors and students in open-ended questions.

The results of this study also show that EMI does not only concern HEIs but is also an issue that concerns the government as well, as stated by many of the stakeholders EMI is necessary simply due to globalization, or because students and teachers may want to conduct research abroad, and raise the standards of the HEIs in Turkey. Therefore, Turkish policy makers should consider EMI issues to stay active in the global market of academic education, just as other countries' policy makers do, since it is an issue that not only HEIs but also governments are concerned with around the world (Gardt & Hüppauf, 2004; Jensen & Thogersen, 2011; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018).

Implications for further research

Firstly, this research focuses on the students, content professors and language instructors of EMI universities. For further research, the perceptions of other stakeholders can be taken into account. Other stakeholders such as parents, managing administrators or decision-making bodies such as rectors and university boards, or government policy makers such as HEC officials would add more depth into the perspectives regarding issue of EMI, letting researchers see the issues from a wider perspective.

Additionally, the main focus of this research is EMI universities on the other hand it would be useful for research to be conducted including a comparison of similarities and differences between EMI and non-EMI or Turkish-medium instruction programs in Turkey, which would shed more light on the *status quo* and might improve programs using either or both media of instruction. Such research would also contribute to the decision process of changing the medium of instruction according to the outcomes.

Moreover, this research collected data through online surveys. Yet online surveys cannot always reach the depths of the issue, such as the reasons why the participants have such perceptions. For this purpose, other qualitative data collection techniques such as in-depth interviews with stakeholders, student and/or teacher journals, or field observations, whose data can be analyzed using content analysis, can be

conducted to shed more light into the reasoning and other related ideas of the

stakeholders regarding their perceptions, and let them convey their thoughts and

perceptions individually.

Other implications for further research include conducting research with higher

numbers of participants, since this one was conducted with 331 participants. Also,

this was a survey research and the data was collected in a short time, yet longitudinal

studies could be used to receive more holistic results.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study is that it was practically difficult to pursue such

research with all stakeholders, such as parents, and the managing administrators and

decision-making bodies such as the rectors, and government policy makers such as

YOK officials, due to restrictions in time. Therefore, the participants of this research

only include the students, content professors and English language instructors in the

8 universities that have fully adopted EMI, and 17, which use EMI in the majority of

their faculties in their institution in Turkey.

The present research makes use of surveys as its main data collection instrument.

Aldridge and Levine (2001) give two main drawbacks for this. The first is the

lacking control of variables, as would be possible in an experiment, due to the lack

of a possibility to employ laboratory conditions. The second criticism of surveys

they mention is participant bias, due to the participants' awareness of taking part in a study, which might lead to artificial responses (Aldridge & Levine, 2001).

Another limitation is that the surveys were sent through email to the deans, department heads and language school heads, and although who should take the surveys is specified in the email, it cannot be controlled whether the correct participants reply the surveys. Due to time restrictions, other stakeholders' accounts were not taken, in-depth interviews and observations could not be conducted, and a longitudinal study was not possible in the case of this research.

REFERENCES

Aldridge, A., & Levine, K. (2001). *Surveying the social world: Principles and practice in survey research.* Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 5-14.

Arkın, İ. E. (2013). *English-medium instruction in higher education: A case study in a Turkish university context* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Eastern Mediterranean University institutional repository. (URI: http://hdl.handle.net/11129/634)

Atik, E. (2010). *Perceptions of students towards English medium instruction at tertiary level: The case of a Turkish university* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Yükseköğretim kurulu başkanlığı tez merkezi. (Thesis No. 263075)

Başıbek, N., Dolmacı, M., Cengiz, B. C., Bür, B., Dilek, Y., & Kara, B. (2014). Lecturers' perceptions of English medium instruction at engineering departments of higher education: A study on partial English medium instruction at some state universities in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *116*(2014), 1819-1825. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.477

Björkman, B. (2011). English as a lingua franca in higher education: Implications for EAP. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, (22), 80.

Block, D., & Cameron, D. (eds.) (2002). *Globalization and language teaching.* London and New York: Routledge.

Bono, R., Blanca, M. J., Arnau, J., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2017). Non-normal

distributions commonly used in health, education, and social sciences: A

systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1602. doi:

10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01602

British Council, & TEPAV. (2015). *Türkiye'de yükseköğretim kurumlarındaki*

İngilizce eğitimi. Ankara: Yorum Basın Yayın Sanayi. Retrieved from British

Council Türkiye website:

https://www.britishcouncil.org.tr/sites/default/files/20160211_english_he_ba

seline_study_final_tr.pdf

Brumfit, C. (2004). Language and higher education: Two current challenges. *Arts*

and Humanities in Higher Education, 3(2), 163-173.

Clyne, M.G. (1984). *Language and society in the German speaking countries.*

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M.G. (1995). *German language in a changing Europe.* Cambridge:

Cambridge.

Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education.

Language Teaching, *39*(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1017/S026144480600320X

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language second edition.* Cambridge and

New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dearden, J. (2014). English as a medium of instruction - a growing global

phenomenon. British Council. Retrieved from

https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4f72cdf8-b2eb-4d41-a785-4a283bf6caaa/do

wnload_file?file_format=pdf&safe_filename=EMI-%2Ba%2BGrowing%2B

Global%2BPhenomenon.pdf&type_of_work=Report

Dey, I. (2005). *Qualitative data analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists.*

London: Routledge.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2011). Internationalisation,

multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes*, *30*(3),

345-359. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01718.x

Ellili-Cherif, M., & Alkhateeb, H. (2015). College students' attitude toward the

medium of instruction: Arabic versus English dilemma. *Universal Journal of*

Educational Research, 3(3), 207-213. doi: 10.13189/ujer.2015.030306

Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English language education.* Oxford: Routledge.

Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Gamage, J. & Weerahandi, S. (1998). Size performance of some tests in one-way

ANOVA. *Communications in Statistics—Simulation and Computation*,

27(3), 625–640. doi: 10.1080/03610919808813500

Gardt, A. & Hüppauf, B. (eds.) (2004). *Globalization and the future of German.*

Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English?* London: British Council.

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block,

& D. Cameron (eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (161-177).

Routledge.

Güler, C. (2004). *An investigation into the academic English language needs of students at Yıldız Technical University and disciplinary teachers' attitudes towards English-medium instruction at the tertiary level* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi. (Thesis No. 145546)

Hu, G., Li, L., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction at a Chinese university: Rhetoric and reality. *Language Policy*, *13*(1), 21-40. doi: 10.1007/s10993-013-9298-3

Im, J. - H., & Kim, J. (2015). Use of blended learning for effective implementation of English medium instruction in a non-English higher education context. *International Education Studies*, *8*(11), 1–15. doi: 10.5539/ies.v8n11p1

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 281-315. doi: 10.1017/S0261444811000115

Jensen, C., & Thogersen, J. (2011). Danish university lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Iberica, 22*(2011), 13-34. Retrieved from https://www.redalyc.org/html/2870/287023888002/

Kerestecioğlu, F., & Bayyurt, Y. (2018). *Üniversitelerde İngilizcenin eğitim dili olarak kullanımı: Bütüncül bir yaklaşım: Sonuç Raporu.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of Kadir Has University, İstanbul. Retrieved from http://emi.metu.edu.tr/en/system/files/sempozyum_raporu.pdf

Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an

    English-medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic*

    Studies, *1*(1), 101-123. Retrieved from

    http://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/10/11

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. doi:

    10.1080/13562510802602640

Kiliçkaya, F. (2006). Instructors' attitudes towards English-medium instruction in

    Turkey. *Humanising Language Teaching Online Journal, 8*(6). Online

    submission. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED570169.pdf

Macaro, E. (2015). Going global 2015: English medium instruction: Seven key

    points of controversy. [PowerPoint Slides]. Retrieved from

    http://www.slideshare.net/British_Council/going-global-2015-48709789

Macaro, E., Akincioglu, M. & Dearden, J. (2016). English medium instruction in

    universities: A collaborative experiment in Turkey. *Studies in English*

    Language Teaching, 4(1). Retrieved from

    https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:8fa796bb-bb1d-4aab-826e-8135c12386e3/do

    wnload_file?file_format=pdf&safe_filename=470-1048-1-PB.pdf&type_of_

    work=Journal+article

Macaro, E., & Akincioglu, M. (2018). Turkish university students' perceptions

    about English medium instruction: Exploring year group, gender and

university type as variables. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *39*(3), 256-270. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2017.1367398

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

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osam, Ü. V. (Chair), Arkın, İ. E. & Selvi, A. F. (2019). *Üniversitelerde İngilizcenin eğitim dili olarak kullanımı: Bütüncül bir yaklaşım - III: Sonuç Raporu.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Eastern Mediterranean University, Gazimağusa. Retrieved from https://emi-sempozyum.emu.edu.tr/tr/PublishingImages/DAU%20EMI%20S EMPOZYUM%20RAPORU.pdf

ÖSYM. (2018). *2018-Yükseköğretim programları ve kontenjanları kılavuzu.* Retrieved November 22, 2018, from ÖSYM Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ölçme, Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi Başkanlığı website: https://www.osym.gov.tr/TR,15240/2018-yuksekogretim-programlari-ve-kon tenjanlari-kilavuzu.html

Phillipson, R. (2003). *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy.* London & New York: Routledge.

Presser, S. (1984). The use of survey data in basic research in the social sciences. In C. F. Turner, & E. Martin (Eds.), *Surveying subjective phenomena* (pp.

110-132). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Saris, W. E., & Gallhofer, I. N. (2014). *Design, evaluation, and analysis of questionnaires for survey research*. New Jersey and Canada: John Wiley & Sons.

Sebüktekin, H. I. (1981). *Yüksek öğretim kurumlarımızda yabancı dil izlenceleri.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Selvi, A. F. (2014). The medium-of-instruction debate in Turkey: Oscillating between national ideas and bilingual ideals. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*(2), 133-152. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2014.898357

Shingala, M. C., & Rajyaguru, A. (2015). Comparison of post-hoc tests for unequal varience. *International Journal of New Technologies in Science and Engineering*, *2*(5), 22-33.

Taber, K. S. (2017) The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education, 48*(6), 1273-1296. doi: 10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2

Tarhan, Ş. (2003). *Perceptions of students, teachers and parents regarding English-medium instruction at secondary education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Toh, G. (2016). *English as a medium of instruction in Japanese higher education: Presumption, mirage or bluff?* Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Torres-Olave, B. M. (2012). Imaginative geographies: Identity, difference, and

English as the language of instruction in a Mexican university program.

Higher Education, 63(3), 317-335. doi: 10.1007/s10734-011-9443-x

Tsou, W., & Kao, S. - M. (2017). Overview of EMI development. In W. Tsou, & S. -

M. Kao (Eds.) *English as a medium of instruction in higher education:*

Implementations and classroom practices in Taiwan (pp. 3-18). Singapore:

Springer.

Tsou, W., & Kao, S.- M. (2017). *English as a medium of instruction in higher*

education: Implementations and classroom practices in Taiwan. Singapore:

Springer.

YÖK. (2018). *Üniversitelerimiz*. Retrieved from Yükseköğretim Kurulu:

http://www.yok.gov.tr/web/guest/universitelerimiz

YÖK. (2018). *Üniversite bazında öğrenci sayıları*. Retrieved January 14, 2019, from

Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi website: https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr

YÖK. (2018). *Üniversite bazında öğretim elemanı sayıları*. Retrieved January 17,

2019, from Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi website:

https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr

Zhao, J., & Dixon, L. Q. (2017). Introduction. In J. Zhao, & L. Q. Dixon (Eds.)

English-medium instruction in Chinese universities: Perspectives, discourse

and evaluation (pp. 1-20). London & New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A: Student Questionnaire
Öğrenci Anketi

Değerli öğrenciler,

Bu anket, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent Üniversitesi Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim yüksek lisans programı çerçevesinde, eğitim dili İngilizce olan üniversitelerde, öğrencilerin ve öğretim elemanlarının İngilizce dilinde öğretim hakkındaki düşüncelerini ölçme amaçlı tezim için hazırlanmıştır. Anketi doldurmanız yaklaşık 5 dakikanızı alacaktır. Bu anket kapsamında;

- Kimliğiniz kesinlikle açık ifade edilmeyecektir.
- Cevaplarınız okul tarafından bilinmeyecek ve öğrencilik haklarınızı etkilemeyecektir.
- 18 yaşını doldurmuş olmanız gerekmektedir.
- Anketten istediğiniz zaman ayrılabilirsiniz.
- İstediğiniz takdirde sonuçlar sizinle paylaşılacaktır. Bu durumda, aşağıdaki e-mail adresinden bana ulaşabilirsiniz.
- Verilerinizin araştırmamda kullanılmasına izin vermeme hakkına sahipsiniz. Bu durumda lütfen aşağıdaki kutucuğu işaretleyiniz.
- ☐ *Ankette verdiğim cevapların ve verilerimin kullanılmasını istemiyorum.*
- Araştırmam için ek bilgi sağlamak amacıyla kısa bir mülakata gönüllü olursanız, size ulaşmam için lütfen e-mail adresinizi ve telefon numaranızı paylaşınız.

e-mail: _____ telefon: +90 (5___) _____

Yukarıdaki şartları kabul ediyorsanız, ankete başlamak için Devam butonuna tıklayınız.

Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederiz.

94

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

MA. Bilkent University/ Curriculum and Instruction

e-mail: sezin.cirak@bilkent.edu.tr

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit

I. BÖLÜM: Kişisel Bilgiler

1. Cinsiyetiniz: K   E

2. Üniversitenizin türü: Vakıf   Devlet

3. Üniversitenizin bulunduğu şehir:

    İstanbul   Ankara   İzmir   Diğer: _____

4. Şu anda bölümünüzde kaçıncı **yarıyılınız**?

    1.-3.   4.-6.   7.-9.   10.-12.   12+

5. Bölümünüzün bilimsel alanı:

    Mühendislik   Tıp Bilimleri   Sosyal ve İdari Bilimler

    Eğitim   Fen Bilimleri   Sanat   Diğer: _____

6. Hazırlık okudunuz mu?

    Evet   Hayır

7. Bölümünüze geçerken dil yeterliliğinizi nasıl kanıtladınız?

    Kurum hazırlık atlama sınavı   TOEFL   IELTS

    FCE   Diğer: _____

8. a. Dil yeterlilik sınavından geçme notunuzu nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

    Çok yüksek   Yüksek   Sınırda başarılı

8. İngilizce dışında herhangi başka bir yabancı dilde rahat iletişim

    kurabiliyor musunuz?

    Evet   Hayır

9. a. Cevabınız 'EVET' ise hangi dil/diller ile rahat iletişim kurabildiğinizi

belirtiniz:

…………………………………………...

95

10. Daha önce anadili İngilizce olan veya olmayan başka bir ülkede yaşadınız mı?

      (Uygun olan tüm seçenekleri işaretleyiniz)

  Başka bir ülkede yaşamadım.

  Anadili İngilizce olan bir ülkede yaşadım.

  Anadili İngilizce olmayan bir ülkede yaşadım.

10. a. Eğer başka bir ülkede yaşadıysanız lütfen en uzun süre kaldığınız ülkede ne kadar süre kaldığınızı işaretleyiniz.

  0-3 ay   4-6 ay   7-11 ay

  1-3 yıl   3 yıldan fazla

11. Lisenizin okul türü ve eğitim dili:

  Devlet kurumu

  Özel kurum (İngilizce)

  Özel kurum (Türkçe veya başka bir yabancı dil)

12. Liseyi nerede okudunuz?

  Yurtdışı

  Marmara Bölgesi   Ege Bölgesi   İç Anadolu Bölgesi

  Ege Bölgesi   Akdeniz Bölgesi   Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi

  Karadeniz Bölgesi   Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi

13. Annenizin eğitim durumu: (En son bitirdiği eğitim kurumu/düzeyi)

Anne: Okul bitirmemiş   İlkokul   Ortaokul

                              Lise

           Üniversite   Lisansüstü (master/doktora)

14. Babanızın eğitim durumu: (En son bitirdiği eğitim kurumu/düzeyi)

Baba   Okul bitirmemiş   İlkokul   Ortaokul   Lise

           Üniversite   Lisansüstü (master/doktora)

15. Eğitim dili İngilizce olan bir üniversiteyi öncelikli seçme nedenleriniz

nelerdir? (*Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz.*)

Kaliteli bir eğitim almak için

İngilizceyi daha iyi öğrenmek için

Öğrenim dilinin İngilizce olması kendi alanımda yapılan çalışmaları anlamamı sağlayacağı için

Alanımı İngilizce okumak iş bulmamı kolaylaştıracağı için

Ailem istediği için

Puanım uygun olduğu için

Diğer
(Lütfen
Belirtiniz)...
.

16. Aşağıdaki **her bir** dil becerisi için <u>yeterlik düzeyinizi</u> uygun seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

ÇOK İYİ : Duyduğum ve okuduğum her şeyi kolaylıkla anlayabiliyor, farklı ve karmaşık konularda iyi yapılandırılmış kompozisyon yazabiliyor, ana dili konuşan insanlara günlük konuşmada kendimi akıcı ve doğru şekilde ifade edebiliyorum.

İYİ: Farklı konulardaki metinlerin ve konuşmaların ana fikirlerini anlayabiliyor, bazı konularda açık kompozisyonlar yazabiliyor, ana dili konuşan kişilerle çok çaba sarf etmeden belli bir akıcılıkta iletişim kurabiliyorum.

ORTA: Günlük dilde sık kullanılan cümle ve ifadeleri yaptığım okumalarda ve duyduğumda anlayabiliyor, basit konularda kendim ve çevrem ile ilgili tanımlar yapabiliyor, yavaş ve açık konuşulduğunda karşıdaki kişi ile iletişim kurabiliyorum.

ZAYIF: Günlük dilde basit cümle ve ifadeleri yaptığım okumalarda ve duyduğumda anlayabiliyor, kendi kişisel bilgilerim hakkında basit cümleler yazabiliyor, yavaş konuşulduğunda nerede yaşadığı ve sahip oldukları şeyler gibi konularda karşımdakiyle konuşabiliyorum.

Dil becerisi	Çok iyi	İyi	Orta	Zayıf
Okuma				
Dinleme				
Yazma				
Konuşma				

II. BÖLÜM: Yabancı dille öğretim

1. Genel Tutum

Aşağıdaki ifadelere katılma derecenizi uygun seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

(5) Tamamen katılıyorum   (4) Katılıyorum   (3) Kararsızım

(2) Katılmıyorum   (1) Hiç katılmıyorum

YABANCI DİLLE ÖĞRETİME İLİŞKİN İFADELER GENEL TUTUM	Tamamen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Hiç katılmıyorum
1. İngilizce ile öğretimi yararlı buluyorum.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Üniversitede İngilizce ile öğretim gereklidir.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Üniversitede sayısal dersler İngilizce yapılmalıdır.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Üniversitede sözel dersler İngilizce olarak okutulmalıdır.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Tüm üniversitelerde İngilizce ile öğretimden vazgeçilmelidir.	5	4	3	2	1
6. İngilizce ile öğretim yapmak yerine İngilizcenin daha etkin öğretilmesi gerekir.	5	4	3	2	1
7. İngilizce ile öğretim, öğrencilerin alan derslerindeki başarısını olumsuz etkiler.	5	4	3	2	1

8. Genel olarak sayısal ve sözel derslerinin İngilizce yapılmasını uygun buluyorum.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Öğrencilerin İngilizce temeli daha sağlam olursa sayısal ve sözel derslerindeki başarıları artar.	5	4	3	2	1
10. İngilizce ile öğretim öğrencilerin bilişsel (zihinsel) gelişimine katkı sağlamaktadır.	5	4	3	2	1
11. İngilizce ile öğretim yapan bir kuruma devam etmek toplum içerisinde kişiye saygınlık kazandırmaktadır.	5	4	3	2	1

12. İngilizce ile öğretim hedef dilin (örn. İngilizce) kültürünü tanımaya katkı sağlamaktadır.	5	4	3	2	1
13. İngilizce ile öğretim sayısal ve sözel derslerinin verimliliğini olumsuz olarak etkilemektedir.	5	4	3	2	1
14. İngilizce ile öğretim, öğrencilere bu dili kullanım ortamı yarattığı için, İngilizcelerinin gelişmesini sağlamaktadır.	5	4	3	2	1
15. İngilizce ile öğretim yaratıcılığı sınırlamaktadır.	5	4	3	2	1
16. İngilizce artık uluslararası bir dil haline geldiğinden, İngilizce ile öğretim kültürel açıdan yozlaşmaya yol açmaz.	5	4	3	2	1
17. İngilizce ile öğretim bilim ve teknoloji alanlarında Türkçe sözcüklerin üretilmesini olumsuz yönde etkilemektedir.	5	4	3	2	1
18. İngilizce ile öğretim yabancı dili öğretmek için etkili bir yöntemdir.	5	4	3	2	1

Yukarıdaki ifadeler ile ilgili olarak eklemek istediğiniz görüşlerinizi lütfen belirtiniz.

_____

2. Öğretim Süreci

Aşağıdaki ifadelere katılma derecenizi uygun seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz. İfadede belirtilen bir durum sizin kurumunuzda geçerli değilse ve hiç olmadıysa, o ifadeyi "GD"(Geçerli Değil) olarak işaretleyiniz. Lütfen cevapsız ifade bırakmayınız.

a) Alan Derslerinin öğrenilmesi

YABANCI DİLLE ÖĞRETİME İLİŞKİN İFADELER ÖĞRETİM SÜRECİ	Tamamen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Hiç katılmıyorum	Geçerli değil
1. Derslerin İngilizce olması derslerdeki başarımı olumlu yönde etkiliyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
2. Derslerde öğretim elemanı bir konuyu İngilizce olarak anlattığında kavramakta zorluk çekiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
3. Derslerde öğretim elemanının İngilizce olarak anlattığı konuları Türkçe'ye çevirmesini istiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
4. Derslerde İngilizce olarak soru sormakta zorluk çekiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
5. Derslerde İngilizce olarak sorulan **sözlü** sorulara cevap vermekte zorluk çekiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
6. Derslerde İngilizce olarak sorulan **yazılı** sorulara cevap vermekte zorluk çekiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
7. Derslerde öğretim elemanı sorulara İngilizce olarak cevap verdiğinde cevabı anlamakta zorluk çekiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
8. Derslerde İngilizce olarak işlenen bir konuyu İngilizce olarak özetlemekte zorluk **çekmiyorum.**	5	4	3	2	1	GD

9. Derslerde kullanılan İngilizce kaynakları anlamakta zorluk çekiyorum.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
10. Derslerde terimlerin hem İngilizcesi hem Türkçesini öğrenmek bana artı bir yük getirmektedir.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
11. Derslerin İngilizce olması yeni öğrenilen terimlerin ve kavramların aklımda kalmasını zorlaştırıyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD

12. Derslerin İngilizce öğretilmesi beni ezberciliğe yöneltiyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
13. Derslerdeki kavramları ancak Türkçe olarak öğrenebilirim.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
14. Sınavların İngilizce yapılması başarımı olumsuz yönde etkiliyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD

15. Derslerin İngilizce olarak yapılmasının **olumlu** yönleri sizce nelerdir? Lütfen belirtiniz.

_____

_____

16. Derslerin İngilizce olarak yapılmasının **olumsuz**

yönleri sizce nelerdir? Lütfen belirtiniz.

_____

_____

b. Dil becerileri: Derslerin İngilizce yapılması…..

17. İngilizcedeki *dinleme* becerimi geliştiriyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
18. İngilizcedeki *okuma ve okuduğunu anlama* becerimi geliştiriyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
19. İngilizcedeki *yazma* becerimi geliştiriyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
20. İngilizcedeki *konuşma* becerimi geliştiriyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD
21. Türkçemi geliştirmeme engel oluyor.	5	4	3	2	1	GD

APPENDIX B: Content Professor Questionnaire

Dear Professor,

This questionnaire was prepared for my thesis within the scope of İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Curriculum and Instruction Master's Program, with the purpose of exploring the perceptions of the main stakeholders of universities where the medium of instruction is English (EMI). It will take approximately 5 minutes to complete the questionnaire. In terms of this questionnaire;

- Your identification will never be disclosed.
- Your answers will not be shared with the school and will not affect your working rights.
- You can leave the questionnaire any time you want.
- The results will be shared with you if you request them. In this case, you can reach me via the e-mail address stated below.
- You have the right to forbid the use of your data in my research. If this is the case, please select the box below.
- ☐ *I do not allow the use of my answers in the questionnaire or my data.*
- If you would like to volunteer for a short interview to provide me with further information please share your e-mail address and phone number below.

e-mail: _____ mobile: +90 (5___) _____

If you accept these terms, please click "Next" to begin the questionnaire.

Thank you for your contribution.

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

MA. Bilkent University/ Curriculum and Instruction

e-mail: sezin.cirak@bilkent.edu.tr

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit

PART I: Personal Information

1. Gender: Female   Male

2. University type: Public   Foundation

4. Where is your university?

      İstanbul   Ankara   İzmir   Other: _____

5. Your academic position:

  Instructor   Assistant Professor

  Associate Professor   Professor

6. Which academic discipline are you teaching?

  Engineering   Natural Sciences   Medicinal Sciences

  Social and Administrative Sciences   Education   Art   Other:
_____

7. How long have you been teaching in an English medium instruction (EMI) context?

  less than 1 year   1-3 years   4-6 years

  7-10 years   more than 10 years

8. Is English your native language?

  Yes   No

9. Can you communicate comfortably in any other foreign language than your native language and English?

  Yes   No

9. a. If your answer is 'Yes', please indicate in which language(s):
…………………………………………...

10. Have you ever lived in a country where the native language **was** or **was not** English? (Choose all that apply)

  No, I have never lived in a different country.

  Yes, I have lived in a country where the native language **was** English.

  Yes, I have lived in a country where the native language **was not** English.

10. a. If your answer is 'Yes', what was the duration of your longest stay:

  0-3 months   4-6 months   7-11 months

  1-3 years   more than 3 years

11. If you are **not** a native speaker of English, please indicate your proficiency level for **each skill below** by selecting the appropriate choice.

VERY GOOD: I can understand everything I hear and read easily, write a well-structured essay about different and complex subjects, and express myself fluently and correctly in daily speech with native speakers.

GOOD: I can understand the main ideas of text and speech of different subjects, write clear essays about some subjects, and communicate with native speakers with a certain level of fluency, without much effort.

AVERAGE: I can understand sentences and phrases commonly used in daily language in texts and in speech, describe myself and/or my surroundings when talking about basic subjects, and communicate when I am spoken to slowly and clearly.

POOR: I can understand basic daily language sentences and phrases in texts and in speech, write basic sentences about my personal information, and talk about where someone lives or what they have when I am spoken to slowly.

Skill	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor
Reading				
Listening				
Writing				
Speaking				

PART II: University Instruction in English

1. General Attitude

Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below by selecting the appropriate choice.

(5) Completely agree   (4) Agree   (3) Neutral   (2) Disagree   (1) Completely disagree

STATEMENTS ABOUT UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH GENERAL ATTITUDE	*Completely Agree*	*Agree*	*Neutral*	*Disagree*	*Completely Disagree*
1. I find instruction in English beneficial.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Instruction in English is necessary in universities.	5	4	3	2	1
3. *Numerical* courses in universities should be conducted in English.	5	4	3	2	1
4. *Verbal* courses in universities should be conducted in English.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Instruction in English should be abolished in all universities.	5	4	3	2	1
6. English should be taught more effectively instead of teaching in English.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Instruction in English affects students'	5	4	3	2	1

success in content lessons negatively.					
8. In general, I find it appropriate that numerical and verbal lessons are conducted in English.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
9. Students will be more successful in numerical and verbal courses if their foundation in English is stronger.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
10. Instruction in English contributes to students' cognitive development.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
11. Studying in an institution that teaches in English will make a person earn respect in the community.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

12. Instruction in English contributes to the introduction of the culture of the target language (eg. English).	5	4	3	2	1
13. Instruction in English affects the effectiveness of numerical and verbal lessons negatively.	5	4	3	2	1
14. Instruction in English improves the students' English because it creates an area of use for this language.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Instruction in English limits creativity.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Because English has become an international language, instruction in English does not lead to cultural degradation.	5	4	3	2	1
17. Instruction in English affects the production of Turkish words in the areas of science and technology negatively.	5	4	3	2	1
18. Instruction in English is an effective way to teach a foreign language.	5	4	3	2	1

Please add below if you have any other opinions about EMI.

_____

2. Instruction Process

Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below by selecting the appropriate choice. If a situation in the statements is not valid in your institution or has never existed, please select "N/A" (Not Applicable). Please do not leave any statement unanswered.

a) Teaching Content Lessons

STATEMENTS ABOUT UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH INSTRUCTION PROCESS	*Completely Agree*	*Agree*	*Neutral*	*Disagree*	*Completely Disagree*	*Not Applicable*
1. The lessons' being English affects the success of students in lessons positively.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2. When I teach in English, students have difficulty grasping the subject.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3. Students ask me to translate the subjects that I teach in English into Turkish.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4. Students have difficulty asking questions in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5. Students have difficulty answering the **oral** questions I ask in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6. Students have difficulty answering the **written** questions I ask in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7. When I reply questions in English, students have difficulty understanding my reply.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8. Students **do not** have difficulty making an English summary of a lesson I taught in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

9. Students have difficulty understanding the English resource materials I use in lessons.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10. Learning the terms both in English and Turkish brings an extra burden to students.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11. Lessons' being in English makes it difficult for students to remember newly learned terms and concepts.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

12. The lessons' being in English leads students to learning by memorization.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
13. Students can only learn the concepts in lessons in Turkish.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
14. The exams' being held in English affects the success of students negatively.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

17. What do you believe are the **positive** sides of teaching lessons in English? Please indicate them below.

_____

_____

16. What do you believe are the **negative** sides of teaching lessons in English? Please indicate them below.

_____

_____

b. Language Skills: The lessons' being taught in English...

17. Improves students' *Listening* skills in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
18. Improves students' *Reading and comprehension* skills in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
19. Improves students' *Writing* skills in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
20. Improves students' *Speaking* skills in English.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
21. Prevents students from improving their Turkish.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

APPENDIX C: Language Instructor Questionnaire

Dear instructors,

This questionnaire was prepared for my thesis within the scope of İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Curriculum and Instruction Master's Program, with the purpose of exploring the perceptions of the main stakeholders of universities where the medium of instruction is English (EMI). It will take approximately 5 minutes to complete the questionnaire. In terms of this questionnaire;

- Your identification will never be disclosed.
- Your answers will not be shared with the school and will not affect your working rights.
- You can leave the questionnaire any time you want.
- The results will be shared with you if you request them. In this case, you can reach me via the e-mail address stated below.
- You have the right to forbid the use of your data in my research. If this is the case, please select the box below.
- ☐ *I do not allow the use of my answers in the questionnaire or my data.*
- If you would like to volunteer for a short interview to provide me with further information please share your e-mail address and phone number below.

e-mail: _____ mobile: +90 (5___) _____

Thank you for your contribution.

Alev Sezin Kahvecioğlu

MA. Bilkent University/ Curriculum and Instruction

e-mail: sezin.cirak@bilkent.edu.tr

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit

PART I: Personal Information

1. Gender: Female   Male

2. University type: Public   Foundation

4. Where is your university?

   İstanbul   Ankara   İzmir   Other: _____

5. Your academic position:

   Instructor   Assistant Professor

   Associate Professor   Professor

7. How long have you been teaching in an English medium instruction (EMI) context?

   less than 1 year   1-3 years   4-6 years

   7-10 years   more than 10 years

8. Is English your native language?

   Yes   No

9. Can you communicate comfortably in any other foreign language than your native language and English?

   Yes   No

9. a. If your answer is 'Yes', please indicate in which language(s):

   …………………………………………...

10. Have you ever lived in a country where the native language **was** or **was not** English? (Choose all that apply)

   No, I have never lived in a different country.

   Yes, I have lived in a country where the native language **was** English.

   Yes, I have lived in a country where the native language **was not** English.

10. a. If your answer is 'Yes', what was the duration of your longest stay:

   0-3 months   4-6 months   7-11 months

   1-3 years   more than 3 years

11. If you are **not** a native speaker of English, please indicate your proficiency level for **each skill below** by selecting the appropriate choice.

VERY GOOD: I can understand everything I hear and read easily, write a well-structured essay about different and complex subjects, and express myself fluently and correctly in daily speech with native speakers.

GOOD: I can understand the main ideas of text and speech of different subjects, write clear essays about some subjects, and communicate with native speakers with a certain level of fluency, without much effort.

AVERAGE: I can understand sentences and phrases commonly used in daily language in texts and in speech, describe myself and/or my surroundings when talking about basic subjects, and communicate when I am spoken to slowly and clearly.

POOR: I can understand basic daily language sentences and phrases in texts and in speech, write basic sentences about my personal information, and talk about where someone lives or what they have when I am spoken to slowly.

Skill	*Very Good*	*Good*	*Average*	*Poor*
Reading				
Listening				
Writing				
Speaking				

PART II: University Instruction in English

1. General Attitude

Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below by selecting the appropriate choice.

(5) Completely Agree   (4) Agree   (3) Neutral   (2) Disagree   (1) Completely Disagree

STATEMENTS ABOUT UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH GENERAL ATTITUDE	*Completely Agree*	*Agree*	*Neutral*	*Disagree*	*Completely Disagree*
1. I find instruction in English beneficial.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Instruction in English is necessary in universities.	5	4	3	2	1
3. *Numerical* courses in universities should be conducted in English.	5	4	3	2	1
4. *Verbal* courses in universities should be conducted in English.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Instruction in English should be abolished in all universities.	5	4	3	2	1
6. English should be taught more efficiently effectively instead of teaching in English.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Instruction in English affects students'	5	4	3	2	1

success in content lessons negatively.					
8. In general, I find it appropriate that numerical and verbal lessons are conducted in English.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Students will be more successful in numerical and verbal courses if their foundation in English is stronger.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Instruction in English contributes to students' cognitive development.	5	4	3	2	1
11. Studying in an institution that teaches in English will make a person earn respect in the community.	5	4	3	2	1

12. Instruction in English contributes to the introduction of the culture of the target language (e.g. English).	5	4	3	2	1
13. Instruction in English affects the effectiveness of numerical and verbal lessons negatively.	5	4	3	2	1
14. Instruction in English improves the students' English because it creates an area of use for this language.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Instruction in English limits creativity.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Because English has become an international language, instruction in English does not lead to cultural degradation.	5	4	3	2	1
17. Instruction in English affects the production of Turkish words in the areas of science and technology negatively.	5	4	3	2	1
18. Instruction in English is an affective way to teach a foreign language.	5	4	3	2	1

Please add below if you have any other opinions about EMI.

_____