Quality factors of an English as a Medium of Instruction program associated with students' satisfaction

José L. Arco Tirado
Francisco D. Fernandez-Martin
Manuel A. Berrio-Gutierrez
University of Granada

Received: 2023-05-15 / Accepted: 2023-12-19
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi42.28186*
ISSN paper edition: 1697-7467, ISSN digital edition: 2695-8244

ABSTRACT: This study examines the association between key quality factors of an English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) program with student satisfaction delivered at a Primary Education Degree in a Spanish university. The significant growth of demand and offer of bilingual and plurilingual studies in Higher Education in the last decade in many non-Anglo-Saxon countries, recommends conducting more evaluation research studies aimed at measuring quality and impact of EMI programs on students' performance and satisfaction. To respond to that need, this ex-post facto research study included a sample of 131 self-selected students. The dependent variable, student satisfaction, was measured with a questionnaire ($\alpha = 0.82$ and an $\omega = 0.85$) delivered through a computer-assisted web interviewing technique. The nonparametric regression analysis yields an average of the mean of student satisfaction of 3.7 (on a 5 points scale) and the (only) average marginal significant effect of the variable teachers' teaching practices estimated to be 0.7, $p < 0.01$. The final model 6 fitted with all predictions and controls explains 40.69% of the variation of the dependent variable. Finally, some conclusions and recommendations are drawn to increase future students' satisfaction.
Keywords: English-Medium Instruction (EMI), English-Taught degree Programs (ETPs), Student satisfaction, Quality university program, Bilingualism

Factores de calidad de un programa de Inglés como Medio de Instrucción asociados con la satisfacción de los estudiantes

RESUMEN: Este estudio examina la asociación entre factores clave de la enseñanza denominada inglés como medio de instrucción (EMI por sus siglas en inglés) con la satisfacción de los estudiantes en un Grado de Educación Primaria de una universidad española. El crecimiento importante de la demanda y oferta de programas plurilingües en la Educación Superior en la última década en muchos países no anglosajones recomienda realizar más estudios de evaluación de la calidad y el impacto de los programas EMI en el rendimiento y satisfacción de los estudiantes. Se adopta un diseño ex-post facto con una muestra de 131 estudiantes auto seleccionados. La variable dependiente satisfacción de los estudiantes se midió mediante un cuestionario ($\alpha = 0.82$ y un $\omega = 0.85$) administrado online. La regresión no paramétrica revela un valor medio de la satisfacción de los estudiantes de 3.72 puntos (en una escala de 5 puntos) y un (único) efecto marginal significativo en la variable enseñanza de los profesores en el aula de 0.7, $p < 0.01$. El modelo 6 final con todos los predictores y

controles explica el 40.69% de la variable dependiente. Finalmente, se proponen algunas recomendaciones dirigidas a mejorar la satisfacción del estudiantado.
Palabras clave: Inglés como Medio de Instrucción; Grados impartidos en lengua inglesa, Satisfacción de los estudiantes, Programas universitarios de calidad, Bilingüismo

1. Introduction

1.1. Internationalisation, globalization, and englishization of Tertiary Education

Countries around the world are dedicating substantial resources to the internationalisation of their higher education systems (Lasagabaster, 2021). Internationalisation of tertiary education has been used as a tool to develop the market in many nations of the world, paying special attention to the student's academic marks and success to attract those who are exceptional (Galloway et al. 2020). Globalisation has also contributed decisively to the use of English for global communication (Zenkova & Khamitova, 2018), and as the foreign language in research-based conversation (Altbach & Knight, 2007). The European Union's educational policy, aimed in the last decade of the twentieth century at stimulating the use of two extra languages apart from the L1, is also responsible for the English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) expansion across Higher Education (HE) systems in Europe (Dafouz, 2018; Nieto & Fernández, 2021). Other countries around the world have also launched various initiatives in the last 15 years like Japan (Rakhshandehroo & Ivanova, 2020), China (Hu & McKay, 2012), Korea (Byun, 2011), or Nordic countries (Airey et al., 2017).

As reported by the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports reported in the document 'Strategy for the internationalisation of Spanish Universities 2015-2020' (Lasagabaster, 2021), the dissemination and adoption of EMI programs in Spain has not been a linear process with very few universities offering 30% of their bachelor's degrees and 50% of their master's degrees in English in the 2020/21 academic year. Furthermore, although the Conference of Rectors of Spanish universities commissioned a study (Bazo et al., 2017) aimed at establishing shared guidelines to develop a common language policy in Spanish universities, the number of studies on the 'englishization' process in Spanish universities is rather limited (Ploettner, 2019). Furthermore, this scarcity of evaluation research studies that allow us to establish clear evidence of the relationship between practice and beneficial outcomes is also applicable to the rest of EMI education across Europe (Macaro et al., 2018; Rubio et al., 2019).

1.2. Student satisfaction and quality of EMI programs

In the literature, student satisfaction is a short-term attitude resulting from students' evaluation of their perceived learning experience at university and it is considered an important type of college students' perceived learning outcomes (Elliot & Healy, 2001). Student satisfaction has become an important theme in the sector of HE over the past two decades given the substantial increase of university student population and, therefore, the massification of some universities and studies (García-Aracil, 2009). Indeed, student satisfaction has been selected by the Chinese Ministry of Education as one of the five major benchmarks

to evaluate the quality and development of Chinese college education since 2016 (Luo et al., 2019). However, the research interest in students' satisfaction in EMI contexts entails a different but complementary evaluation approach to identify what institutional, instructors' teaching, and students' learning behaviours determine EMI quality.

In this regard, authors like Dearden (2014), Doiz et al. (2012) and Hu and Lei (2014) concluded that there was scant research into the effect of EMI on the different bodies that make up the university community. However, more recently, the situation has clearly changed due to the increase in the amount of evaluation studies published, the significant increase in student mobility, and the use of English in European HE programs (Aguilar, 2018), or other more specific factors like the involvement of educational authorities increasing their resources to support their students' English language learning (Huang, 2015). As stated by Fernández (2017), when referring to EMI evaluation in HE, the focus has been directed to planning aspects, instructors' viewpoints, learners' performance results, the improvement of specific skills, and how this influences internationalisation and motivation. In the case of Spain, as in many other European countries, although EMI was embraced with enthusiasm in the belief that it is a natural response to the process of globalisation and the best way to foster foreign language learning, the delivery of EMI courses in Spanish university contexts by non-native speakers teaching mostly non-native students has contributed to a sense of insecurity among all the stakeholders (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2018). For example, in relation to the impact of EMI programs on stakeholders, Nieto and Fernández (2021) point out that the design of a successful EMI programme requires the coordinate response of various university bodies, such as Vice-Rectorates, Faculties, Departments, and Language Centers. Indeed, the fact that EMI is at the intersection of the competencies of these institutions—and therefore its smooth functioning relies on the contributions of all of them, means that EMI can become a problematic area (González-Alvarez, 2020). Furthermore, official reports and recommendations from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (2014) consistently identified the low level of English of the university community as a weakness for EMI implementation. In this vein, O'Dowd's (2018) research shows that 77% of the universities' teacher education programs pay attention to offering English, 54% provide support in supervised feedback in teaching practice sessions, 49% plan training on bilingual education methodology, and 29% plan the development of academic language. Additionally, Macaro et al. (2019) found great variation in beliefs regarding teachers' own competency in EMI, but widespread agreement, including university managers, on the need to change university teachers' pedagogy, as well as to set some type of teaching quality-assurance. Furthermore, Doiz et al. (2012) and Macaro et al. (2018) concluded that the diversity characterising EMI courses make it quite difficult to clarify the role that delivering instruction in English plays on students' eventual learning and performance. Finally, Hu and Lei's (2014) results revealed considerable misalignment between policy intentions, management mechanism, actual needs of stakeholders and actual practices in the classroom.

In relation to the impact of EMI programs on instructors, Doiz and Lasagabaster (2018) found that teaching in English requires an additional effort for non-native English-speaking lecturers in terms of the elaboration of classroom materials, the preparation of lessons, and the creation and implementation of assessment tools and time commitment necessary to keep their English proficiency up to date. In this line, Doiz et al. (2019) concluded that lecturers

attributed to teaching in a foreign language several negative consequences, such as a decrease in the degree of detail and depth of their explanations, a reduction in their communicative skills and a significant reduction in the vocabulary they use, which negatively affects the emotional links and good rapport with their students when teaching in their L1.

Chen et al. (2020) concluded that most countries had teachers who did not complete a previous English test (i.e., they were given the job if they had appropriate oral skills in English). Another study by Arkin and Osam (2015) determined the lack of knowledge and understanding during the classes and the lack of interactions between teachers and students during the lesson, as key factors determining their progress. Fortanet (2011) identified differences in teachers' perspectives on how to use English effectively in classes and Ploettner (2019) reveals that teacher satisfaction with current EMI teacher training could be improved through specific EMI teacher trainer orientation. In sum, results on the EMI programs impact on instructors' response to EMI challenges is still insufficient with scarce and inconsistent results (Hu & Lei 2014; Macaro et al., 2018).

Regarding students' responses to EMI programs, Doiz and Lasagabaster (2018) point to benefits in students' identity formation and security. Çağatay (2019) concluded EMI was beneficial for students' command of English, and Şahan and Şahan (2021) found higher motivation and perception of professional benefits for students enrolled in full versus partial EMI programs. In other studies, Feixas et al. (2009) and Huang (2015) found that students did not have the perception of content learning losses (e.g. Engineering and the Business Colleges in Southeast Asia) compared to their counterparts in monolingual classrooms, and Toledo et al. (2012), found that the higher command of the second language the easier understanding of the subject matter. So, current research results revolve around three issues: (a) the impact of the language of instruction on their perceptions about potential content learning losses, and/or advantages beyond the university, (b) the burden that EMI classes pose on them and the lack of institutional resources and support, including language classes supplement that compensate their extra effort, and (c) whether or not their academic performance is conditioned on the EMI factor, although it is clear the need for systematic reviews studies on the impact of EMI programs on students' satisfaction and their response to EMI challenges.

1.3. The present study

Our review results indicate that assessment of satisfaction (including teachers' and students') is commonly used as a proxy of program quality and the need for more research and advanced analysis to clarify the role of potential key factors conditioning the quality of EMI programs. In this context, the main objective of this research is to extend our knowledge about what quality EMI factors are associated with students' satisfaction in the case of the Spanish EMI program in the present study. The EMI program at the Faculty of Education at the University of Granada (UGR), consists of delivering around 65% of credits in English across four years. So, the following hypotheses (H) are posed:

H1: Course level will be positively associated with students' satisfaction.
H2: Grade Point Average (GPA) scores (i.e., access score and current score) will be positively associated with students' satisfaction.

H3: Language proficiency (i.e., English accredited level) will be positively associated with students' satisfaction.
H4: Quality variables (i.e., course teaching materials, internationalisation opportunities, and language promotion) will be positively associated with students' satisfaction.

2. Method

2.1. Sample

The sample was made up of 131 students from different cohorts of the bilingual program in Primary Education Teacher Training at the UGR. The participants' mean age was 23.67 years old (*SD* = 3.29). By gender, 113 (86.26%) participants were female, 17 (12.98%) were male, and 1 (0.76%) was non-binary. By course 25 (19.08%) were second year students, 14 (10.64%) were third year students, 21 (16.03%) were fourth year students, and 71 (54.20%) were graduate students. Thus, by registration status we had 60 (45.80%) undergraduates and 71 (54.20%) graduates from the course 2017-2018 til the course 2019-2020.

The sampling selection was based on a non-probabilistic sampling technique.

2.2. Instruments

Quality of the UGR's EMI Program from the Students' Perspective Questionnaire (Appendix 1) is a Likert-type scale made up of 27 items estimated between 1 ("total disagreement") and 5 ("total agreement") points grouped into 5 sections: (a) course lecturing and materials of the specific program, (b) internationalisation and language learning of the students, (c) students' learning practices, (d) instructors teaching practices, and (e) the overall satisfaction with the EMI programs. The objective of the instrument is to measure students' satisfaction against a set of items proposed by the literature as key factors of high-quality bilingual education in HE. In this research, the questionnaire showed a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.82 and a McDonald's omega (ω) of 0.85. Moreover, a four-factor confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was estimated, with adequate fit indexes: Chi-squared ($\chi 2$) = 379.961, $p > 0.05$, degree of freedom (df) = 293, comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.95, goodness of fit index (GFI) = 0.94, standardised root mean squared residual (SRMR) = 0.08, root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.05.

Sociodemographic and Academic Information Self-report (SAIS) consisted of 21 items aimed at gathering information from the participants on the following dimensions: (a) sociodemographic, (b) personal education background, and (c) university education.

2.3. Design and procedure

This study adopts a retrospective Ex Post Facto research design (Campbell & Stanley 1963). This type of research designs examines past occurrences to understand a current state. Although this study includes both a dependent and an independent variable, the investigator cannot manipulate the latter.

First, a scoping search of literature on bilingual, multilingual or plurilingual education and students' satisfaction in HE was completed. The scoping review failed to find previous validated instruments measuring satisfaction among university students. Alternatively, our review identified several studies like Başıbek et al. (2014), Fernandez (2017), Galloway (2019), and Zenkova and Khamitova (2018) from which several items were selected to build the instrument intended to measure the construct underlying our dependent variable and the research questions posed. Next, a pilot test was conducted (n=5) to confirm the adequacy of the online format, the approximate time needed to fill it out, and the appropriate content and format of its items.

Secondly, we used a computer-assisted web interviewing technique to recruit a sample of: (a) students registered in the EMI group from second to fourth year, excluding first year students since we considered their exposure was not long enough to accumulate experience in most of the questions posed by the questionnaire, and (b) graduate students, who were contacted if they had finished in the last three years, since a longer time lapse since leaving the university could compromise their memories more seriously. Prospective participants were sent an online invitation and given four weeks to respond. This invitation provided information on the objective of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, and the confidentiality of their responses and the link to the SAIS and to the Quality Questionnaire. Responses were collected between April and May of 2021.

The study was carried out in accordance with the Ethical Committee of the UGR (1974/CEIH/2021).

2.4. Data analysis

To make valid inferences from the assumed linear regression model, we need to check data distribution, linearity and atypicality, as well as the presence of missingness bias. Subsequently, the internal consistency of the Quality Questionnaire was measured via α and ω, while its internal structure was analysed by means of a CFA. The CFA was estimated using the Unweighted Least Squares (ULS) method. The three multivariate tests of normality applied to our dependent variable reject the null hypothesis of multivariate normality, which justifies the choice of the ULS estimator of the CFA and the nonparametric regression. Next, a nonparametric Kernel regression was run with six models, as Table 1 shows.

Statistical analyses were carried out using JASP 0.11.1 for CFA and internal consistency, and STATA 17 for regression analyses.

3. Results and discussion

As Table 1 shows, the average of the students' satisfaction across all models is 3.7 (in a five points scale), $p < 0.001$ and the only variable with direct significant estimated effect is instructors teaching practices 0.7, $p < 0.05$, with all predictors and controls included simultaneously in M6 explaining around 40.7% of the variation of students' satisfaction, which can be considered high in the field of social sciences. Continuing with Table 1 results, M1 with demographic factors yields a statistically significant association between age and students' satisfaction, although this significance is lost when compared with the rest of fac-

tors in M6. Age along with gender explains around 14.4% of the variation in the students' satisfaction, which unveils the important contribution of these factors to explain students' satisfaction variability.

Table 1. *Students Overall Satisfaction Predicted by all Selected Factors and Controls*

Effect	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6
Age	-0.1*					0.0
	(-2.3)					(0.2)
Gender	-0.2					-0.0
	(-1.6)					(-0.1)
Course		-0.3*				-0.1
		(-2.0)				(-0.9)
GPA access			0.1			0.1
			(0.5)			(1.2)
GPA current			-0.0			-0.1
			(-0.2)			(-0.4)
English Accredited				-0.2		-0.0
				(-1.8)		(-0.1)
Course lecturing and materials					0.3	0.3
					(1.4)	(1.4)
Internationalisation					0.4	0.3
					(1.5)	(1.6)
Students' learning practices					-0.4	-0.0
					(-1.3)	(-0.4)
Instructors teaching practices					0.3	0.7**
					(1.3)	(2.6)
N	123	131	124	131	122	121
Overall satisfaction	3.7***	3.7***	3.7***	3.7***	3.8***	3.7***
	(35.8)	(40.5)	(38.8)	(41.9)	(41.3)	(41.0)
R-sq	0.14437	0.08584	0.17814	0.02407	0.67212	0.40695

Note. *t* statistics in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

In relation to H1, M2 with the course level yields a statistically significant association between course registration and students' satisfaction, although again this significance is lost when compared to the rest of factors. This factor alone explains around 8.5% of the variation in the dependent variable, which also points to the capacity of this factor to predict student's satisfaction. However, this result does not support our first hypothesis. On the contrary, the result shows a negative association between both variables, which suggests that students' satisfaction decreases as they advance from one year to the next. Other authors like Fernández (2017) found similar results with students from first and second years showing higher satisfaction than their peers from third and fourth years. This apparent pattern is statistically confirmed with a more detailed analysis of our data comparing undergraduate and graduate students, with the Kruskal-Wallis's test, which reveals an intriguing significant difference in satisfaction between undergraduate and graduates ($\chi 2 = 9.309$, $p = 0.0023$). This pattern could be attributed to graduates' first contact with the labour market demands, which probably

translates into lower satisfaction with the skills gained throughout their learning and training period at the University. Unfortunately, the lack of more robust data and analysis from other studies exploring this relationship prevents us from providing a more elaborated explanation.

In relation to H2, M3 with academic factors yields a non-statistically significant association between academic factors (i.e., current GPA and GPA access) and students' satisfaction, which lead us to reject our second hypothesis. Alternatively, this set of factors explains around 17.8% of the variation in the dependent variable, which represents the high potential of this set of factors to predict student's satisfaction. The lack of statistical significance in the case of GPA access is relatively surprising, since this indicator is usually a good predictor of students' performance and therefore satisfaction. The lack of statistical significance in the case of current GPA could be attributed to the presence of other unknown variables. For example, the fact they do not appreciate any differences in their performance when they compare themselves with monolingual peers, probably translates into less satisfaction with their scores due to the extra effort they make on the EMI courses. In this regard, Arco-Tirado, et al. (2018) provide convincing evidence that there is a cost in academic performance of the same EMI program analysed, although we discard this potential explanation since that study outcome has not been disseminated among students. So, we do not want to over-interpret our results, considering that many other important variables are not accounted for in the model, but in any case, this negative effect of the program on key students' outcomes reinforces the need for evaluating more rigorously the academic impact of HE bilingual programs.

In relation to H3, M4 with English proficiency yields a non-statistically significant association between English language proficiency accredited level and students' satisfaction, explaining a relatively low 2.4% of the variation in students' satisfaction. Again, this result does not support our third hypothesis and could be explained by the overestimation of students' self-perceived level of English language proficiency, as they think their level of English is higher than it is to cope with the different learning tasks. The negative association found between the students' English proficiency accredited level and their satisfaction, does not align with that found by Kym and Kym (2014) and Toledo et al. (2012) with students' satisfaction increasing when freely accessing the bilingual modality and having higher English level competency.

To respond to this debate, some EMI programs, as mentioned above, plan to establish an English entry and qualification exam for students and instructors respectively, fulfilling one of the quality standards recommended for EMI programs. This is an important issue since it is related to another controversial debate around whether student's learning is negatively conditioned by the EMI lectures (Aguilar & Rodríguez, 2012; Arzu, 2020). In this regard, the idea that EMI students do not acquire the same amount of knowledge compared to their non-EMI or monolingual students is not supported by our data since students declare that they have learned the same as their peers in monolingual programs. Although this statement should rest on empirical data comparing bilingual and monolingual groups on learning and performance. Aligned with these results Feixas et al. (2009) point out that students learn the same amount of content learning through English than those learning through their L1. Furthermore, Hsieh and Kang (2007) also report that the difference between the Chinese-taught and English-taught courses was not significant in terms of students' content

learning. Alternatively, other authors sustain the opposite, that is, they found differences in students' learning depending on the language of instruction (e.g., Chang, 2010; Hellekjær, 2010). In sum, this issue remains controversial and requires further research.

In relation to H4, M5 with quality factors yields a non-statistically significant association between variables related to course and materials, internationalisation and students' learning practices and students' satisfaction, and instructors' teaching practices and students' satisfaction, explaining around 67.2% of the variation in the students' satisfaction variable. These results partially support our fourth hypothesis since only the variable instructors teaching practices maintain its statistical significance in M6. In this vein, Chen et al. (2020) find that the use of the English language was the first obstacle to offer EMI courses in HE in 55 countries, with almost all of them lacking teachers with prior English assessment. Similar results were found by Dafouz (2018), O'Dowd (2018) and Arzu (2020) regarding the instruction of EMI instructors, finding that linguistic development was the first demand, followed by other skills like class preparation, or how to approach students linguistically.

Finally, M6 including all variables at the same time shows that the specific set of teaching skills and behaviours attributable to teachers is a dominant predictor of quality from the students' perspective. This is important since it suggests a concrete set of teaching behaviours that institutions could focus on when planning EMI teacher training. This conclusion is relevant not only to include and connect with students' expectations, but also because these instructor characteristics have been long endorsed by other studies like Marsh et al. (2013), and Short (2006) as key teaching behaviours in plurilingual settings.

Different threats to this study may affect the quality of the interpretations and conclusions drawn from the models analysed. Among the different factors that can influence the power of a study we will focus on those that are most important and influential in our results. First, because participation was possible on a voluntary basis, the students sample representativeness could be compromised. Second, as many well-known publications, sample size is probably underlying the lack of statistical significance found in most of the predictors, however, despite prompting potential participants to respond, we could not collect data on more subjects. Third, mismeasurement could stem from the retrospective nature of the data, especially the recall questions about initial English proficiency level, as well as some variables related to the perceived quality of the EMI model displayed. While this is potentially problematic, other measurement issues can be overcome by good design, planning and an acceptable internal consistency of the instrument utilised. Fifth, the student's satisfaction variable does not comply fully with a normal distribution which could affect the estimates of the standard error and the confidence interval, and hence the significance of the factors analysed. To counteract this issue, we have used a nonparametric regression which implies the estimated parameters, and their confidence interval estimates remain robust. Sixth, another source of bias are potential confounders, which were identified from the available literature and incorporated in the regression models as explanatory factors to a limited extent. And seventh, the way we have measured our response variable could also condition our results, however, the lack of standardised measures has prevented us from using another more sensitive and lower in measurement error measurement.

4. Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the results and the discussion. The model we propose here to improve students' satisfaction with EMI undergraduate studies with three key significant variables from the statistical and theoretical perspective can be taken as a starting point for further research on this sub-field of EMI education in HE.

Even though EMI is thought to be very beneficial for the students' education and professional development, this study provides convincing evidence on what are the key factors from the student's perspective conditioning their satisfaction. Among others, we recommend for further research all those related to quality, including institutional ones like classroom ratios or English proficiency, accredited level to access, but particularly those related to instructors teaching practices. Particularly worrying is the decrease in students' satisfaction in the third and fourth years of university, not to mention once they graduate.

The sub-field of research on EMI would benefit from a broader range of research designs and methodological approaches adopted by more evaluation studies focusing on other dependent variables apart from the one studied in this research, as a way of measuring progress toward assumed quality standards.

5. References

Aguilar, M. (2018). Integrating intercultural competence in ESP and EMI: From theory to practise. *ESP Today-Journal of English for Specific Purposes at Tertiary Level*, *6*(1), 25–43. https://upcommons.upc.edu/bitstream/handle/2117/125706/Marta_Aguilar_full_text.pdf

Aguilar, M., & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*, 183–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.615906

Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salo, L., & Schwach, V. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, *73*, 561–576. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalisation of Higher Education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542

Arco-Tirado, J. L., Fernández-Martín, F. D., Ramos, A. M., Littvay, L., Villoria, J., & Naranjo. J. A. (2018). A counterfactual impact evaluation of a bilingual program on students' grade point average at a Spanish university. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *68*, 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2018.02.013

Arkin, E., & Osam, N. (2015). English-medium Higher Education: A case study in a Turkish university context. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European Higher Education* (pp. 177-199). De Gruyter Mouton.

Arzu, E. (2020). English Medium Instruction (EMI) from the perspectives of students at a technical university in Turkey. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *44*(2), 231-243. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1527025

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*, 1819–1825. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.477

Bazo, P., Centellas, A., Dafouz, E., Fernández, A., González, D., & Pavón, V. (2017). *Documento Marco de Política Lingüística para la Internacionalización del Sistema Universitario Español* [Towards a language policy for the internationalisation of Spanish universities: A framework of reference]. Conferencia de Rectores de Universidades Españolas (CRUE).

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

Çağatay, S. (2019). The pros and cons of English-medium instruction in Higher Education in an EFL context. *Journal of Foreign Language Education and Technology, 4*(2), 206–241. https://www.jflet.com/articles/the-pros-and-cons-of-englishmedium-instruction-inhigher-education-in-an-efl-context.pdf

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Chang, Y. Y. (2010). English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reactions from Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Taiwan International ESP Journal*, *2*(1), 53–82. https://doi.org/10.6706/TIESPJ.2010.2.1.3

Chen, H., Han, J., & Wright, D. (2020). An investigation of lecturers' teaching through the English medium of instruction—a case of Higher Education in China. *Sustainability, 12*(10), 4046. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104046

Dafouz, E. (2018). English-medium instruction and teacher education programmes in Higher Education: Ideological forces and imagined identities at work. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(5), 540–552. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1487926

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction – A growing global phenomenon.* British Council and Oxford University Department of Education.

Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Teachers' and students' second language motivational self-system in English-medium instruction: A qualitative approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(3), 657–679. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.452.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Pavón, V. (2019). The integration of language and content in English-medium instruction courses. Lecturers' beliefs and practices. *Ibérica*, *38*, 151–176. http://www.revistaiberica.org/index.php/iberica/article/view/96

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2012). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Multilingual Matters.

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *10*(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v10n04_01

Feixas, M., Codó, E., & Espinet, M. (2009). Enseñar en inglés en la universidad: reflexiones del alumnado y el profesorado en torno a las experiencias AICLE. In R. Roig (Coord.), *Investigar desde un contexto educativo innovador* (pp. 137–154). Marfil.

Fernández. A. (2017). Assessing students' perceptions regarding English medium instruction in Higher Education. *Didáctica. Lengua y Literatura*, *29*, 43–63. https://doi.org/10.5209/DIDA.57129

Fortanet, I. (2011). Critical components of integrating content and language in Spanish Higher Education. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.3.17

Galloway, N. (2019). *Questionnaire about your views on English medium instruction (EMI) in University Settings.* SurveyMonkey. https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2019surveySTUDENTs

Galloway, N., Numajiri, T., & Rees, N. (2020). The 'internationalisation', or 'Englishisation', of higher education in East Asia. *Higher Education*, *80*, 395–414. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00486-1

García-Aracil, A. (2009). European graduates' level of satisfaction with higher education. *Higher Education, 57*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9121-9

González-Álvarez, D. (2020). Languages and internationalisation. Strategies and policies. In D. González-Álvarez, & E. Rama-Martínez (Eds.), *Languages and the Internationalisation of Higher Education* (pp. 10–28). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hellekjær, G. O. (2010). Lecture comprehension in English-medium Higher Education. *Hermes*, *45*, 11–34. https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlcb.v23i45.97343

Hsieh, S. H., & Kang, S. C. (2007). *Effectiveness of English-medium instruction of an engineering course and strategies used by the teacher*. Center for Teaching and Learning Development, National Taiwan University.

Hu, G., & McKay, S. L. (2012). English language education in East Asia: Some recent developments. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*, 345–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661434

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese Higher Education: A case study. *Higher Education*, *67*, 551–567. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9661-5

Huang, D. F. (2015). Exploring and assessing effectiveness of English medium instruction courses: The students' perspectives. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *173*, 71–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.033

Kym, I., & Kym, M. H. (2014). Students' perceptions of EMI in Higher Education in
Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *11*(2), 35–61. http://journal.asiatefl.org/main/main.php?inx_journals=40&inx_contents=49&main=1&sub=2&submode=3&PageMode=JournalView&s_title=Students_Perceptions_of_EMI_in_Higher_Education_in_Korea

Lasagabaster, D. (2021). EMI in Spain striving to maintain a multilingual balance. In R. Wilkinson, & R. Gabriëls (Eds.), *The englishization of Higher Education in Europe* (pp. 77–96). Amsterdam University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv21ptzkn.7

Luo, Y., Xie, M., & Lian, Z. (2019). Emotional engagement and student satisfaction: A study of Chinese college students based on a nationally representative sample. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *28*, 283–292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00437-5

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in Higher Education. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 36–76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350

Macaro, E., Jiménez-Muñoz, A. J., & Lasagabaster, D. (2019). The importance of certification of English medium instruction teachers in higher education in Spain. *Porta Linguarum, 32*, 103–118. http://hdl.handle.net/10481/58569

Marsh, D., Pavon, V., & Frigols, M. J. (2013). *The Higher Education languages landscape: Ensuring quality in English language degree programmes*. Valencian International University.

Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport. (2014). *Estrategia para la Internacionalización de las Universidades Españolas*. www.mecd.gob.es/educacion-mecd/dms/mecd/educacion-mecd/areas-educacion/universidades/politica-internacional/estrategia-internacionalizacion/EstrategiaInternacionalizaci-n-Final.pdf

Nieto, E., & Fernández, A. (2021). Main challenges of EMI at the UCLM: Teachers' perceptions on language proficiency, training and incentives. *Alicante Journal of English Studies*, *34*, 39–61. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2021.34.02

O'Dowd, R. (2018). The training and accreditation of teachers for English medium instruction: An overview of practice in European universities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(5), 553–563. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491945

Ploettner, J. (2019). A critical look at teacher development for English-Medium Instruction. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, *9*, 263–287. https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2019-0016

Rakhshandehroo, M., & Ivanova, P. (2020). International student satisfaction at English-medium graduate programs in Japan. *Higher Education*, *79*, 39–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00395-3

Rubio-Alcalá, F., Arco-Tirado, J. L., Fernández-Martín, F. D., Lechuga, R., Barrios-Espinosa, E., & Pavón, V. (2019). A systematic review on evidence supporting quality indicators of bilingual, plurilingual and multilingual programs in Higher Education. *Educational Research Review*, *27*, 191–204.

Şahan, Ö., & Sahan, K. (2021). The driving forces behind monolingual and bilingual English-medium instruction: A comparison of students' perspectives in Turkey. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *15*(2), 81–97. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1320265

Short, D. J. (2006). Content teaching and learning and language. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 101–105). Elsevier https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00685-4

Toledo, I., Rubio, F. D., & Hermosín, M. (2012). Creencias, rendimiento académico y actitudes de alumnos universitarios principiantes en un programa plurilingüe. *Porta Linguarum, 18*, 213–228. https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.15836

Zenkova, T., & Khamitova, G. (2018). English medium-instruction as a way to internationalisation of Higher Education in Kazakhstan: An opinion survey in the Innovative University of Eurasia. *e-TEALS*, *8*(1), 126–158. https://doi.org/10.2478/eteals-2018-0006

6. Appendix

QUALITY OF THE UGR'S EMI PROGRAM FROM STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to analyse the students' perspective on the quality of the Primary Education Teachers Training Bilingual Program at the University of Granada. Since the questionnaire is anonymous, please answer with the highest sincerity possible. There are no right or wrong responses, so please answer based on your experience on this English as a Medium of Instruction Program (EMI).

	COURSES AND MATERIALS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	In general, lecturers have a good level of English	1	2	3	4	5
2	Lecturers in the EMI/Bilingual Programme teach mostly in English	1	2	3	4	5
3	I do not understand some of the lecturers when they explain in English	1	2	3	4	5
4	Class materials, resources, and bibliography are suitable and updated	1	2	3	4	5
5	There are available materials in English for most subjects	1	2	3	4	5
6	Students' participation in the courses taught in English is similar to the one in the courses taught in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5
	INTERNATIONALISATION AND LANGUAGE LEARNING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
7	The EMI/Bilingual programme has promoted my interest for visiting other countries	1	2	3	4	5
8	There are enough mobility opportunities and international exchanges at the university	1	2	3	4	5
9	Taking part in this programme has improved my level of English	1	2	3	4	5
10	Following lessons in English has provided me with technical and professional vocabulary and skills in English	1	2	3	4	5
11	I am prepared to study and even work in a foreign country using English	1	2	3	4	5
	STUDENTS LEARNING PRACTICES	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
12	I prefer teamwork to work on the EMI subjects	1	2	3	4	5
13	I communicate in English during teamwork	1	2	3	4	5
14	I develop oral communication through debate techniques	1	2	3	4	5
15	I use dictionaries to learn new words	1	2	3	4	5
16	I use online translators	1	2	3	4	5

	PROFESSORS TEACHING PRACTICES	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
17	There is no teacher-student interaction in most of the EMI classes	1	2	3	4	5
18	There are available tutorials between teachers and students	1	2	3	4	5
19	Teachers do not encourage students' participation	1	2	3	4	5
20	Teachers promote self-esteem and self-confidence of the learners	1	2	3	4	5
21	Previous level of English of the students is taken into account	1	2	3	4	5
22	Motivation is encouraged in class	1	2	3	4	5
23	Cooperative work and interaction are encouraged in class	1	2	3	4	5
24	It is more difficult to evaluate learners' success in EMI/bilingual program	1	2	3	4	5
25	Lecturers assess both in English and Spanish	1	2	3	4	5
26	EMI content lecturers should also help students with their English language proficiency	1	2	3	4	5
	SATISFACTION	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
27	In general, I am fully satisfied with the Bilingual Program	1	2	3	4	5