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This dissertation project aims to shed light on EMI instructional strategies by investigating undergraduate students’ and instructors’ perspectives in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) at KSAU-HS in the Al-Ahsa campus. This exploratory instrumental case study revealed the students’ and instructors’ beliefs toward EMI implementation to increase the awareness and understanding of the consequences of implementing EMI in one of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. In so doing, two major research questions about EMI implementation as well as perceived risks and benefits in the CAMS drive the project: “How do science, health, and IT instructors at KSAU-HS in the CAMS in Al-Ahsa implement EMI?; what do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach?” and “How do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements and improving their English language proficiency?” From my observations notes and the interviews responses, I found that both stakeholders believed that some kind of a bilingual model of education was preferable to English-only in the CAMS case where all students come from the same linguistic background, the Arabic language. All participants agreed that EMI helps them to engage
in global communications and provides them with better and wider access to modern knowledge compared to their first language (L1). On the other hand, all the participants of this study also acknowledged that students’ low English proficiency hampers the effectiveness of EMI which is consistent with studies such as Al-Bakri (2017), Al-Mashikhi et al. (2014), and Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb (2015). As a result, instructor and student participants indicated that they could preserve the information delivered through EMI for a short time compared to the instruction delivered through students’ L1; therefore, rote memorizations, lack of participation, burden of memorizing new vocabularies, and others impact students’ information retention in the long-term memory. This dissertation also compared and discussed the implications of EMI in different settings around the globe with data that I collected from the participants of this study to infer the participants’ positions toward EMI and how it may impact the students’ comprehension of the content, modes of delivery, the national language in the entire country, namely Arabic, and the education products either negatively, positively, or both (Altbach, 2019; Canagarajah, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2013; Pennycook, 1994). The results described in this dissertation have implications for teacher education, language policymakers, and pedagogies for EMI programs.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Preliminaries

As internationalization developed into a salient movement of the most prestigious universities around the globe, several non-English dominant countries considered implementing EMI as an indispensable solution for internationalizing university programs and improving university ranking (Shimauchi, 2018; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). For this initiative, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, among other countries, took several political and educational steps toward the “Englishization” of tertiary education, specifically in professional majors (e.g., Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Thompson & McKinley, 2018). In the face of EMI’s growing trend, the argument that English instruction equals internationalization can have serious unintended negative consequences, including, what Canagarajah warns about: “The need for English in other communities is assumed to be beyond dispute… That the local languages may have an equal or greater role to play in educational and social development is often ignored” (2005, p. xv). It is necessary, therefore, to properly contextualize and critically understand EMI and its influences on knowledge construction in local institutions and students’ mindsets. I see this instrumental case study as a first step to shed light on EMI implementation in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia, then contextualize appropriate language policy in higher education.

The growing emphasis in policy and practice upon college education through English in the Middle East and North African regions (MENA), as in other international contexts, can be traced back to the fact that “English [has come to represent] an essential
element in the spread of political, social, and educational norms [and] economic globalization” (Kirkpatrick & Barnawi, 2017, p. 2). Similarly, Chowdhury and Ha’s (2014) study emphasizes on Englishization and internationalization of tertiary education as powerful elements that would lead to modernization that will bring about access to wide knowledge, improve the economy, and facilitate global communications (also in Delgado-Marquez et al., 2013). Moreover, the majority of the world’s international students are learning through English (Ball & Lindsay, 2013). Thus, decision-makers in the Ministry of Education apply EMI in professional majors, as it is supposed to prepare students to be active and engaged participants in an interrelated world. A world obsessed with material redemption over any other kinds of existential concerns. In this instrumental case study, I explored the progress of EMI in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (the College, henceforth) at KSAU-HS in Al-Ahsa through overt observations1 and semi-structured interviews with English specialized instructors, content (health, science, and IT) instructors, and students to illustrate teachers’ perspectives about EMI implementation and tackle issues related to students’ academic needs. The aim of this study is to explore the implementation of EMI from the perspectives of both students and teachers in the College programs at an English medium university in the city of Al-Ahsa.

The Nature of the Problem

Internationalization of tertiary education and globalization are seen as key factors for the spread of EMI around the globe which has had an influential impact on language

---

1 Due to COVID-19, one observation and four interviews were conducted through Zoom, and students knew that I observe them for the data collection.
policy in the education systems of the Expanding-Circle countries such as Saudi Arabia (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016), and Europe (Coleman, 2006, Doiz et al., 2013). Students in Saudi Arabia and in the Gulf region who would like to pursue their higher education in scientific majors such as medicine, pharmacy, IT, computer sciences, health sciences, engineering, etc. have no other choice than to study in English. This exploratory and interpretive study interrogates students’ needs and instructors’ attitudes toward implementing EMI at KSAU-HS in Al-Ahsa. In my dissertation, I argue that Saudi students in this particular context, who are taught and exposed to Arabic Medium Instruction (AMI) in secondary education i.e., from kindergarten to 12th grade, experience a sudden shift in professional majors\(^2\), to English as the language of instruction at the university level, encounter multiple issues related to students’ English language proficiency, institutional language policy, and quality of education outcomes. In addition to that, I noticed a contradiction in the EMI program. The students speak Arabic 75% of the day and English perhaps only 20-25% of the time when they are in school settings. So, their language proficiency will always be in the AMI, not EMII. In fact, what EMI does, is perhaps weaken the students’ proficiency in AMI. So, in a sense, the process is counter-productive because it works to weaken the language that locals know very well and barely strengthens their proficiency in the foreign one i.e., the English language in this context. Therefore, I compared the responses of the students and instructors to understand how EMI is implemented, as well as to offer solutions to obstacles of studying through EMI.

\(^2\)By professional majors I mean any university majors that are related to science, technology, engineering, medicine, and health.
There is a common assumption in the Gulf region and other expanding countries that studying in English or EMI will promote students’ mastery of English (Ismail, 2011; Macaro, 2015; Rogier, 2012). For example, a study that measured General English proficiency gains using a standardized test done by Rogier (2012) showed that university students in the UAE could improve their English, in particular, speaking. This assumption is supported by several researchers (e.g., Chapple, 2015; Macaro, 2015; Shohamy, 2013). On the other hand, other scholars found that there was no positive effect on English proficiency with students studying in EMI programs (e.g., in China, Lei & Hu, 2014; Macaro, 2018; in Austria, Tatz & Messnarz, 2013). Macaro stated that “there is no conclusive evidence” that supports the assumption that EMI improves students’ English proficiency (2018, p. 182). Hence, the generalization of saying that EMI improves students’ English proficiency is faulty, and the relationship between EMI and language proficiency is not always linear, and it depends on educational, social, and individual variables.

To illustrate the relationship between students’ language development and EMI, it is necessary to discuss English language pedagogies that relate to teaching language and content in an EFL context. English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Content-based Instruction (CBI), and English for a Specific Purposes (ESP) are mainly focused on English language learning and teaching as it relates to academic content and specialized vocabulary and language skills. Other English language teaching approaches (ELT), such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), began with the implementation of the multilingual policy in Europe to facilitate both language acquisition and content
learning. EMI is defined here as “the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (Dearden, 2015, p. 2) see also (Macaro, 2018). That means the learning process in the EMI programs concentrates on the content of the subject, not the English language itself, and this could pose challenges for many learners, especially when the K-12 education system is not sufficient to prepare students for the EMI program requirements. It is noteworthy to understand the differences between English language teaching pedagogies that focus on content with those on language skills. For example, enhancing students’ English proficiency is not a priority in EMI as it is in CBI and CLIL.

EMI implementation has stirred concerns and debates among academics, administrators, and researchers. Some people see the EMI approach as a colonial language that has its characteristics and impact on the education system of that country. Others, especially in the contemporary time, understand implementing EMI in education as a way that gives access to knowledge (Pennycook, 1998; Coleman et al., 2018). One of the concerns is the impact of EMI on the home language. Troudi (2009) reported that the Arabic language, the home language of the participants of this study, is perceived by some educators in the Arab world and in the Gulf region, in particular, as not adequate to be utilized for teaching sciences-related subjects due to lack of resources and textbooks in Arabic. To understand issues that revolve around EMI, it is necessary to investigate the sociolinguistic realities of the English language in the community. For instance, Ahmed mentioned that “Marginalization of Arabic and its culture begins to be evident” due to the wide introduction of EMI in tertiary education (2011, p. 285). Tayem et al. (2020)
illustrated the communication barriers that EMI may create, and how those barriers impact the graduates to communicate effectively with their local community members. Because of these consequences, some Gulf countries take steps forward to minimize the widespread introduction of EMI and make decisions that revive Arabic as a scientific language. For example, the Supreme Education Council in Qatar adopted AMI in four of the colleges of Qatar University: law, international affairs, mass communication, and business and economics (Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015). Similar procedures are conducted in the UAE when members of the Federal National Council are planning to “call for a law to ensure Arabic is the language of instruction in state schools and universities” (Salem, 2014). In addition to that, EMI is considered a double-edged sword, which means it could impact the quality of education and learning experiences of students negatively due to, for example, students’ low English proficiency (Al-Mahrooqi, 2012; Al-Bakri, 2017; Kırkgöz, 2014; McMullen, 2014). Students with low English competency are allowed to enter a degree program because “it is necessary to ensure that an acceptable number of students progress onto the degree program” (Ismail, 2011, p. 253). What Ismail stated is applicable to the context of this study. It is evident that social and political considerations also have an influential role in educational decisions. Indeed, research has revealed that students, whose English is a foreign language, encounter difficulties studying in EMI (Alghammas & Alhuwaydi, 2020; Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; McMullen, 2014). Therefore, the problem of EMI in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia relies on students’ low English proficiency and marginalization of the Arabic language. Some of the effects of the radical shift from
Arabic Medium Instruction (AMI) to EMI on students in Saudi Arabia and some considerations to the social effects of this disjointed form of training and education will be discussed in Chapter Four.

**Research Questions**

EMI is an inevitable approach that affects not only Saudi universities but also several Outer- and Expanding-Circle countries\(^3\) (in the Kachruvian paradigm) due to several factors such as internationalization of tertiary education, scholarship, and resources availability. This dissertation project aims to shed light on EMI instructional strategies through/by investigating undergraduate students’ and instructors’ perspectives in the College in Al-Ahsa. In so doing, the following research questions drive this project:

1. How do science and health specialties instructors at KSAU-HS in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) in Al-Ahsa implement EMI? Also, what do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach?

2. How do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements and improving their English language proficiency?

In fact, whether we understand EMI implementation in several tertiary education systems as the legacy of colonial education, or we see it as a modernization movement, language

---

\(^2\) Outer Circle Countries are those that use English as a lingua franca between ethnic and language groups such as in India and Nigeria. Expanding Circle Countries encompasses countries where English is utilized as a medium of international communication and considered as a foreign language, such as in Saudi Arabia and China (Kachru, 1985).
policymakers at KSAU-HS as well as the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia are accountable to contextualize EMI policy to meet local needs. Through this dissertation project, educational decision-makers can obtain knowledge about the instructors’ and students’ attitudes toward EMI teaching and learning environment so that their decisions regarding language policy are more contextualized, evidence-based, and appropriate.

**Theoretical Framework**

All the universities in Saudi Arabia, KSAU-HS is included, choose to implement the EMI approach in professional/scientific majors specifically for the sake of a variety of purposes such as university rankings, economic development, and access to up-to-date knowledge (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Dearden, 2015; Macaro, 2018; McMullen, 2014). These developments have also been seen as complicit with English linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992), and in some ways, English language colonialism. The hegemony of the English language has been rejuvenated not by imperial hegemony, but by as some scholars pointed out “marketization and standardization of tertiary education” (Shimauchi, 2018, p. 78). The paradigm is based on terminological and conceptual considerations derived from the key discussion of English for specific purposes, English for academic purposes, content and language integrated learning, and English-medium instruction literature (Bhatia, 1993; Hyland, 2006; Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Dafouz-Milne & Smit, 2016).

The widespread introduction of EMI in the professional majors in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia affects educational policymakers. Several studies around the world have examined the effects and consequences of EMI implementation in tertiary
education in terms of language policy and educational practices (e.g., Al-Bakri, 2017; Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Briggs, Dearden, & Macaro, 2017; Doiz et al., 2013; McMullen, 2014; Phillipson, 2009; Shimauchi, 2018; Wilkinson, 2013). One of the primary issues of EMI implementation is that educational policymakers perceived that EMI could replace EFL programs and improve the students’ English proficiency. To clarify that, it is important to differentiate between English education and education in English which are often discussed interchangeably or probably mixed between the two. Although CBI and EMI programs share some similarities in the education process, their differences are significant to consider. In CBI, the L2 being used in the classroom is spoken locally unlike in the EMI situation where the medium of instruction is probably a foreign language. For example, CBI is a commonly used concept in the U.S. and Canada, whereas EMI is mostly implemented in EFL countries such as China, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia. Another difference is instructor expertise. A CBI instructor is usually a language specialist, while an EMI instructor is always a content specialist (Cenoz, 2015).

Another critical issue of implementing EMI is, as De Wit (2011) notes, students’ low English proficiency becomes an obstacle to learn and comprehend the content effectively; potentially, leading to a decline in the overall quality of education. In Naples, for example, more than 50% of students were found not to have sufficient levels of proficiency to contend with EMI (Guarda & Helm, 2016). Another study in Iraq indicated that almost 75% of the EMI students are at beginner or elementary levels of English (Borg, 2016). In fact, there are several studies that have investigated students’ English proficiency studying in the EMI programs, from instructors’ perspectives discussed in
Chapter Two of this dissertation. The inadequate linguistic skills can be a barrier to learning content, and in the long run, undermine their educational attainment (Al-Bakri, 2017; Chan, 2014; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2017; McMullen, 2014). These studies and others are an attempt to show the consequences of EMI on students’ academic achievement and institutional outcomes, and to minimize the exacerbation of global and local inequalities in education through the disadvantageous impacts of linguistic diversity provoked by English language teaching and in particular EMI.

The Research Gap

Several researchers have investigated the EMI issues and practicality in terms of language policy and institutional pedagogy in different contexts, from Europe to Asia (e.g., Al-Bakri, 2017; Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Briggs, Dearden, & Macaro, 2017; Doiz et al., 2011, 2012, 2013; McMullen, 2014; Ryhan, 2014; Shimauchi, 2018; Thompson & McKinley, 2018). The following central question concerning these policies still persists: in what ways has the implementation of EMI policies transformed the tertiary education sector, and subsequently affected primary social actors, such as students, instructors, and administrators embedded within these shifting contexts? EMI studies in the Gulf region are limited, and there are no investigations of both students and instructors or comparisons between their perspectives toward EMI implementation. As I started to investigate more about EMI studies in the Saudi context, I realized that this topic is barely discussed specifically in health-specialized universities in Al-Ahsa city. McMullen’s (2014) study discusses English proficiency and its role in the EMI learning environment and the value of a preparatory year in Saudi Arabia in general. Alhawsawi
& Barnawi (2016) explain the importance of nationalizing and contextualizing the institutional language policy and improve the quality of EMI education outcomes. One of the studies that explored EMI in the Gulf region is Al-Bakri (2017). She investigated Omani students’ perspectives only towards EMI in an Omani university. In her study, she did not compare and contrast students’ and instructors’ responses. Also, the context of her study, specifically the majority of instructors in the investigated college, are from India, which differs from the context of my study. In this study, I interrogated students’ and instructors’ attitudes toward EMI in the College in Al-Ahsa. Furthermore, I compare instructors’ responses with what students said about EMI to perceive the teaching and learning in the classroom by hearing instructors’ and students’ voices.

McMullen (2014) and Ryhan (2014) examined the role and impact of EMI in Saudi education in terms of language superiority and comparing students’ perspectives on Arabic and English as a medium of instruction. While these studies focused on EMI, in general by comparing EMI with AMI, and exploring students’ academic obstacles through studying in the EMI programs, they did not investigate instructors’ classroom pedagogies nor the students’ experiences. No studies have identified and compared instructors’ perspectives and experiences on EMI with students’ experiences of the same learning environment. Thus, in this instrumental case study, I built on these studies to develop insights into EMI in the College in Al-Ahsa through overt observations and semi-structured interviews with English specialized instructors, content instructors, and students. Such insights helped me to be aware of EMI practices in the College, and

---

4 Some of the Observations and interviews were conducted through Zoom due to COVID-19.
understand instructors’ and students’ views towards EMI implementation from their own perspectives. It also illustrated instructors’ and students’ perspectives about EMI implementation and tackled issues related to that. Moreover, it raised the education stakeholders’ awareness on the necessity of constructing and shaping a language education framework that resonates with the local needs like Saudi culture and social communications, and understands the students’ and instructors’ capabilities, in order to enable Saudi citizens to think locally and act globally. Creating such a framework is what Alhawsawi and Barnawi (2016) called for i.e., effective implementation for both, English language teaching, and teaching in English.

EMI is considered a primary approach for improving the quality of teaching and learning in the KSA (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016). One of the drawbacks of the EMI implementation is that the language education policy being applied in Saudi Arabia is taken from foreign contexts such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFRL) which differs from the local context in terms of culture and language. In order to implement EMI successfully, it is necessary to design a strategic and well-stated plan directed by local linguistic and cultural conditions and needs. Therefore, this study could fill the gap in the field of EMI and language instructor education in Saudi education in identifying EMI problems and possible local solutions; consequently, educational policymakers could articulate a clear institutional language policy in tertiary education that tackles students’ and instructors’ challenges in EMI programs. This dissertation makes a unique contribution in this regard by understanding how EMI is implemented in the College, comparing students’ and instructors’ views on
EMI, and discussing solutions to overcome EMI obstacles in the College particularly, and reflect on the implications to other EFL contexts, in general.

**Methods, Data Sources and Analysis**

This project is designed to be an instrumental case study to provide an understanding of students’ and instructors’ perspectives about EMI practices, and investigating EMI implementation in the College in the Al-Ahsa campus. In so doing, two major research questions about EMI implementation: instructors’ and students’ beliefs on EMI, and perceived risks and benefits from implementing EMI in the College drive the project. Case studies could be conducted in three different ways; critical, interpretivist, and positivist approaches, and each one of them depends on the researcher’s epistemological standpoint (Crowe et al., 2011). The interpretivist approach is the epistemological approach of this dissertation project since it focuses on theory building. The aim of the interpretivist approach is to “understand the event or phenomenon from its context” (Crowe et al., 2011, p. 4). The interpretation process is through interrogating individuals from that social context to comprehend meanings as perceived from various perspectives. In other words, the purpose of case study is to understand human interaction within a social unit, a single instance bounded by the caseworker in the process of designing the research (Stake, 1995). Indeed, the instrumental case study enables me as a researcher to closely examine the data within this specific context through a limited number of individuals as the subject of study. Therefore, the reason for utilizing a qualitative design ‘instrumental case study’ is to
identify and understand EMI practices in the College in Al-Ahsa to develop insights into general issues, concepts, or phenomena related to EMI implementations.

The key methods of data collection of this study are semi-structured interviews and overt classroom observations. The interviews are conducted with two English specialists (English-native and Arabic-native speakers), four content instructors, whom some of them utilize the English Only method in teaching disciplines such as science, health, and IT, and four students (one from each academic year) who study in the College in Al-Ahsa campus. The reason behind selecting interviewing instructors specialized in these three majors is that students begin studying courses from these three disciplines in the pre-professional years through EMI, so these instructors are the first team who meet the students in the College. The sampling of data was a purposeful typical sampling composed of six experienced instructors, and a student from each academic year, a total of ten participants. The semi-structured interview questions are designed for two different emphases (instructors and students), and each interview is conducted individually. So, a purposeful sampling fitted my interest to answer the questions of this study. All the actors/participants of the study were from the College in Al-Ahsa at KSAU-HS, and I have not had an opportunity to teach any participants of this study. In reference to student-based studies, Ferguson et al. (2004) mention the preference of getting involved in the participants who are not the researcher’s own students.

Another primary data source of my project was from three classroom observations. Two of the observations were on English courses, one was for an English native speaking instructor, and the other one was for an Arabic native speaking instructor.
both of whom teach the English language skills courses to pre-professional students. The other observation was for Arabic speakers teaching health specialties courses to observe how the students’ L1 plays a role in the medium of instruction. The data analysis began when I started collecting data and transcribing the interviews. I utilized the Generative Codes which means to develop codes directly from the data during and after data collection (Beaudry & Miller, 2016). In addition to that, I implemented two emic ‘insider’ interpretative approaches, phenomenological and symbolic Interaction, which mean the interpretation process referred to perspectives and interpretations of actors/participants of this study because the focus of this study is to describe instructors’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI implementation. Unlike the etic ‘outsider’ interpretation which refers to perspectives and interpretations of the researcher. For further information, Chapter Three detailed my method and discussed the rationale behind my selection.

**Significance of the Study**

EMI has become a significant shift in most of the high-ranking universities in this world to the extent that several non-English dominant countries consider implementing EMI as an indispensable solution for their reputations (Shimauchi, 2018; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). The Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia takes several political and educational steps toward the “Englishization” of tertiary education specifically in the professional majors (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Thompson & McKinley, 2018). The KSAU-HS represented by the CAMS, in this study, is the only university that majored in health sciences in the Middle East according to the university’s official website. So, it is
beneficial to conduct research that observes and investigates EMI participants in the College to reveal the manifest outcomes to consider in understanding how to use English in teaching content subjects ‘health-related specialties’ to be able to implement EMI effectively. Therefore, this study is significant to the field of EMI and language instructor education in several ways: First, it helps educational policymakers and the stakeholders in Saudi Arabia to identify EMI problems and solutions; consequently, they could articulate a clear institutional language policy in tertiary education that tackles students’ and instructors’ challenges in EMI programs. Also, this study contributes to increase the awareness of the EMI among instructors, learners, and decision-makers in the EMI programs in Saudi Arabia. The benefit of that is to question the monolingualism bias in the EMI programs where all professional majors in the tertiary education in Saudi Arabia are taught through English-only instruction. As Tollefson (2013) argues that equality in education exists when “individuals and groups who are affected by policies have direct involvement and power in policymaking” (p. 308). So, it is important to give educational stakeholders, namely instructors and students a voice to express their preferences and explain their academic needs.

The significance of this study also comes from the alternation of the medium of instruction in the professional majors, i.e., ‘Englishization of tertiary education’ due to some reasons such as recruitment, accreditation, and establishing partnerships with overseas universities (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Thompson & McKinley, 2018). The EMI policy may not please all educational stakeholders, and it may not also fulfill students’ academic needs. So, it is necessary to conduct observations and interviews that
investigating EMI participants in the Saudi context to understand the phenomenon of teaching content subjects through English in tertiary education and its consequences on students all of whom are Saudi and have the Arabic language as their L1. As Alhawsawi and Barnawi (2016) reported that internationalization affects the policymakers’ decisions in implementing the English language in schools and universities in Saudi Arabia. Thus, this study helps to provide a beneficial source by interrogating students’ and instructors’ experiences and academic obstacles which may contribute to help educators and language policymakers to create a plan for smooth transitions from AMI in the secondary education system to EMI in professional majors in the tertiary education system. Indeed, the significance of this study stemmed from the need to understand the students’ and instructors’ perspectives about EMI, and the efficacy of designing a bilingual approach in the College context that protects students’ L1 and elevates the status of the Arabic language.

**Key Terms Explained**

- **Bilingual Education**

  Bilingual education is a term refers to the teaching of academic content in two languages, students’ mother tongue and the second language. The mount use of each language depends on the end goal of the model. There are two common models of bilingual education, Additive Bilingual Education and Subtractive Bilingual Education.
- **Content and Language Integrated Learning**

  Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has become the umbrella term describing both learning another (content) subject such as physics or geography through the medium of a foreign language and learning a foreign language by studying a content-based subject.

- **Content-Based Instruction**

  Content-Based Instruction (CBI) refers to an approach to second language teaching in which teaching is organized around the content or information that students will acquire, rather than around a linguistic or other types of syllabi.

- **Content Instructors**

  Those who teach science-related subjects such as physics, chemistry, health sciences courses, etc. in the EMI programs at a university level.

- **English Language Specialists**

  Instructors who teach students English language skills, reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and other English academic skills such as taking notes, and giving presentations in universities.

- **English Medium Instruction**

  The use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English (Macaro, 2018).
- **Professional/Science-related majors**

University-level majors or specializations in colleges of medicine, pharmacy, engineering, computer sciences, IT, nursing, applied medical sciences, and other health sciences where students are taught through the EMI approach.

- **Translanguaging**

In pedagogy, Translanguaging refers to the ways in which bilingual students and instructors engage in complex and fluid discursive practices that include, at times, the home language practices of students in order to make sense of teaching and learning, to communicate and appropriate subject knowledge, and to develop academic language practices (Paulsrud et al., 2021).

**Dissertation Organization**

This dissertation comprises five chapters. Chapter One consists of introductory information about the project. It illustrated the statement of the problem, research questions, theoretical framework, significance of the study, an overview of chapters, and conclusion. In Chapter Two, I discuss the major conclusions, findings, and methodological issues related to English medium instruction. The theoretical topics in Chapter Two are as follows: EMI around the globe, language policy and EMI, English language teaching pedagogies and EMI, attitudes toward EMI, challenges related to EMI, maintenance of first language and culture, and the Arabic language as a language of science. Chapter Three details the methodological choices and procedures embraced in this study in terms of elaborating the contextual background, methodological choices and the rationale behind that, identification of research questions, demonstration of data
collection and data analysis, illustration of setting, participants, and ethical considerations of this study, and finally, description of challenges and limitations. Chapter Four presents the findings and discussion of the study into the following themes: Contextual data: EMI implementation in the College in Al-Ahsa, the medium of instruction inside the classrooms in the College includes multiple languages, biliteracy practices outside classrooms, diverse roles and responsibilities of instructors in EMI contexts, beliefs in the EMI approach in the College: educational outcomes, EMI and improvement of students’ English language proficiency, instructors’ and students’ impression of English varieties and proficiency, perceived advantages of EMI, drawbacks of EMI, students’ low English proficiency, effects on students’ home language, EMI decision-making, and models. Last, Chapter Five details the implications of the research and indicating what might happen in the future with suggestions, recommendations, and predictions. It also explains the limitations of the study and concluded with a personal reflection on my dissertation journey.

**Conclusion**

This study aims to contribute to the EMI literature in tertiary education, in particular in the Saudi Arabian context where research in this field is still not fully-fledged, unlike other contexts of East Asia and Europe. It also aims to contribute to the work of other scholars who have discussed EMI implications such as Al-Bakri (2018); Dearden (2015); Findlow (2006, 2008); Ismail (2011); Troudi and Jendli (2011); among others. EMI in Saudi universities needs a “development of national policies that put the interest of Saudi Arabia first and negotiate the link with the international framework
This study met the call and started the first step by interrogating the most important stakeholders in the education process, instructors and students. It explored how EMI is implemented in the College from the students’ and instructors’ responses as well as from my observations’ notes. Then it discussed the impact of EMI on the students’ and instructors’ teaching and learning environment. After three observations and ten interviews, this study revealed the following findings: a) students’ L1 is an important factor in teaching and learning in the EMI programs, b) EMI policy which is imposed on students should consider the local context and students’ linguistic competence, c) instructors and students found the Preparatory Models to be more effective and appropriate than other EMI models since this model provides students with ample English support, and d) students and instructors believed that the widespread introduction of the EMI might impact the status of the indigenous language of students (Arabic in this context), so they preferred to study and teach in Arabic or in both languages but had no other choice than English.
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Preliminary

This chapter identifies the dissertation concepts, evaluates and explains relevant theories, and shows how this project as an instrument case study fits in and makes use of the mentioned theories. I begin this chapter with an introduction identifying topics of investigation and issues around EMI. Then I discuss the relevant literature and insights drawn from the current study: First, EMI around the globe which discusses what is meant by EMI, and briefly indicate the reasons behind EMI implementation. Second, I illustrate language policy and EMI, and present the English education policy in Saudi Arabia. Through that, I explain institutional requirements around EMI, for instance, English language entry requirements policy, and one-year English for academic purposes policy. After that, I describe the attitudes toward EMI with more emphasis on similar contexts to Saudi Arabia such as the Gulf region countries i.e., Oman, Qatar, and the UAE. Then, I discuss academic challenges related to EMI such as literacy skills in EMI programs, English language teaching pedagogies, the influence of EMI on education outcomes and national language(s), and content instructors’ responsibility in improving students’ English skills and protecting students’ L1. After discussing the academic challenges, I briefly present the historical part of the Arabic language when it was the language of science to prove that the Arabic language could be used as a medium of instruction for science-related subjects in tertiary education. Finally, I conclude this chapter with closing remarks reminding the readers about the main discussed topics.
Introduction

Several studies have investigated issues related to EMI implementation in a wide range of settings from linguistic, pedagogical, cultural, and political angles. From linguistic and pedagogical perspectives, researchers have explored matters related to EMI pedagogy. Specifically, they looked at students’ comprehension of lectures, the role of questions in comprehension (e.g., Björkman, 2011; Suvinitti, 2012), students’ tendency towards learning content courses through English (e.g., Ismail et al., 2011), and students’ difficulties i.e., linguistic constraints in following EMI classes (e.g., Airey, 2011; Floris, 2012). Much research has also focused on students’ contentment with EMI (Kim & Sohn, 2009), strategies students use to cope with EMI when fulfilling academic tasks (Marie, 2013; Suliman & Tadros, 2011), the quality of learning and teaching through English compared to students’ first languages (e.g., Byun et al., 2010; Suvinitti, 2012; Tange, 2010; Tung, Lam, & Tsang, 1997), students’ and lecturers’ views about effectiveness of EMI and the challenges they faced (e.g., Kim, 2011; Tatzl, 2011), and inconsistency between EMI policy and its implementation in practice (Li, Leung, & Kember, 2001).

Previous studies have also investigated the difficulties lecturers encountered in teaching in a language other than their native language (e.g., Jensen et al., 2011; Vinke et al., 1998), their language and pedagogical demands to nurture their teaching abilities (e.g., Ball & Lindsay, 2013), their views and attitudes and perceptions toward EMI (e.g., Channa, 2012; Dafouz, Hüttner, & Smit, 2014; Doiz et al., 2011; Margić & Vodopija-Krstanović, 2015; Pulcini & Campagna, 2015), and instructors’ opinions about students’
learning achievements when they begin learning non-language subject courses such as science-related courses in English (e.g., Mansor, Badarudin, & Mat, 2011).

In addition to the pedagogical and linguistic issues, researchers have also investigated topics related to EMI from political and cultural viewpoints. For example, they have studied concerns related to domain loss, the potential threat of English to local cultures and languages, and loss of national identity, among others (e.g., Carroll-Boegh, 2005; Channa, 2012; Choi, 2008; Cots, 2013; Kerkgöz, 2005; Li, 2013; Ljosland, 2010; Phillipson, 1992, 2003; Preisler, 2009; Sercu, 2004; Tange, 2010; Tsiligiris, 2012; Zaaba et al., 2010). Although topics surrounding EMI have been investigated thoroughly from various perspectives, little has been explored about EMI and its implementation in Saudi Arabia. More specifically, there is scarce research that interrogated and compared instructors’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI implementation.

**English Medium Instruction Around the Globe**

Due to the internationalization of tertiary education, many countries around the world implement EMI in their education system even though English is a foreign language (e.g., Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Briggs, Dearden, & Macaro, 2017; Doiz et al., 2011, 2012, 2013; Phillipson, 2009; Shimauchi, 2018; Wilkinson, 2013). The aspects that influence internationalization are autonomy and academic freedom, reputation, rankings, and excellence programs, and the changing economic and political climate. Before I dig deeper into EMI implementation, I would prefer to define EMI briefly. The definition of EMI is still an imprecise concept in the education, and its meaning and implementation practices are still evolving (Airey, 2016; Dearden 2015; Galloway et al.,
While English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Content-based Language Teaching (CBLT), and English for a Specific Purposes (ESP) mainly focus on English language learning and teaching, as well as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) which began with the implementation of the multilingual policy in Europe to facilitate both language acquisition and content learning, EMI focuses on “the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (Dearden, 2015, p. 2). In other words, in the EMI approach, the learning process concentrates on the content of the subject, not the English language skills themselves, and this is problematic for several English language learners (ELL) (Macaro, 2018). Another understanding of the English language is what Coleman et al., (2018) mentioned that EMI related to a colonial language has its characteristics and impact on the education system of the colonized country. Unlike now, people see the English language from a contemporary perspective as a means to give access to knowledge and employment (See also Pennycook, 1998).

Different justifications have been found in the literature for the adoption of the EMI. One of the arguments for the implementation of EMI, especially at the higher education level, is related to the status of English as an international language (Matsuda, 2006; McKay, 2002). Undoubtedly, English is a global and influential language in many countries around the globe. More than three-quarters of scientific papers today are published in English, and in some fields, it is more than 90 percent, according to data compiled by Montgomery (2013; See also Ramírez-Castañeda, 2020). Furthermore, Graddol (1997) asserts that “the need to teach some subjects in English, rather than the
national language, is well understood. In sciences, for example, up-to-date textbooks and articles are obtained much more easily in English” (p. 45). Therefore, all the universities in Saudi Arabia, KSAU-HS is included, choose to implement the EMI approach in professional majors specifically for the sake of a variety of purposes such as world university rankings, economic development, and access to up-to-date knowledge (Dearden, 2015; Macaro, 2018; McMullen, 2014). These developments have also been seen as complicit with English linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). In many ways, English language colonialism has been rejuvenated not by imperial hegemony but by the “marketization and standardization of tertiary education embodied in such things as the global university ranking system” (Shimauchi, 2018, p. 78). So, I see that it is beneficial to interrogate university students’ and instructors’ perspectives towards EMI, and to explore how a variety of EMI contexts around the globe conceptualize and understand EMI implementation, and what the impact of implementing EMI on local language(s), teaching-learning experience, and content comprehension are (in Qatar, Al-Maadheed, 2013; in Turkey, Başibek et al., 2014; in Japan, Hashimoto, 2013; in Saudi Arabia, McMullen, 2014; in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) context, Moore-Jones, 2015; in Tanzania Rea-Dickins, Khamis, & Olivero, 2013).

Certainly, the implementation of EMI in several contexts around the globe, Japan as an example, has been largely proclaimed at the “macro-level (i.e., national policies)” with the aim of globalizing students’ mindsets or increasing the number of international students in order to reduce the linguistics barriers and develop educational outcomes (Shimauchi, 2018, p. 88). In Europe, globalization of the market and internationalization
of education have a vital role for the increased use of EMI at tertiary education, specifically (Coleman et al., 2018; Doiz et al., 2013). That role is represented in implementing English at European universities to attract international students, and to prepare domestic students for the global market, as well as to raise the profile of the institution (Doiz et al., 2013). For instance, universities are able to enhance their profits by charging international students with higher fees than local students (Barnard, 2014). Indeed, the adoption of EMI in education benefits many non-English countries to enhance their academic, university ranking for example, and increase their financial revenue.

There are many benefits to EMI in local contexts. As can be seen in Appendix A: Glances of EMI Implementation in four EFL Countries, EMI facilitates gaining access to groundbreaking knowledge and increasing worldwide competitiveness to raise the global profile. It increases income (and compensates for shortages at the domestic level), and thus enhances student and lecturer mobility. EMI also boosts the employability of graduates/international competencies while improving students’ English proficiency. EMI proves to bring forward advancements in English language teaching (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Baker & Hüttner, 2018; Coleman et al., 2018; Galloway et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2016; Macaro, 2018). All these advantages and others are strong motivations for Saudi policymakers to implement EMI in professional majors.
Before I elaborate more on the English language policy in the Saudi context, I would like to mention two important definitions of *language policy* found in the literature since EMI and its implementation is highly shaped by local language policies. In a broad sense, a language policy may be interpreted as “an officially mandated set of rules for language use and form within a nation-state” (Spolsky, 2012, p. 3). More specifically, Shohamy (2006) defines *language policy* more critically as, “the primary mechanism for organizing, managing, and manipulating language behaviors as it consists of decisions made about languages and their uses in society” (p. 45). In this dissertation project, I will follow Shohamy (2006) who described language policies as specific documents, laws, or regulations in which “desired language behaviors are determined in the form of rules” (p. 45) because this project is related to a language policy that formulated and planned by educational policymakers in the institution. The educational policymakers choose a specific language, English in my context, as the medium of instruction, and officially determine the language use in the EMI programs. However, it should be taken into consideration that not all policies of the institutions are explicitly disclosed; therefore, unwritten policies can still become influential in shaping desired language behaviors (Karakaş, 2016). In my personal experience in teaching at an EMI university, I have encountered unwritten language policies that determine my language choice in teaching and communicating with students inside the classroom, as well as with colleagues in official meetings.
It is necessary to mention Spolsky’s (2004) components of language policy: language management (planning), language beliefs (ideology), and language practices (ecology). Language management is defined as “the explicit and observable effort by someone or some group that has or claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs” (Jones et al., 2011, p. 4). In Saudi Arabia, the Arabic language is the medium of instruction of all disciplines in all education levels except professional majors at the university level where English is the language of teaching. The Ministry of Education (MOE) has the ultimate authority to form and apply the language policy in educational institutions. Document of Education Policy in Saudi Arabia, Article 24 states that “the Arabic language is the official language for entire education level in the country except if there is a necessity to utilize other languages” (Ministry of Education, 1995, p. 9). Broadly, MOE implements the English language in its learning system due to the following objectives:

1. Learning English will help students to be able to communicate globally.

2. Learning English will enable the learners to benefit from other cultures’ sciences, and transfer this diverse knowledge to the Saudi nation.

3. Learning English will improve students’ awareness about the cultural, economic, religious, and social issues of the Saudi society, so that they could provide effective solutions for these issues.⁵

---

⁵ This is highly contradictory! How does the government imagine that learning English will help students understand Saudi society? In the US, immigrants are told to learn English so they can understand the culture. American students don’t learn Arabic to help them understand American society. And what this reveal is that language researchers and teachers must be involved in the formulation of a national language policy.
4. Learning English will improve the learners’ positive attitudes toward the English language (Ministry of Education, 2002), See also (Al-Nasser, 2015; Al Zayid, 2012; Rahman & Alhaisoni, 2013).

In general, the educators’ beliefs in Saudi Arabia toward teaching professional majors in English are optimistic, prestigious, and supportive due to internationalization and scholarship (Alshareef et al., 2018; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Faruk, 2013). Similarly, in the Arab world, Habbash and Troudi (2015) affirm that “English has gained a higher status than ever before. It is believed, unquestionably brings many advantages to the millions who learn it” (p. 57). Therefore, all public and private higher education institutions in the Gulf countries have opted for EMI in scientific specializations (Al-Bakri, 2017).

According to the practices of English in Saudi Arabia, the English language is exclusively drawn from two sources only, British and American Englishes (Alasmari & Khan, 2014). Most of the EMI instructors tend to imitate American or British accents to sound more fluent and eloquent because English education is imported from Western products and services, and Saudi educators are influenced primarily by the American education system (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016). The main reason behind the limitation of English variety in Saudi schools is that the Ministry of Education requires Saudi English instructors to use certain English textbooks published by American or British presses (See also, Al-Asmari and Khan, 2014). In short, the English language policy in EMI programs in Saudi Arabia is influenced by linguistics and non-linguistics factors (political, demographic, social, religious, cultural, psychological, bureaucratic, and so
on). Hence, implementing English in the education system has become one of the
development plans in Saudi Arabia (The Ministry of Economy and Planning, Ninth
Development, 2006). Globalized economy and internationalized political relations
enhanced the status of the English language. Consequently, the global spread of the
English language has affected language policy and language education policy in
particular, in many countries around the globe (Doiz et al., 2013; Fenton-Smith et al.,
2017).

**English Education Policy in Saudi Arabia**

Internationalization has an influential role to impact the educational policymakers
in the education system in Saudi Arabia to apply EMI. Al-Seghayer (2014) pointed out
that “English currently asserts several functions and enjoys an eminent status in various
sectors at all levels within Saudi Arabia” (p. 17). EMI is considered as a primary
approach for improving the economy and the quality of teaching and learning in Saudi
Arabia to achieve Vision 2030 (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Faruk, 2013). Similarly,
English in Saudi Arabia has been considered as a tool through which people could learn
up-to-date knowledge in sciences, engineering, medicine, and technology, and be able to
share this knowledge with local as well as global communities (The Ministry of
Education, The Development of Education, 2004). However, one of the drawbacks of
internationalized tendency is that the language education policy being applied in Saudi
Arabia is taken from foreign contexts such as the Common European Framework of
Reference for Languages (CEFRL) which differs from the local context in terms of
culture and language (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016). Research has shown that the CEFR-
criterion is not considered useful for students studying in EMI as a tool in their field (Suvviniiitty, 2012). From this perspective, it is proposed that this framework needs adjustment in terms of its descriptions of language competence and skills (Björkman, 2011; Pitzl, 2015 for a further critique of the CEFR). In order to implement EMI successfully, it is necessary to design a strategic and well-stated plan directed by local intellectual conditions and needs. This dissertation project aims to illustrate instructors’ and students’ attitudes in the College toward implementing EMI in the College programs to increase the awareness of educational policymakers on the impact of utilizing English in education. Furthermore, it increases the educational policymakers’ awareness on EMI practices and how some of the educational stakeholders interact with them in reality. It also calls attention to the urgency of involving language scholars in the formulation of national language policies.

**English Language Entry Requirements Policy**

Most of the universities around the globe have the English language entry requirement for all students except those who speak English as a first language. The common proof of English proficiency from students before their admission is to provide an IELTS or TOEFL test in the application. Wächter and Maiworm (2014) have found that 88% of the EMI programs in Europe require evidence of language proficiency. However, critics have also argued about the ways these tests are administered and evaluated (Björkman, 2013; Mauranen, 2012). One of the critiques is that these tests or assessments are designed and sometimes carried out by native English speakers (NESs) which might fail to demonstrate students’ true communicative skills because most NESs
“are monolingual and thereby bound their linguistic and cultural background” and “what works best for an international context can be a different matter from what is appropriate in an NES perspective” (Mauranen, 2012, p. 239). Therefore, entry requirements including English language proficiency could impact students’ application and prevent him/her from studying in the EMI programs even if s/he has solid background knowledge in the prospective specialization.

Fortunately, KSAU-HS has a different entry requirement policy. The admission criteria at the university are three major requirements determining the admission of the student’s application. The first one is the Grade Point Average (GPA) of the high school. This criterion takes 30% of the quotation of admission. The second requirement is the standardized test which also takes 30%. The 40% portion goes to the third requirement which is the comprehensive exam. The standardized test and the comprehensive exam are carried out by the Education & Training Evaluation Commission. Once a student passes all these three requirements, s/he moves to the interview. In the interview, students are asked about general background knowledge related to science courses in high school. Most of the time the interview is conducted in English. During the interview, the interviewer, who is an instructor at KSAU-HS, will determine whether the student’s English proficiency is adequate and meets the university English language entry requirement policy or not. This is the process of students’ admission at KSAU-HS.

One-year English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Policy

EMI implementation differs from one context to another depending on the preferred type of EMI policy and the required level of English proficiency. Alexander
(2008) broadly categorized EMI implementation into three distinct types according to the amount of English use (replacement type, cumulative type, and additional type). The first type entails that English should replace the local language(s), Arabic in my context, as the only medium of teaching, and the instructors and students tend to be considered to have a sufficient level of English proficiency. The replacement EMI type is implemented in the Gulf region, Finland, and other states (Al-Bakri, 2017; McMullen, 2014). The second type is cumulative which applies to situations where the use of English is gradually increased and progressed parallel to the improvement of the stakeholders’ English proficiency. The last one is the additional type which takes advantage of English in order to make students’ transition to classes in their domestic language easier. In other words, at the beginning of the university education phase, say one year or two years, all courses are delivered in English, and in the remaining years, the English role is gradually reduced and substituted with the local language(s). These categorizations could be labeled with different terms; nevertheless, all institutions that implement EMI policy in the instruction of content courses do not deviate from the content of this classification.

While delving into and exploring EMI implementations at EMI universities around the globe, KSAU-HS adopts the replacement type where students are exposed to English instruction only and researching, testing, and official meetings, namely all academic activities, are achieved entirely in English. Because of that, universities in Saudi Arabia, tend to have Preparatory Year Program (PYP) where students are exposed to intensive English language and basic sciences courses through EMI.
Many Saudi students and instructors who have experienced studying/teaching in EMI programs realize the gap between the curricula objectives and the student’s achievement (Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; McMullen, 2014; Shamim et al., 2016). Since there is an inconsistency between the school system and the tertiary education system specifically in the medium of instruction, where the former is Arabic and the latter in professional specializations is English, filling the gap is mandatory (Troudi & Jendli, 2011). Before students can pursue their studies at the professional colleges that are replacing the AMI to EMI, the Minister of Education created PYP (see Figure 1) which is one or two yearlong depending on students’ achievement (Macaro, 2018). This model is designed for students whose English proficiency is limited and does not meet the requisite level of English proficiency of the EMI program. Therefore, students are immersed in an intensive bridging course to get them up to speed for EMI requirements and achieve the required English-proficiency level.

The PYP in Saudi universities aims at preparing students for undergraduate study in one of the professional-related majors. It consists of a variety of tracks such as Health Sciences, Engineering, IT and Computer Sciences, Medicine, and Sciences, and each track is designed to develop a student’s knowledge in his/her prospective specialization alongside with intensive English courses. The purpose of PYP is to improve freshmen skills in English, sciences, and mathematics, as well as prepare them to be able to study in EMI programs (McMullen, 2014). Even though the PYP might rectify the deep inconsistencies between the language policy in public schools with those in EMI programs, students’ English proficiency levels still are not adequate for the EMI agenda.
Therefore, it is noteworthy that institutional policymakers should adopt an appropriate and effective model of EMI that resonates with students’ academic needs, instructors’ proficiency, and institutional academic goals.

**The Preparatory Year Model**
- E.g. Year-long intensive English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and study skills courses. All universities in Saudi Arabia apply this model.

**The Institutional Support Model**
- Modified content courses in early years.
- EAP or ESP courses.
- Reduced over time.

**The Pre-institutional Selection Model**
- Minimal language support provided in favour of language proficiency benchmarks.

Figure 1. Preparatory Year Models (Macaro, 2018).

After discussing language policy and EMI education in Saudi Arabia, next section will discuss English language pedagogies and its relation to EMI programs.

**English Language Teaching Pedagogies and EMI: Critical Issues and Perspectives**

Although English education and education in English are often discussed interchangeably or probably mixed between the two, nature or expected outcomes and risks associated with each need to be treated differently. For instance, CBI and EMI programs share some similarities in the education process, and their differences are significant to consider. In CBI, the L2 being used in the classroom is spoken locally unlike in the EMI situation where the medium of instruction is probably a foreign language. CBI is a commonly used concept in the U.S. and Canada, whereas EMI is
mostly implemented in non-English dominant countries such as China, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia. Another difference is instructor expertise. In the CBI, instructors are usually language specialists, while EMI instructors are always content specialists (Cenoz, 2015). As it is illustrated in the English Education and Education in English Continuum, the purpose of these two approaches is to teach students both language and content, (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. English Education and Education in English Continuum (Shimauchi, 2018, p. 78).

EMI is a different approach not only from CBI but also from CLIL approach although they share some similarities. We cannot understand the concept of EMI unless we unpack CBI and CLIL, and how educators put them into practice in their local contexts. CBI is designed to provide second-language learners instruction in content and language, whereas CLIL is an approach for learning content through an additional language (foreign or second), hence teaching is for both the content and the language (Thompson & McKinley, 2018). Several analytical studies show that CBI and CLIL programs/approaches share the same essential properties and are not pedagogically different from each other (Butler, 2005; Cenoz et al., 2014; Cenoz, 2015). For instance, CBI and CLIL utilize the L2 in teaching, and they tend to develop students’ linguistics skills in both L1 and L2 simultaneously. Moreover, curricula are designed in both
approaches to teach students, who are probably learning English as a foreign/additional language, the language skills and the subject content at once. Students are English language learners. CBI and CLIL, therefore, pedagogically are similar, and they aim to improve students’ linguistics and academic skills at once. CBI and CLIL approaches are beneficial for students studying in EMI programs (Airey, 2016; Butler, 2005; Cenoz, 2015). Students could improve their knowledge development in both language and subject content while they are studying subject-courses. I see it is necessary to find a channel for English language specialists and content instructors to work cooperatively and collaboratively to improve the students’ linguistic and scientific repertoire in the EMI program. This cooperation could take place in the shape of contextualizing ESP curricula, for instance.

Before I move to the attitude toward EMI, it is important to illustrate resistance to linguistic imperialism in teaching the English language. English language teaching has been manipulated by the ideology of monolingualism and monoculturalism bias, clearly exposed in the insistence on “standard” English as the norm, the refusal to give a pivotal role to the students’ L1 in learning English, the marginalization of “non-native” English instructors, and the disinterest in maintaining indigenous cultural traditions (Canagarajah, 2005). Research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and cognitive development confirms that “a thorough grounding in one’s L1 and culture enhances the ability to acquire other languages, literacies, and knowledge” (Canagarajah, 1999, P. 2). Saudi university students do not have the grounding knowledge of the professional specializations, for example, medicine, in their L1. EMI programs need to shift their
language policy to adopt students’ L1 particularly in the Saudi context where all students share the same L1 background, and more than half of the instructors are able to speak Arabic fluently. It is a key solution for the English hegemony what Canagarajah (2005) calls the Hybrid Discourses Pedagogy (HDP) which is a wise path that avoids “the traditional extremes of rejecting English outright for its linguistic imperialism or accepting it wholesale for its benefits” (p. 174). Hybrid Discourses Pedagogy goes beyond the English-only communicative teaching method as instructors design class activities that enforce and enhance students’ awareness of both the English and Arabic languages. It is possible—and necessary—to combine learning English and maintaining the indigenous culture productively through a healthy and balanced linguistic ecology.

Now, I am going to present the attitudes of educational stakeholders, students and instructors specifically, about EMI and its implementation, with a comparison of studies that discuss the preference of AMI, EMI, and bilingual approaches.

**Attitudes toward EMI**

Students’ and instructors’ attitudes toward EMI vary from region to region due to social, political, economic, and educational rationales. Research on EMI demonstrates different views and attitudes toward EMI implementation from the stakeholders of the education process, i.e., students, instructors, and educational policymakers. Students’ and instructors’ perspectives in a variety of contexts concerning the implementation of EMI are inconclusive. For instance, students encounter obstacles related to limited English language competence that hinders them to understand their lectures, to take notes, to effectively participate in class discussions, and to read texts in English (Kagwesage,
Although there are obstacles and challenges that could impact students’ academic achievement, they still are positive about EMI, and they are determined to work hard in order to cope with EMI. Evans and Morrison (2011a) showed similar results where participants of the study are in favor of EMI due to the perceived need of English as a key to access updated knowledge and its status as an international language in the global world. Additionally, in the Arab world, Golam Faruk (2014) articulated that “Saudis’ attitudes toward English are highly positive where most Saudi people believe that English is vital to the country’s future prosperity, and that it is significant needed in various domains” (p. 173; See also Al-Jarf, 2008). Most of the instructors and students in Saudi Arabia have a positive attitude towards EMI for pragmatic reasons such as resource availability and wide access to international scientific communications etc. etc. (Al-Bakri, 2013; Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Alshareef et al., 2018; Al Zumor, 2019). Another influential tendency toward EMI is that the English language is a basic requirement for employment especially in the private sector (Al-Bakri, 2017).

In contrast, Ellili-Cherif and Alkhateeb (2015) found that 295 Qatari university students from different specializations namely ‘Law, Business and Economics, Mass Communication, International Affairs’ are in favor of AMI because they believed that using Arabic could enhance learning although they agree that Arabic instruction “will affect their job prospects and their chances of completing post-graduate studies” (P. 212). The preference of AMI is also mentioned in Al-Kahtany et al.’s (2016) study in Saudi Arabia, and by most female students in Solloway’s (2017) study in the UAE. In Solloway’s (2017) study, two data collection procedures were used, a 21-item
questionnaire and face-to-face semi-structured interviews with female students in the foundation program at a government university. The participants of the study expressed their preference of AMI because they believe that English is a second language, and it acts as a barrier to learning. The same study also found that some students believed that their secondary school education had failed to afford them adequate preparation for EMI HE. In addition to such academic-related findings, students see that the “pervasive spread of the English language in the UAE poses a threat not only to Arabic, but also to the religious identity and cultural integrity of the indigenous Emirati population” (Solloway, 2017, P. ii). Moreover, Al-Mashikhi et al., (2014) investigated 60 undergraduate science students’ attitudes towards EMI at Sultan Qaboos University (SQU). The findings showed that more than half of the participants convey their preference for AMI. In the Gulf region, specifically, attitudes toward EMI are inconclusive, and it seems that the majority of students tend to prefer EMI over AMI due to “the perceptions that learning in English will open doors for employment, a belief which they uncritically embraced” (Al-Bakri, 2017, p. 73). Lastly, Alhamami’s (2015) study revealed the Arab scientists’ preference to teach their students at the Arab universities through AMI. In this study, Alhamami investigated their attitudes towards using EMI and AMI through a written survey, and the findings showed that using students’ mother tongue (Arabic in Alhamami’s study context) demystifies academic challenges posed by EMI in science education at university undergraduate level.

Between AMI and EMI, there are some students and educational stakeholders who prefer a bilingual approach, mixing between the Arabic and English languages in
teaching. For example, Al-najjar et al. (2015) in Palestine explored 350 university students’ attitudes towards EMI through the use of a questionnaire. The result revealed that most of the students expressed their preference for a bilingual approach in teaching where English and Arabic are used to facilitate learning and teaching. Similarly, several researchers consider the bilingual approach as an effective solution to protect the native language and national identity, on the one hand, and to improve student’s English proficiency and provide them with wide access to updated knowledge written in the English language, on the other hand (Ismail, 2011; Barnard, 2014; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Macombe, 2015; Raddawi & Meslem, 2015). In addition, most students in an Asian context encounter difficulty to comprehend and interact effectively in an English-only learning environment since their English language skills are incompetent to produce “original work at the appropriate academic standard” (Barnard, 2014, p. 13). Therefore, several studies indicated and illustrated the benefits of a dual-medium model that would better prepare students academically, bilingually, intellectually, and interculturally to meet the challenges of the multicultural world.

Ismail (2011) urged educational policymakers in the Gulf region to reevaluate the consequences of the sudden shift from AMI, in basic education, to EMI, in tertiary education, and to consider bilingual education at the tertiary level (See also Belhiah & Elhami, 2014). Macombe (2015) also believed that it is crucial to modify monolingual language policies and replace them with bilingual ones where only selective courses should be taught in English. In addition, some researchers see education through English functions as gatekeepers to English and potential benefits from gaining English
proficiency. This could lead to perpetuating inequalities among the social community members and “differentiating the society” (Hu, 2009, p. 53; See also Brock-Utne, 2012; Al-Kahtany et al., 2016). Furthermore, Troudi (2009) encouraged the use of Arabic to teach sciences at tertiary education and to continue using Arabic at schools since EMI has detrimental effects on the status of Arabic as a language of science and academia, and on students’ learning experiences. In brief, the attitudes toward implementing EMI only in tertiary education vary between supporters and opponents.

**Challenges Related to EMI**

One noticeable challenge that faces the instructors in the EMI programs is the changing role of content instructors. EMI instructors encounter difficulties in balancing two time-consuming tasks: teaching class content, and improving students’ English linguistic proficiency. Shohamy (2013) explains how students are interested in learning and improving their English language skills while they are studying in the EAP programs. However, their interest in learning and studying in English experiences a paradigm shift when they encounter specialized terms in content subjects because content instructors do not emphasize on language learning in class (Ali, 2013; Costa & Coleman, 2013). In fact, Doiz et al (2013) pointed out that “heed is usually paid to vocabulary, but grammar is hardly ever worked on in class, even by those instructors who have a background in linguistics” (p. 217). That is because content instructors do not consider themselves as language instructors, and assume students to have the required English language proficiency that enables them to cope with EMI requirements (Airey, 2012; Dearden, 2015). Dearden reported that a study conducted in 55 Asian countries reveals that EMI
instructors “firmly believed that teaching English was not their job” (Dearden, 2015, p. 28). Similarly, in King’s (2014) study in the Gulf region when he interrogated 45 content instructors’ perspectives on EMI in higher education toward their role as a language instructor. He found that content instructors did not acknowledge their role as English language instructors, and most of them believed that students are responsible for their language development. The roles of content and language specialist instructors in the EMI programs sometimes are not clearly stated and explained to the instructors, as the findings of this study disclosed. Indeed, EMI policymakers should clearly illustrate the role of content and language instructors, and how they could work cooperatively to improve students’ English language proficiency.

In addition to the challenge of changing roles, some content instructors’ linguistic and pedagogic competence becomes an issue to effectively deliver academic content. Several researchers reported that some content instructors have limited language proficiency to teach in English (in Asia context see, Hamid et al., 2013; Jiang et al., 2016; Zacharias, 2013) compared to others. The same in Europe, some content instructors in EMI programs struggle with language proficiency (Airey & Linder, 2006; Wilkinson, 2013). In Norway, Griffiths (2013) interviewed 20 instructors and conducted five classroom observations, and she found that many instructors were confronted with difficulties in teaching through English and that “limited vocabulary caused challenges for all disciplines” (p. 100). Furthermore, Barnard argues that those who are proficient in the English language might not be equipped with the pedagogic skill “to deliver conceptually complex matters in a second language” (2015, p. 9). A concern shared by
Griffiths (2013) who found that instructors in EMI programs lack the necessary pedagogic expertise for the multicultural classroom. Moreover, those instructors need more time and effort to deliver lessons through English which they felt was frustrating (Wilkinson, 2005). As a result of that, EMI classes lack interest and a sense of humor, so students felt bored (Barnard, 2015). To avoid issues of teaching in a foreign language, some content instructors tend to use their mother-tongue in the teaching since they find it more comfortable and as it helps them make the lessons more interesting (Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011). Again, institutional language policy may prevent such action, as what happened at KSAU-HS, so instructors found themselves in a critical situation due to a lack of adequate preparation to teach through EMI (Dearden 2015; Macaro, 2018; Williams, 2015). In Zacharias’ (2013) qualitative study in Indonesia, 12 instructors informed through semi-structured interviews that “the training that they received was only dealt with daily English and not the English for the specialized purpose related to their subject matter” (p. 105). I would argue that all of the above-mentioned concerns and issues are crucial, at the same time, problematic and need to be addressed by educational policymakers immediately because they will inevitably have detrimental consequences on the quality of education and on students’ academic learning experience, issues that have been rarely discussed in the literature of EMI.

**Challenges Related to Students’ Literacy Skills (Reading and Writing) in EMI Programs**

Reading and writing academic texts requires a high level of language proficiency. According to the academic reading, Sengupta (2002) defined it as “purposeful and critical
reading of a range of lengthy academic reading texts for completing the study of specific major subject areas” (p. 3). Research has investigated students’ reading skills, English language in EMI context, whether students are well-prepared to the demands of academic reading and writing or not. In Europe, Hellekjær (2009) interrogated 578 university students’ academic reading proficiency, and he found that unfamiliar vocabulary and slow reading were noticed as the main source of the reading difficulty. Another research in Hong Kong conducted by Evans and Green (2007) has shown in a large-scale study of around 5000 EMI students that understanding academic texts and technical lexica were recognized as the two major challenges that hinder students’ understanding. In addition to the academic reading difficulty, most of the English academic resources are written for native speakers of English and not well-designed for L2 learners which could make academic reading skills more challenging (see Cheng, 2010; Shen 2013).

In the Arab world, several studies pointed out the students’ difficulties in reading English academic texts (Alhmadi, 2014; Al-Mahrooqi, 2012; Al-Nasser, 2015). In Al-Nasser’s (2015) study, Saudi English instructors generally focus on how students pass the exam not how to improve their English linguistic competency, so students memorize without appropriate understanding ‘rote memorization’ instead of meaningful, associative, and active learning. Similarly, Al-Mahrooqi (2012) explored 23 female college students through the employment of semi-structured interviews on how their academic reading skills during their study in tertiary education. The result was that the difficulty of academic and non-academic English reading texts stems from various factors such as “absence of reading culture, low English proficiency, a paucity of vocabulary,
lack of ineffective use of reading strategies, and poor teaching” (Al-Mahrooqi, 2012, p. 26). In fact, academic English proficiency is challenging for most EMI students in Saudi Arabia. This fact is in line with research on L2 acquisition (Ortega, 2015). Although one of the rationales of implementing EMI in Saudi tertiary education is that most of the scientific resources are written in English, unfortunately, many students in EMI programs will not benefit from these resources mainly because they lack sufficient reading skills.

Saudi students do not suffer from reading academic text only, academic writing is also another challenge in the EMI programs. Mastering L2 writing skills consumes time and effort. Students studying in tertiary education institutions through EMI face difficulties in writing skills specifically, which makes them unable to cope with the institutions’ literacy expectations (Al Zumor, 2019). In Hong Kong, academic writing is considered the most difficult English language skills for undergraduate students (Hyland, 1997). A longitudinal study by Evans and Morrison (2011b) showed that EMI students experience difficulties in writing skills that hinder their education process and content comprehension. However, content instructors rarely provide their students with feedback on their writing (Barnard, 2015; Hyland, 2013) although instructors’ feedback on students’ writing is crucial and important for learning (Ng, 2015). In contrast, Hyland (2013) investigated 20 content instructors’ perceptions of feedback at an EMI university in Hong Kong, and he found that most instructors valued feedback, yet they often do not provide students with feedback on their writing. In the same study, Hyland mentioned that content instructors do not care about accuracy in students’ writing. Indeed, teaching
composition skills in EMI programs requires a high proficiency in the English language as well as in the subject area.

In the Arab world, several studies investigated students’ difficulties in academic writing in English (Al Zumor, 2019; Huwari & Al-Khasawneh, 2013; Javid & Umer, 2014). Javid and Umer (2014) interrogated 108 male and 86 female students in their third and fourth academic year of study about learning English, and they found that the use of proper lexical items, organization, and grammar is difficult. A similar finding is seen in Hammad’s (2014) study where he investigated undergraduate students’ writing issues through a questionnaire, essay writing test for 60 students, and interviews with three English writing instructors. He noticed that the writing issues come from “grammatical errors, lexical errors, word-for-word translation, cohesion errors, lack of academic style, and lack of content knowledge” (Hammad, 2014, p. 13). In the same study, students reported that instructors do not provide them with effective feedback that improves their literacy skills. In a mixed-method study, Alghammas and Alhuwaydi (2020) explored 21 English writing instructors about the most common obstacles of writing skills for undergraduate students in Saudi universities. The result showed that “lack of English writing practices, L1 interference, instructors’ focus on syntactic forms more than semantic forms, ineffective teaching methods, and unwillingness to teach writing” are the key issues in English writing (Alghammas & Alhuwaydi, 2020, p. 297-98). In another study, Al-Bakri and Troudi (2020) collected in-depth qualitative and quantitative data from 328 students studying in seven different majors, 14 classroom observations, and 14 students’ interviews. The findings demonstrate that the EMI policy
has detrimental effects on students’ writing abilities. Many content instructors teaching in EMI programs focus on content rather than language when assessing students’ writing since they consider themselves content instructors, not language specialists. This confirms findings in the literature that content instructors see the responsibilities to improve students’ language proficiency rely on the students themselves. In fact, mastering composition skills is challenging for both English native and non-native undergraduate students. Therefore, EMI program administrators need to design effective plans to train EMI instructors and improve students’ English literacy skills to fulfill the academic program requirements and achieve the curricula objectives.

EMI instructors need to be aware of the importance of writing skills for their students’ success at university since students’ grades are mainly determined by their performance in written tasks i.e., tests, and examinations. Hyland (2003) mentioned the importance of practical and theoretical knowledge in a composition class to bring an informed and critical eye (See also, Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Matsuda (2003) stated that both instructors and researchers should understand the historical context of the composition field since theoretical and pedagogical practices are always historically situated. Similarly, Kaplan’s suggestion led to a realization that “writing much more than orthographic symbolization of speech; it is, most importantly, a purposeful selection and organization of experience” (Matsuda, 2003 P. 720). Without the knowledge providing the theoretical values, we lose sight of vital tools for responsible instructional planning, effective classroom decision making, productive expert response, and meaningful assessment (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). That is to demonstrate how composition is
important in teaching and learning in the EMI programs. Teaching composition is integrated with other language skills such as reading and grammar. Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) discuss the four types of schemata: content, cultural, formal, and linguistics schemata, and how they are influential for both writers and readers. For example, the content schemata are very effective for L2 readers to comprehend the texts as incomplete content knowledge can sometimes lead to serious comprehension gaps. Personally, as an English language learner, I encounter difficulties to understand the proper meaning of a new vocabulary because context or content, cultural, formal, and linguistic schemata could change the meaning. Therefore, training EMI instructors on such important issues and topics in second language acquisition are crucial for effective teaching.

### Maintenance of First Language and Culture: The Role of EMI Instructors

Instructors play an important role in helping students become reflective learners to use their L1, values, and historical backgrounds to motivate them to discuss knowledge in specific manners. Several educators support the value of such reflective styles of learning in sharpening students’ skills to utilize their talents and skills, including linguistics skills (Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Spivak, 1993). The results of this pedagogy are critical to understanding the discourses inside and outside of the classroom and appropriating them to the students’ needs and interests (Canagarajah, 2005). In fact, maintaining students’ L1 will increase their chances of being biliterate and linguistically competent for multilingual and multicultural communities. Another important role of content instructor is what Gibbons (2003) asserts on the instructors’ mediation in assisting students to improve both English language skills as well as academic skills.
Students in non-English dominant contexts, such as the EMI institutions in Saudi Arabia, need to learn both the academic language and subject skills to succeed in their study and to communicate effectively in the international and national academic and science-related forums. In order to do that, instructors should teach students how to implement scaffolding as learning strategies while they study. Students in EMI programs need to employ the antecedent knowledge of the English language, so they can utilize it to facilitate content knowledge understanding.

The current situation of professional majors in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia demonstrates that the EMI policy promotes the hegemony of the English language. Another pivotal task of instructors is to establish a safe classroom environment for their students to bring their own culture and specifically their language (Canagarajah, 2005). It is important to understand the efficacy of students’ L1 in the learning process, and how implementing mother tongue-based education is beneficial while they are constructing their own linguistic and academic repertoire especially when all of the students are sharing the same language background such as in Saudi universities. Ortega (2015) stated that all L2 acquirers possess L1, so L1 is an important source for L2 learning. In addition to that, some scholars argue for teaching through students’ L1 which is more effective than teaching in a foreign language (see Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 2009; Shohamy, 2006). In fact, limiting the medium of instruction to the English language in professional majors does not only increase the spread of the English language but most importantly it gives English a superior status and prestige in relation to the national language.
The Influences of EMI on Institutions’ Learning Outcomes and National Language(s)

Since education has a vital role in any civilization, nations are required to establish an effective education system that fosters knowledge, including knowledge of indigenous language(s). It is, therefore, imperative that the education system promotes, improves, and protects local languages, values, and cultures (Brooks, 2016; Cheryle, 2010). Through my English Studies coursework specifically in the Seminar in Literature, I have recognized the significant relationship between language and culture, and how they are intertwined. Culture is something influenced by the language whereas language is formed by the culture of a society (Thiong’o, 1986; Ashcroft, 2009).

The debate about the impact of EMI has been going on for decades, particularly in ex-colonies in the three continents: Asia, Africa, and Europe. In the Arabic Gulf region, some educators and social activists recognized the implicit threats of the English language on indigenous identity particularly on the Arabic language, a language with rich literature (Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Hunt, 2012; Troudi & Al Hafidh, 2017). Habbash and Troudi (2015) indicated that several studies in the Arab world have shown that utilizing EMI could lead to linguistic-cultural dichotomy where English is perceived as “a symbol of technology and modern life, travel and employment, while Arabic is educationally marginalized and is seen to represent tradition, religion, and even worse, backwardness” (p. 62). In the Saudi context, the same study, Habbash and Troudi (2015) conducted a small-scale qualitative study to critically explore the effect of the spread of English on students’ and instructors’ views. The research methods employed were
document analysis and semi-structured interviews with eight male secondary school students and ten male English language instructors. The findings indicated that the dominance of EMI in scientific related specializations, e.g., professional majors, “relegates Arabic to a second-class status” (p. 71). Similarly, Al-Rubaie (2010) investigated 200 Kuwaiti preservice English language instructors on the use of EMI through a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, and he found that the “participants associated Arabic with religion, history, and local tradition, while English was linked to technology and science” (263). Whether in the Gulf region or in any part of the Arab world, the spread of EMI in the tertiary education system has increased rapidly, and its consequences are still unexplained clearly (Ahmed, 2010; Ismail, 2011). Continuing EMI will lead to weakening the Arabic language in the literature of the science-related subjects’ literature. Consequently, Saudi students’ interest will be in learning the English language since it is the language of science and development.

Globalization and its role in spreading EMI around the world is one of the primary causes of language extinction or linguistic genocide, which has contributed to greater disparity between national/indigenous language(s) and the English language. Because of that, Kumaravadivelu (2006) sees English as a ‘Trojan Horse’, a hidden threat to one’s cultural liberty. From this angle, EMI students who are exposed to and taught through English Only may not be able to communicate effectively with their local community and explain specialized medical terminologies clearly in a language they do not study through. For example, an Arabic doctor who graduated from an EMI program sometimes encounters difficulties in describing medical conditions to a patient who
knows only Arabic (Tayem et al., 2020). In Saudi universities, the language policy in the EMI programs uses English and Arabic interchangeably and unofficially as a medium of instruction as personal diligence from the instructors themselves. Indeed, implementing inequitable policy such as English Only impacts the knowledge production ‘teaching and publication’ and pushes it to be in English which is a loss of knowledge in the local language(s).

Another critical issue of implementing EMI is, as De Wit (2011) notes, students’ low-English academic proficiency that becomes an obstacle to learn and comprehend the content effectively, potentially leading to a decline in the overall quality of education (Kirkpatrick, 2011). In Naples, for example, more than 50% of students were found not to have sufficient levels of proficiency to contend with EMI (Guarda & Helm, 2016). Another study in Iraq finds that almost 75% of the EMI students are at beginner or elementary levels of English (Borg, 2015). In the Gulf region, several researchers have indicated that more than 80% of the students do not have adequate English language proficiency to study at tertiary level (Al-Issa, 2011; Al-Mashikhi et al., 2014; Baporikar & Shah, 2012). It is noteworthy to understand that language has basic skills as well as academic skills, and each one of them requires special preparations. Hellekjær (2009) argues that the basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) development does not replace the need to develop cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). As these studies illustrate, academic language skills require more time and effort than everyday language. Students with adequate general English skills could encounter linguistic difficulties during their academic study (Evans & Morrison, 2011).
In fact, there are several studies that have investigated students’ English proficiency studying in the EMI programs, from instructors’ and students’ perspectives (Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Cheng, 2010; Macaro, 2018). These studies show how their inadequate linguistic skills can be a barrier to learning content, and in the long run, undermine their educational attainment (also in Chan, 2014; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2017; McMullen, 2014). For instance, research has shown that oral interactions between instructors and students in EMI classrooms are limited and, in some cases, repetitive (Brock-Utne, 2012; Kagwesage, 2012). In addition to the poor communication skills in the EMI setting, it has been reported that students find it difficult to follow the content instructors and take notes during lectures, so students tend to copy notes from the board without understanding (Airey & Linder 2006; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014). Indeed, EMI becomes a gatekeeper to higher education in the Gulf at least because students have to meet specific language proficiency requirements in order to be admitted to some colleges (Al-Bakri, 2013; Troudi & Jendli, 2011).

There is no doubt that linguistic hegemony of English is a fundamental aspect of modern global culture, as Standard English is the dominant language of science and scholarship. The English language is utilized as a lingua franca in several communities in non-English dominant countries around the globe (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Pennycook, 1998). Saudi universities, like other expanding-circle countries, urge their faculty members to publish in prestigious English language journals and offer them financial rewards for doing so. At the same time, publishing in local journals yields few benefits (Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Altbach, 2019; Jiang et al., 2016). Language
policymakers in Saudi Arabia should consider the rhetorical question raised by Thiongo (1998): “By our continuing to write in foreign languages, paying homage to them, are we not on the cultural level continuing that neocolonial slavish and cringing spirit?” (p. 101). That means educational policy will push knowledge production ‘teaching and publication’ to be in English which is a loss of knowledge in the local language(s). While English has long been the dominant language in scientific journals, pressure to publish in English now is reaching social sciences and humanities scholars (Curry & Lillis, 2018). Therefore, Educational institutions in Saudi Arabia will not elevate the status and enrich the literature of the Arabic language if they pursue separating it from professional majors and scientific fields.

The effect of EMI on indigenous language(s) should be taken seriously by educational policymakers, particularly knowledge production. English has a pivotal role in globalizing systems and practices, being deemed by many institutions around the globe to be “the global language of science” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 1). That is leading to what might be referred to as an English bias in academic literacy and knowledge production. Lillis and Curry (2018) revealed that after two decades of closely analyzing the effects of English as a way to reach a broader academic context than their local context, they found that little attention was being paid to what is lost in this focus of English. Therefore, the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia needs to bring some equity to knowledge production because the dominance of the English-only policy makes knowledge production inequitable. If English is still viewed, in the opinion of decision-makers, as the only valid language for teaching science-related courses, then the fate of
the Arabic language will decline till it disappears. Certainly, educational institutions in Saudi Arabia should manage to relocate the center of the English language by decentering it.

After discussing the impact of EMI on the national language, the Arabic language in this context, it is beneficial to briefly present the historical part of the Arabic language when it was the language of science to assert its competence and efficacy as a medium of instruction for science-related subjects.

**The Arabic Language as a Language of Science**

Historically, at the height of the Golden Age of Muslim Civilization, the Arabic language was the lingua franca that served as the language of science, art, and governance etc. from Spain (known as Andalusia) to China (Desk, 2019). The Arabs translated the sciences of Greece, India, and Persia, into the Arabic language, and they interacted with them, added and innovated to them, and then spread knowledge throughout the world. The first key for that was using their mother tongue i.e., the Arabic language, in teaching, learning, and communication. The second one is establishing libraries, the houses of knowledge, where scholars discuss, debate, argue, and publish their contributions. One of the well-known libraries in the ear of Abbasid ‘the Golden Age of the Islamic Civilization’ is The House of Wisdom (Bayt Al-Hikmah). It accommodated the intellectual richness, introduced the heritage of humanities from all over the world, and helped scholars and researchers e.g. (Ibn Al-Nafis, Ibn Haytham, Ibn Sina, etc.) to creatively flourish (Algeriani & Mohadi, 2017). Muslim libraries have played a major role in “translating and transmitting works of Greek, Persian, Indian and
Assyrian physicians, scientists, and philosophers that later became the basic textbooks in European schools of Bologna, Naples, and Paris” (Algeriani & Mohadi, 2017, P. 185). Knowing that asserts the fact that the Arabic language is capable of being a medium of instruction for science-related subjects.

In the modern era, the first medical college was established in Abu Zaabal in the days of Muhammad Ali al-Kabir in 1827 CE in Egypt (Al-Sibai & Othman, 1994). Teaching medicine was through the Arabic language and continued for about 60 years. During this period, 53 books on medicine were written in the Arabic language until British colonization of Egypt began in 1882 CE, and within five years, medicine education shifted from Arabic to English (Al-Sibai & Othman, 1994). In addition to the Egyptian experience, in 1866 CE, the Syrian Evangelical College was established in Beirut, then it was later called the American University of Beirut, and after that, in 1883 the Jesuit School of Medicine, medicine was taught in Arabic until the colonists conquered Lebanon and shifted the medium of instruction in these two medical education colleges from Arabic to English and French.

Perhaps we could realize the value of the Arabicization of medicine, if we knew that many European countries, such as Sweden, Norway, Finland, Germany, and Austria study medicine in their own languages and at a high level of performance. On the other hand, the Arab countries have a population of about a quarter of a billion people and have more than 123 medical schools, and all of them teach medicine in foreign languages, which are English, French, and Italian, with the exception of seven colleges in Syria using Arabic. Interestingly, the common factor which determines the language of
instruction in the medical schools in most of the Arab countries is colonization. For example, Morocco, Egypt, and Somalia were colonized by France, Britain, and Italy respectively, and the medium of instruction in the medical schools in these three Arab countries are French in Morocco, English in Egypt, and Italian in Somalia (Al-Sibai & Othman, 1994).

The experience of Arabicizing medicine in Syria is undoubtedly a pioneering experiment (Alshareef et al., 2018). Teaching medicine through the Arabic language began in Syria after the establishment of the University of Damascus in 1919. The Arabicization of medicine movement began with the establishment of the institute, which later turned into the College of Medicine. The professors who established and taught at the institute had the merit of translating scientific terminology and developing Arabic medical translations and literature. Moreover, in 1924, they began issuing the Arab Medical Journal. Just as Arabic was the language of instruction in all the colleges and branches of the University of Damascus, so it was in the other universities that were established later: Aleppo, Al-Baath and Tishreen. Syrian universities have come a long way in this, graduating thousands of doctors who have proven their success inside and outside the country (Alshareef et al., 2018). However, this experiment is now facing a major challenge that threatens its continuation. The translation of medical references requires tremendous efforts from professors and educational bodies to be able to provide Arabic books and references in a language that is smooth and easy to understand, and content equivalent to the competence of foreign books and references.
Another scientific study was conducted at the University of Gezira, in Sudan by Al-Abdulrahman (2004), with the aim of evaluating the impact of teaching medicine in the Arabic language on the academic achievement of the graduate students (from 1993 to 2003). Based on the final GPA of these students, sixteen graduating classes were selected out of a total of 20 classes, eight of them from batch 5 to batch 12 studied in English, and the other eight from batch 13 to batch 20 studied in Arabic. The percentages of students were calculated and compared with each other. The comparison showed that students studying in Arabic are generally better than their peers studying in English, and the difference is statistically significant 0.05>p (Al-Abdulrahman, 2004).

In fact, the Arabicization of medicine project must be a collective and cooperative work between all Saudi universities, health organizations, and language centers in the country. The project should be a national project in which a political decision must be taken, and a strategic plan is required to ensure the availability of modern medical resources in both languages, Arabic and English. This requires translation centers ‘simultaneous translation, specifically’, international agreements with medical publication centers, and global databases to make the Arabic language on the list of immediate release or publishing (Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Alshareef et al., 2018; Khallof, et al., 2019). Thus, the Arabic language is capable of being a language of science as same as the English language if not better. Providing professional majored students with updated resources in their L1 is not an impossible mission as we knew already that the Arabic language was the language of science one day in the past.
Concluding Remarks

This chapter covered theoretical and empirical studies in the EMI and discussed relevant literature. It began with a general discussion related to EMI around the globe and how it is implemented in EFL contexts with some considerations for the Saudi context specifically. Also, it discussed the English language policy in the Saudi education system such as the English language entry requirements policy, one-year English for Academic purposes policy, and English language teaching approaches. It explained how some adopted language policies related to EMI implementation in tertiary education may impact students’ academic comprehension, and prevent some students from getting enrolled in EMI programs due to low English language proficiency. After that, I pointed out students’, instructors’, and researchers’ attitudes toward EMI from a variety of contexts where English is a non-dominant language. The chapter also detailed challenges related to EMI implementation that are related to students’ literacy skills, teaching and learning in EMI, and educational policy. Then, it revealed the influences and impacts of EMI over educational outcomes and student L1 or the national language. At the end of this chapter, I presented some scholarly voices advocating the Arabic language as a medium of instruction for medicine and science-related courses.

The next chapter addressed the methodological design, the research questions pursued, the methods chosen to answer the questions, and the underlying rationales behind all these methodological choices as well as the ethical concerns and limitations.
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Preliminaries

This chapter illustrates the methodology selected in this study to explore the instructors’ attitudes and students’ academic needs in the College in Al-Ahsa city toward English medium instruction (EMI) implementation in the college programs. This chapter also presents the rationale behind selecting the methodology of the study and its research contributions background to the research questions. Adopting a phenomenological research approach, this chapter also discusses the data sources of this study, which are derived from two main instruments: semistructured interviews and classroom observations. In addition, a close analysis of the university’s policy documents and official website that is related to EMI implementation is conducted for clarification purposes. Moreover, this chapter demonstrates how an instrumental case study is beneficial to achieve the target of this project. This type intends to provide an understanding of what students’ and instructors’ perspectives about EMI practices in the College in Al-Ahsa. As earlier chapters indicated, this dissertation project aims to shed light on EMI instructional strategies through/by investigating undergraduate students’ and instructors’ perspectives in the College. In so doing, two major research questions about EMI implementation, quality of education through EMI, and perceived risks and benefits from implementing EMI in the College drive the project: “How do science, health, and IT instructors in the College in Al-Ahsa implement EMI? and what do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach in the College?” and “How do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their
educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements?” The chapter also describes the participants, procedure and instruments, data analysis, and ethical issues. The next section summarizes the background and context of the study in relation to the methodological choices undergirding the research design.

**Contextual Background**

This research project investigated the EMI implementation process in the College in Al-Ahsa through an instrumental case study method. Before I talked about the adopted method, I preferred to describe the setting of this dissertation project. Al-Ahsa is a city located in the East Province in Saudi Arabia that has an Arabic-speaking population. The English language is considered as a lingua franca where people in Al-Ahsa can communicate in English in health establishments and international companies only. However, all professional majors at Saudi universities are delivered through EMI exclusively, whereas all students are Saudi and their L1 is Arabic. Programs in the College in Al-Ahsa are divided into two phases. The first one takes two years, and it is known as the pre-professional studies program. In this stage, students study basic sciences courses and an intensive English language program. The second phase is the professional studies program where students study the specialized courses for another two years. Indeed, KSAU-HS is a unique university in Saudi Arabia. This is a synopsis about the city where the research is conducted, and in the Setting and Participants Sections later in this chapter, I gave more elaborative information about the context of this study.
Knowledge production should be “context-driven, problem-focused, and interdisciplinary” for accurate assessment and quality assurance (Gibbons et al., 1994, p. 6). Seeking this kind of knowledge requires me, on a personal level, as a researcher to be involved in the problems and challenges those students and instructors encounter in the EMI programs in the College. On a social or national level, it requires multidisciplinary teams that work together to tackle issues related to EMI implementation in Saudi Arabia. That is, actors, authorities, stakeholders in the Ministry of Education should conduct workshops and reflect on the current EMI practices to examine its pros and cons so that they can move forward on how to implement EMI in Saudi universities effectively. In fact, internationalization affects the policymakers’ decisions in implementing the English language in schools and universities in Saudi Arabia (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016). As much research in this area demonstrates, the tendency toward Englishization is due to several reasons such as recruitment, accreditation, and establishing partnerships with overseas universities (e.g., Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Thompson & McKinley, 2018). So, one of the objectives should be how to construct and shape a language education framework that resonates with the local needs like Saudi culture and social communications and understands the students’ and instructors’ capabilities, in order to enable Saudi citizens to think locally and act globally. In this way, the Saudi English language policymakers will understand the situation appropriately and avoid a blind adoption of foreign frameworks. In brief, EMI in Saudi universities needs a “development of national policies that put the interest of Saudi Arabia first and negotiate the link with the international framework second” (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016, p. 219).
Therefore, it is important to examine EMI implementation in Saudi universities through qualitative studies and close analysis to create an overarching framework that enables Saudi policymakers to develop EMI performance successfully in Saudi Arabia’s tertiary education.

**Instrumental Case Study as My Methodology**

This qualitative study is an instrumental case study that aims to provide an understanding of what students’ and instructors’ perspectives from EMI practices at KSAU-HS in CAMS in Al-Ahsa. As Richards (2005) states, qualitative research “is sensitive to, and seeks to understand participants’ perspectives on their world… it is context-sensitive, and does not study isolated aspects independently of the situation in which they occur… it depends on a process of interpretation that involves immersion in the data and draws on different perspectives” (p. 149). This is what Macaro (2018) calls when he said that those qualitative investigations, in which the students’ and instructors’ voices are heard, are a welcome development. Therefore, to understand the students’ and instructors’ perspectives’ towards EMI implementation in the College, I see that an instrumental case study method could satisfy my needs to understand the context of the study and to achieve overarching themes.

Case studies may be conducted in three different ways; critical, interpretivist, and positivist approaches, and each one of them depends on the researcher’s epistemological standpoint (Crowe et al., 2011). The interpretivist approach, which is the epistemological approach of this dissertation project, focuses on understanding the event or phenomenon from its context. The interpretation process will be through interrogating individuals from
that social context. That is, the interpretivist approach involves comprehending meanings and processes as perceived from different perspectives, trying to understand individual and shared social meanings (Crowe et al., 2011). Therefore, I see the interpretivist approach as helpful to be able to understand EMI practices in the College through students’ and instructors’ voices who are directly involved in the learning process.

It should be pointed out that there are three types of case studies: Intrinsic case studies, multiple or collective case studies (also called cross-case analyses), and instrumental case studies (Stake, 1994). Intrinsic case studies that are derived from an intrinsic interest of the research to investigate a single case. The other one is collective case studies which explore several instrumental case studies in order to understand a common condition or pattern. The last type of case study design is an instrumental case study which “investigate a single case in order to develop insights into a general issue, concept, or phenomenon that may be representative of other similar cases” (Beaudry & Miller, 2016, p. 77). The instrumental case study adopted in this study allows for the generalization of findings to a wider and bigger population (Zainal, 2007). This dissertation is primarily conceptualized as an instrumental case study since it has investigated only one university i.e., KSAU-HS in Saudi Arabia. In addition to the types of instrumental studies, Yin (2013) classifies case studies as explanatory, exploratory, or descriptive. An explanatory case study would ideally be used when seeking to explore causal links that are too complex for a survey or experimental strategies. Exploratory case studies investigate situations in which the case (intervention for example) being evaluated has no clear or single set of outcomes. The last type is descriptive which is the best fit for
this dissertation project because it helped the researcher to investigate and understand the state of the phenomenon from its context and through the narrations of those who contemplate and experience it. As we see in Yin’s definition, a descriptive case aims to describe the phenomenon within the context it occurred (Lucas et al., 2018). Therefore, as a qualitative researcher using an instrumental case study conducted through an interpretivist approach, I interrogated stakeholders’ perspectives toward EMI and understand the rationale behind EMI implementation in the College.

Case study and Ethnography are two famous detailed qualitative studies used in the field of education and social studies. Although there are certain similarities between these two methods like their holistic nature, and the extended time period, some readers got confused between the two as De Vaus stated that “Most research methods texts confused case studies with other types of social research” (in Thomas, 2011, p. 511) (Cohen, 2003). So, it is noteworthy to mention here that case study and ethnography qualitative designs share some similarities and differences, yet they are not identical for the following features. First, case studies provide an in-depth view of a specific event or phenomenon while ethnographies provide a description of a group or culture. Second, data collection is more structured in case studies than in ethnographies, and the researcher relies more heavily on structured interviews with key actors. Finally, a case study researcher is engaged in the field for a less prolonged and continuous period of time. (Beaudry & Miller, 2016). Therefore, I design my project to be an instrumental case study that has a limited focus on contemporary real-life EMI programs ‘in the College’ to investigate instructors’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI implementation.
Rationale

As the previous section emphasizes, the purpose of a case study is to understand human interaction within a social unit, a single instance bounded by the caseworker in the process of designing the research (Stake, 1995). The reason for utilizing a qualitative design ‘instrumental case study’ is to identify and understand EMI practices in the College in Al-Ahsa to develop insights into general issues, concepts, or phenomena related to EMI implementations. This investigation aims to provide a deeper analysis into a) the types of values and beliefs that instructors in EMI programs in the College maintain, b) students’ academic needs and educational benefits and risks the students encounter.

Today, case studies are shown in a large proportion of the research presented in books and articles in different disciplines such as education (Merriam, 1988), medicine (Taylor & Berridge, 2006), social sciences (Grassel & Schirmer, 2006), etc. (Starman, 2013) Most of the empirical knowledge in our world has been produced by case study research (Flyvbjerg, 2011). A case study describes and interprets a “phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 25) see also (Beaudry & Miller, 2016). According to Mills et al., (2010), an instrumental case study is the study of a case to provide insight into a particular issue, redraw generalizations, or build theory. By implementing a case study, I gain insights into the development of EMI practices in an under-represented English as lingua franca (ELF) context in response to the research questions. Its focus is on a bounded context which means it is ‘fenced in’ so that it does not extend beyond the particular situation or program under study. In addition to that, the
apparent characteristic of case study research is delimiting the object of the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). My choice of instrumental case study research as the methodology for this dissertation project stems from the university’s (KSAU-HS) uniqueness represented in implementing EMI in all of its academic programs, and utilizing English as a lingua franca in official communications e.g., meetings and emails. All of the students are Saudi and their L1 is the Arabic language.

It has been noted that there is some confusion between a case study as a method and a case study as a methodology (Lucas, et al., 2018). As a method, it refers to the examination of particular cases, including individuals and events. Whereas case study as a methodology means to explore and critiques a phenomenon in a context using multiple data sources and collection methods (Baxter & Jack, 2008). So, depending on the philosophical or disciplinary ground that the researcher marches from, the qualitative case studies could be a method and/or a methodology. Personally, I adopted a case study as a methodology because my aim is to explore EMI in the College not to examine certain individuals or events. In addition, I base this approach on the same constructivist paradigm (Several philosophical approaches refer to case study literature such as George & Bennett, 2005; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995, 2005; Yin, 2009, 2013). Constructivism indicates that “learning is an active process constructed from knowledge of experiences and is subjective to the representations of one’s personal reality” (Lucas, et al., 2018, p. 216). Similarly, in this research, a collaboration between the researcher and participants played an important role in understanding the reality of EMI implementation in the
College in Al-Ahsa city which is facilitated by constructivist paradigm adoption. This compelling reason persuades me to design my research to be case studies.

Now that I provided a snapshot of the overarching structure guiding this dissertation project, I will explain in the following section the exact study I did for this project.

The Research Questions

EMI is an inevitable approach that affects not only Saudi universities but also several Outer and Expanding Circle countries\(^6\) (in the Kachruvian paradigm) due to several factors such as internationalization of tertiary education, scholarship, and resource availability. This dissertation project aims to shed light on EMI instructional strategies through/by investigating undergraduate students’ and instructors’ perspectives in the College in Al-Ahsa. Yin (2013) strongly advocates for the power of a case study as a methodology. In particular, Yin acknowledges the strength of a case study to not only answer the ‘what’ research question but also to investigate ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions. From this point, the dissertation project aims to answer ‘how’ and ‘what’ questions. In so doing, the following research questions will drive this project:

- How do science and health specialties instructors at KSAU-HS in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) in Al-Ahsa implement EMI? and what do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach in CAMS at KSAU-HS?

---

\(^6\) Outer Circle Countries are those that use English as a lingua franca between ethnic and language groups such as in India and Nigeria. Expanding Circle Countries encompasses countries where English is utilized as a medium of international communication and it is considered as a foreign language, such as in Saudi Arabia and China (Pakir, 2019).
How do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements and improving their English language proficiency?

Indeed, whether we understand EMI implementation in several tertiary education systems as the legacy of colonial education, or we see it as a modernization movement, language policymakers at KSAU-HS as well as the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia are accountable to contextualize EMI policy to meet local needs.

As it is shown above that the research questions do not immediately lend to a strictly scientific, positivist inquiry, that is related to quantitative data production and resulting statistical analysis. In fact, words like views, experiences, and believe in the research questions reveal that it is instructors’ and students’ perspectives based on their own lived experiences that will be investigated. Since this dissertation project is an exploratory, meaning-centered approach to identifying and understanding instructors’ and students’ perspectives, that is, “a context-embedded, qualitative, and interpretive inquiry” (Becker, 1970; cited in Maxwell, 2010, p. 476). The ontological stance of this study is thus that reality “is multiple and interpreted” by the researcher (O’Gorman & MacIntosh, 2015, p. 70) and is neither ‘fixed’ nor external, but rather is created by and shifts with the changing perceptions and beliefs of the viewer (Duncan, 2004). Furthermore, the epistemological assumption is that the researcher “interacts with that being researched” (O’Gorman & MacIntosh, 2015, p. 70), that is, that ‘reality’ is co-constructed.
Methods

This qualitative study is an instrumental case study that aims to provide an understanding of what students’ and instructors’ attitudes toward EMI practices in the College in the Al-Ahsa campus. Adopting such an approach allows researchers to collect data so as to begin to make inroads into gaps in extant knowledge (Babbie, 2013) in a tentative, inquiring, descriptive, and ethnographic-like fashion. Another reason for utilizing a qualitative design ‘instrumental case study’ is to identify and understand EMI practices in the College in Al-Ahsa to develop insights into general issues, concepts, or phenomena related to EMI implementations. This investigation seeks to deliver a deeper analysis into the types of principles and attitudes that instructors in EMI programs in the College preserve, as well as to explore students’ academic needs and educational benefits and risks the students encounter. Before discussing the data collection procedures employed within this exploratory framework, the next section explains the setting and participants of the study.

Population Sampling

In qualitative research, selecting a setting and actors for the study is arguably the most important decision that qualitative researchers make, and it requires a strategic and thoughtful approach. Researchers need to study people, i.e., actors, in ways that are as natural as possible (Beaudry & Miller, 2016). To approach that, researchers are required to collect data from natural settings, the environment where people/actors live and work. That will allow qualitative researchers to be in a position to grasp the nuances of a particular context and to develop a holistic understanding of a phenomenon, a culture, or
an event. Moreover, qualitative researchers look for information-rich samples that are assumed to answer the research question(s), and usually depend on specific and limited samples that are either “purposeful or theoretical” (Beaudry & Miller, 2016, p. 41). In this dissertation project, I selected a purposeful sampling that fitted my interest to answer the questions of this study. All the actors/participants of the study were from the CAMS in Al-Ahsa campus. Although I am a faculty member at this university, I have not had an opportunity to teach or work with any participants of this study. In reference to student-based studies, Ferguson et al. (2004) mention the preference of getting involved in the participants who are not the researcher’s own students. Athanases and Heath (1995), also, emphasize on the importance of choosing a variety of participants from different backgrounds to attain different perspectives. This is achieved in the present study by also observing and interviewing a number of students at the institution who did not have, and who had never had, myself as their instructor. As with respondents to the interviews, all interviewees were invited to sign a consent form.

In qualitative studies, there is no set minimum number of participants are required for data saturation (Starks & Brown Trinidad, 2007). Guest et al. (2006) examined the data of 60 in-depth interviews, and they found out that a total of 109 content-driven codes emerged from the first 30, of which 80 such codes were identified within the first six transcripts, with an additional 20 codes existing from the following six transcripts. Therefore, 100 codes (92% of the total) emerged from the first 12 transcripts. This illustration leads Guest et al (2006) to conclude that “if the goal is to describe a shared perception, belief, or behavior among a relatively homogenous group, then a sample of
twelve will likely be sufficient” (p. 76). It should be illustrated that, as mentioned above, the participants in this study were relatively homogenous in that, they are studying/teaching in Al-Ahsa city, male students/instructors, their L1 is the Arabic language but two of them, and they are studying/teaching in EMI programs in the College in Al-Ahsa city. Furthermore, Guest et al (2006) note that their four meta-themes “high-level, overarching themes […] sufficient to enable development of meaningful themes and useful interpretations emerged after a mere 6 interviews” (p. 78). Therefore, I see that between 6 and 12 interviews are sufficient for collecting data in a qualitative study (see also Starks & Brown Trinidad, 2007).

**Setting and Participants**

This study took place at the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) at King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences (KSAU-HS). The university is a major government-sponsored university in Riyadh, Jeddah, and Al-Ahsa cities, in Saudi Arabia. It is the first university in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and in the Middle East region specialized in health sciences. KSAU-HS is accredited by the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia for its various programs for undergraduate and graduate degrees (King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences, [KSAU-HS], 2020). It has fourteen colleges on three university campuses in Riyadh, Jeddah, and Al-Ahsa. The medium of instruction in the university programs is predominately English catering primarily to Saudi citizens. I select this site because KSAU-HS is unique, and it differs from all other universities in Saudi Arabia with two distinctions: its specialization in health sciences, and its accommodation of the English language as a language not only
for teaching but also for official communications. My research sheds light on how instructors in the College implement EMI, and what the students’ and the instructors’ perspectives toward that. Therefore, this study manifests instructors’ attitudes and students’ needs in the EMI learning environment which help educational policymakers to be attentive to EMI effects and consequences on education, particularly EMI programs.

Before interrogating the views and experiences of the participants, it is preferable to provide a summary of the most important features of the individual participants’ perspective backgrounds to contextualize their remarks and comments. The participants of this study are instructors and students who are involved directly in the EMI environment in the College. They are six instructors and four students, a total of ten participants, and all of them are Saudi except two instructors: one from British who is an English specialist, and the other is from Pakistan who is a Biologist. A primary aim of selecting instructors and students only is to give a voice to the key stakeholders (i.e., instructors and students) in the education process in the College. As Alshareef et al., (2018) noted that “further studies need to be conducted whereby students, faculty, and frontline healthcare workers are asked about their views on the choices of language for teaching medicine at their respective institutions” (p. 315). Therefore, this study aims to manifest instructors’ attitudes and students’ needs toward EMI implementation, specifically in the College.

The student participants of this study are of Saudi origin, and their L1 is the Arabic language since one of the KSAU-HS admission criteria is to be a Saudi national. Their ages vary from 19 to 22 (Thamir 19 years old, Lulu 20 years old, Suliman 21 years
old, and Amman 22 years old). All of them have been studying English as a foreign language from fourth grade in elementary school for 45 minutes a day, five days a week. Only one of them has studied English abroad, specifically in Canada. Their English proficiency is higher than the average of the students in the College based on their grades in the English courses and their self-assessment. Their parents are Saudi, and their home language is Arabic. None of them were ever students of mine during my tenure at the case institution. For the participant selection, initially, I discussed my project with two faculty members in the College. And based on their recommendation, I tend to go with a random sampling technique (Lance & Hattori, 2016), choosing only four students to represent their classmates in each academic year. According to the instructors, their major was the criterion for the selection.

Six instructors agreed to participate in this study. Two of the instructors are assistant professors (Zafa and Muhin), and the others are lecturers (Khli, Nassir, Salim, and Azmi) in the College. The first instructor is Khli from Britain, and he was born into an Arabic-speaking family. His K-16 education occurred in the UK, and he considers himself a native speaker of English. Khli has been teaching English in the College in Al-Ahsa for more than four years. Second, Zafa is a Pakistani biologist teaches biology to students since 2012. His English is a second language, and he has an Indian accent. His formal training took place in Pakistan. Internationally, he has taught in Pakistan, China, and Saudi Arabia, and all of these contexts are through EMI institutions. Finally, Muhin, Azmi, and Salim are Saudi instructors of pharmacology, biology, emergency medical services, respectively, and their L1 is the Arabic language. Their English is a foreign
language, and they teach content subjects in the College through EMI, mainly. Finally, Nassir is an English specialist who teaches English in the College. His L1 is Arabic, he has diverse experiences in teaching English to Saudi students. He has been teaching English in the College since 2019. The overview of interview participants is presented in table 1 below:

Table 1: Data of interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>English Knowledge</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Duration of Teaching/Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khli</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>English instructor</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafa</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Content instructor</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhin</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Content instructor</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azmi</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Content instructor</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassir</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>English instructor</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salim</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Content instructor</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamir</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Pre-professional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suliman</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Pre-professional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulu</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Respiratory Therapy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammar</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 I labeled students’ English proficiency by N/A because I do not have a specific standard to assess their proficiency.
Data Collection

The key methods of data collection in this study included semi-structured interviews and overt classroom and online observations. The interviews were conducted with two English specialists (English-native and Arabic-native speakers), four content instructors who utilize the English Only method (one from each discipline: science, health sciences, and IT), and four students (one from each academic year) who study in the College in Al-Ahsa campus. The reason behind selecting these three majors was that EMI is implemented from the first two years in College called ‘pre-professional studies’ by the instructors of these majors. The sampling of data was a purposeful typical sampling composed of six experienced instructors, and a student from each academic year, a total of nine participants. This research allowed me to gain insights into the development of EMI practices in an under-represented EFL context in response to these questions: How do science and health specialties instructors in the College in Al-Ahsa implement EMI? What do lead instructors believe to be ideal EMI approach? and how do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements? The semi-structured interview questions are designed for two different emphases (instructors and students). The average time of the interviews was 45 minutes. In addition to interview transcripts and observation notes, I conducted a document analysis of the university’s policy documents and official website that is related to EMI policy; however, until the time of this study, I have not found rich information or official document explaining the rationale behind offering EMI in the university colleges.
Data Sources

The primary data sources are ten transcribed interviews (six with instructors and four with students and three classroom and online observations. Two of the observations were for Arabic-native speaking instructors: One of them teaches subject courses, and the other one teaches English courses. The third observation was for non-Arabic speakers to observe how the students’ L1 plays role in the medium of instruction.

Observations

In this study, I supported my data collection with three classroom observations to be more familiar with EMI implementation in content subject classrooms in the College. Two of them were in class, and the other one was online. Although observation is not a central form of data collection method as Ritchie et al. (2014) indicate, it is often utilized side-by-side with other research instruments such as interviews. The distinction of conducting an observation in research is to gain direct information about what people do rather than be dependent on what they say they do (Dörnyei, 2007). Observation offers me to take a close look into students’ and instructors’ interactions, behaviors, processes, and communications whether verbal or non-verbal, which are difficult to be grasped through verbal accounts (Ritchie et al., 2014). In fact, scholars argue whether the data derived from observations can provide “a more objective account of events and behaviors than second-hand self-report data” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 185). Others argue that observation depicts what is being observed partially and selectively; therefore, the collected data are the outcome of the subjective interpretation of what is being observed, which is seen as a potential weakness (Ritchie et al., 2014). In my perspective, I support the view that the
presence of the researcher within the data will enrich the data analysis, and this is where
the observation lies (Powdermaker, 1966; Ritchie et al., 2014). A study by Brock-Utne
(2006) in Tanzania investigating EMI implementation and effects in secondary schools
shows that classroom observations can provide a vivid picture of the real-life settings of
learning and can reveal the emotional state of students and instructors. Keeping this in
mind, I see observations are beneficial to be more aware of the learning context in the
College and gain deeper insights into the natural learning contexts. Indeed, through
observations, I gained direct information about students’ and instructors’ interactions in
the classroom, which helped me to have a clear understanding of their responses in the
interviews as well as reduce the ambiguity.

Although observation as a collecting data instrument is valuable, it is still
important to acknowledge the limitations of observations. For instance, only observable
behavior can be observed (See Appendix B for the observation guide). The researchers
cannot rely on observations only to interpret mental processes or rationale behind specific
behavior. However, a combination of observations and other instruments of collecting
data, e.g., interviews, will broaden the scope of investigation and analysis which help the
researcher to draw better conclusions. Although the adoption of classroom observation as
a data collection is useful and beneficial, it is in studies on EMI limited (Al-Bakri, 2017).
Another specific limitation of the observations of this study was that due to the COVID-
19 pandemic, I conducted one of the three observations remotely because of the safety
measures.
Interviews

One of the primary data collection methods of this dissertation project is in-depth semistructured interviews. In qualitative research, interview is widely utilized as a data collection instrument in numerous oft-cited studies in Teaching English to Speakers of Other languages (TESOL) literature (e.g., Canagarajah, 1993; Flowerdrew & Miller, 1998). Interviews which are considered “the soul of qualitative research” (Hutchinson & Wilson, 1992; cited in Collins et al., 2005, p. 198) are commonly employed by qualitative researchers since mentioned by Whyte (1979). Westbrook (1994) states that “any able field worker will supplement what is learned from observing and participating with some interviewing” (p. 243). Similarly, Spolsky (2000) asserts that interviews afford qualitative researchers the “opportunity to explore in conversation and through stories and anecdotes the attitudes, identities, and ideologies of our subjects and to gather reports of language use in various domains and with various members of their social networks” (p. 162). Furthermore, interviews give in-depth look at each case, so the researcher comes up with rich data. That means without interviews, qualitative researchers will hardly approach some important details of people’s experiences in the researched topic. Therefore, when my project is seeking to explore and investigate students’ and instructors’ attitudes toward EMI, I see interview as an indispensable instrument to gather specific data.

Despite the usefulness of interviews as a data collection instrument, interviews rest on certain assumptions. Winslow et al. (2002), for example, notice that the “Interview-based approach to collecting qualitative data is based on the assumption that
people are an important source of information about themselves and the issues that affect their lives and that they can articulate their thoughts and feelings” (p. 566). Since we believe that ‘reality’ is co-constructed by people and based upon mutual experiences and insights, beliefs and attitudes of people are dynamic rather than static, and inherently complex (Hüttner et al., 2013). Several scholars see structured interviews tend to produce quantitative data (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Seale & Silverman, 1997) and compare it to open-ended questionnaires (Nunkoosing, 2005). Since the aim of this dissertation project is to facilitate a more focused exploration of EMI in the College programas, the interviews conducted in this study were semi-structured, which, as remarked by DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree (2006), is the most commonly used interview format in qualitative research (See Appendix C for the interview questions of this study). A semi-structured interview offers more flexibility for both the interviewees and the interviewer/researcher to shift the emphasis of the interview in the direction of their choice. Consequently, more explorations and in-depth interrogations about the researched topic were facilitated through a semi-structured interview design.

**Linguistic Challenges of Interviews**

Although the participants of this study are Arabic native speakers except two, all of them showed me their agreement to conduct the interview in English. Goldstein (1995) indicates an important factor during the interview which is the need to be aware of and sensitive to linguistic differences between interviewers and interviewees. Similarly, Sanassian (2011) illustrates how the English language proficiency of some participants could present a challenge to achieve the target of the interview. In order to tackle such
challenges during data collection of this project, I opened the choices for the participants to decide which language they want to speak in the interviews (i.e., Arabic or English) to overcome any possible miscommunications due to language differences and to create rapport with them. I believe that giving the interviewees the choice of the language he is comfortable with promotes access to rich information. Moreover, my emic perspective, both as a bilingual speaker of Arabic and English and a faculty member in the College for six years, helped me to be more aware of the cultural and linguistic dimensions of the interviewees. Karnieli-Miller et al. (2009) refer to the point of considering the language proficiency and background of the interviewee(s), advising the interviewers to “make meticulous use of language tailored to the interviewees’ capabilities and life experience” (p. 286). For example, codeswitching between Arabic and English was useful to explain interview questions and tackle ambiguity. In fact, being Saudi like most of the participants and having studied and taught in EMI programs helped me to tailor the English language employed in interviews to the relevant language competence and background of the students, and to conduct the interviews in a culturally- and linguistically-appropriate manner.

**Importance of Piloting Interviews**

Since the interview is the main instrument for data collection in this study, I felt that the piloting of interviews was an important step for data collection (Goldstein, 1995). I piloted the interview with one expert instructor who has 15 years of experience in teaching in the EMI program at Saudi universities, and specifically has 7 years of experience in teaching English in the College in Al-Ahsa. Furthermore, I piloted the
interview with a student to ascertain whether any aspects of the interview needed to be modified. As a result of this review of the pilot interviews, I modified and clarified my interview questions and technique and divided them into three sections and a total of 20 questions.

**Procedure and Technique for Interviews**

The twenty basic questions of the semi-structured interview format contained some introductory and conclusory questions to indicate the beginning and the end of the session. That increased the participant’s readiness and made them relaxed during the interview (See Appendix C for the interview questions). The questions were directly related to the research questions which were divided into three categories based on the two major questions of this study. The first section was asking about how instructors in the College in Al-Ahsa implement EMI. The aim of this section was to understand the classroom environment related to the medium of instruction and how instructors and students interact with each other in the College. The second section was related to instructors’ attitudes toward EMI and why English was utilized as the medium of instruction in all programs of the College. Seven interview questions were trying to explore advantages and disadvantages of EMI, quality of EMI education, models of EMI, and other issues and concerns related to EMI implementation. The last section of the interview was interrogating students and instructors about educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements and linguistic adequacy. Participants of this study were asked eight questions related to how EMI may or may not impact the education process in the College. In short, the 20 interview questions were designed and
connected to this dissertation project to explore instructors’ and students’ attitudes towards EMI implementation in the College in Al-Ahsa city.

Interviews are key for the data collection method in this study, and it was of the utmost importance to conduct the interviews appropriately, and in a way that the interviewees felt convenient and comfortable during the interview. In order to create an equal footing with the interviewees and avoiding a hierarchical relationship between interviewer and interviewee, before recoding, I started sharing similar interest stories (Collins et al., 2005). As noted, “In order to ensure that the relationship between the researcher and the participant is non-hierarchical, researchers are often involved in a reciprocal sharing of their personal stories” (Dickson-Swift et al., 2007, p. 332). For example, I paused the interview and switch to speak Arabic to the interviewee to release his stress from thinking in English all time of the interview. I saw this effective since they can share more details in Arabic, too. Switching from English to Arabic works well to create a friendly environment that helps the interviewee to give more elaboration specifically in his academic experience in the College. Moreover, I asked the interviewees at the end of each section whether they need to add anything before we move to the other section of the interview. This technique gave the interviewee a pause to think about his answers whether he wants to correct or edit his responses or not.

The interviews were conducted with two English specialists (English-native and Arabic-native speakers). My discussion with the English-native instructor was concentrated on the data related to students’ English language proficiency. On the other hand, my focus with the Arabic-native instructor was to illustrate how students could
cope with EMI program requirements and improve their biliteracy skills. The Arabic-native English language instructor has experienced how the English language is learned, and he graduated from an EMI program. The other four instructors are content instructors who utilize the EMI method in their classes (from each discipline: sciences, health sciences, and IT). The reason behind selecting these three majors is because the College programs are mainly focused on health sciences disciplines and sciences courses such as chemistry, biology, emergency medical services, respiratory therapy, etc. which are taught in the pre-professional and professional programs.

**Transcription of Interviews**

The first step for transcribing the interviews began by utilizing the speech-to-text recording application. Since the interviews were audio-recorded, I utilized Samsung Voice Recorder version 21.3.00.36 which is compatible with Samsung Privacy. The text provided was not 100% accurate, so it needed to be edited and revised by me. From here, my transcription process started taking time and effort and becomes “troublesome, time-consuming” (Bevis, 1949, p. 631). After recording the first interview, I started transcribing it word-by-word ‘verbatim transcription’ to conceptualize and analyze the data of the interview whether it was necessary to continue doing verbatim transcription or not. As there is some argument in the relevant literature whether the verbatim transcription of an interview is possible to desirable (Cook, 1990; Hewitt, 2007; Tilley, 2003). Halcomb and Davidson (2006) state that verbatim transcription is not required in all cases, it depends on the type of analysis to which the data are to be subjected. Since this study is seeking instructors’ and students’ attitudes toward EMI, and it is not related
to content analysis. Furthermore, after conducting a verbatim transcription of the first interview, it was felt that there was little to be gained by doing that. Therefore, I decided to follow Karmani (2010) and Hudson (2013) that verbatim transcription of the interviews is not necessary, rather relevant portions of the interviews, which are carefully and purposefully selected as they are illustrative of emergent themes and serve as analytical points, were transcribed. In addition, I omitted the fillers (e.g., um, hmm, Alaa, etc.) following MacLean et al., (2004), but contrary to the advice of McLellan et al. (2004), to make the transcribed interview extracts easy to read and smooth to follow the ideas, especially when most of the interviewees were speaking in a foreign language where such fillers tend to appear much more extent than would normally be expected when speaking in a mother tongue. I concurred with the majority of the qualitative researchers interviewed by Dickson-Swift et al. (2007, p. 337) who believe that transcribing done by the researcher him/herself is “an important first step in the data analysis” (see also Easton et al., 2000; Tilley, 2003; Wellard & McKenna, 2001). Furthermore, conducting the transcription process by myself allowed me to avoid the “transcriptionist effect” (MacLean et al., 2004, p. 119), which is accidental errors that are done by the stenographer even if s/he is professional, s/he may lack knowledge of the particular subject area and specialized terminologies.

**Data Analysis**

The process of data analysis depends on the researchers’ ability to organize and reduce the collected data and then summarize results. The goal of data analysis is to categorize the collected data into manageable units or themes, so the researcher can get
the benefit of it and provide a clear interpretation of findings. As I mentioned earlier, data analysis began as soon as I started collecting data and transcribing the interviews. According to the coding process, I utilized Generative Codes which means to develop codes directly from the data during and after data collection (Beaudry & Miller, 2016). Charmaz (2000) mentions that the Constant Comparative Method of coding is the default strategy for generative coding in qualitative research. That is comparing different people and experiences to analyze the interviews collected data of the students and instructors in the College in Al-Ahsa. The coding process took place in three stages: First, open coding, which involves coding line by line in order to generate initial concepts about what is occurring in the setting and what people are doing. Second, axial/action coding, which involves making comparisons within and across the data and linking concepts to each other. Finally, selective coding, which identifies core categories that are central to the theory being generated (Beaudry & Miller, 2016).

Central to qualitative research is the concept of interpretation which means the position the research takes in collecting data and in making meaning from them. Data collected for this study was interpreted through two interpreting approaches: Phenomenology and Symbolic Interaction. Phenomenology is as Beaudry and Miller (2016) define “it seeks to understand the essence of a phenomenon from the point of view of the actors, and it depends on in-depth interviews” (p. 47). The other interpreting approach is Symbolic Interaction which assumes a “process of negotiation among actors, leading to shared meanings that are socially rather than individually constructed” (Beaudry & Miller, 2016, p. 48). I implemented these two emic ‘insider’ interpretative
approaches that mean the interpretation process refers to perspectives and interpretations of actors/participants of this study because the focus of this study is to describe instructors’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI implementation. Unlike the etic ‘outsider’ interpretation which refers to perspectives and interpretations of the researcher. Both, transcriptions of the interviews and observation notes side-by-side were analyzed and coded into categories to provide a cohesive summary and interpretation of findings.

In the next section, I will write about the ethical considerations that I implement in this study, and during the data collection, specifically.

**Ethical Considerations**

**IRB Permission**

There is consensus in the literature that research should contribute to enriching the knowledge and humanity, in general, and do not have any harmful consequences on the participants (Wellington, 2015). Since this study is based on two main data sources: interviews and observations, ethics are at the heart of this study from the early design stages. The two data sets posed different kinds of questions related to ethics for this study, especially with regards to human subject research, and all the requirements related to ethics were dealt with appropriately.

The first step before begins collecting the data, I followed the instructions and ethics of conducting interviews related to human subjects. As Ferguson et al (2004) illustrate and assure to the importance of informing the potential participants of all parts of any study in which they are got involved in, including who will have access to their data. The participants of this study were fully aware of any possible benefits or risks, and
informed that even if they initially agree to participate in the study, they may discontinue their participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits. Their participation in this research study entitled “English-Medium Instruction at King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences (KSAU-HS): Students’ Needs and Instructors’ Attitudes” was to critically reflect on their attitudes and perspectives about EMI in an EFL context. The participation in this study was entirely voluntary and if they choose to participate, I would expect them to do the following:

1. Sign the Informed Consent Form now.
2. Participate in the interview. They will not be required to do any additional work.
3. Allow the Co-Principal Investigator to use their responses in the interview for analysis purposes.

Upon the approval from the IRB at Illinois State University, and receiving permission from KSAU-HS, participants of this study were reached out in person by the research team. I distributed the consent form to each interviewee, and explain to him why he is being asked, what he should do, the consequences of participating in this study, and how his information is protected, who will benefit from the study, whom he contacts for future inquiry, and finally, the goals purposes of the research. In addition to that, it was made clear that the researcher team, Principal Investigator and me, will know their names but in the writing, we will give them pseudonyms. Also, I confirmed that I will not reveal any information that can be used to identify the participant in a presentation or publication that emerges from this research. I will refer to them in general terms like ‘students’ and ‘instructors’. Also, I clarified to them that they are ineligible to participate in the study if
they are currently within the European Economic Area (as per the IRB protocol guidelines) or are under 18 years old. Finally, if they have questions about this research, they can ask me now or later in Arabic or English, whatever they feel more comfortable with.

After each interview, I downloaded the audio file into my computer for transcribing purposes. Both, my computer and audio device, are protected and secured by Windows and Knox 3.7, respectively. In regard to storage, all hard copies such as interview questions, interview transcriptions, observation field notes, etc., were kept under locked storage and soft copies and audio files were password protected. Indeed, the ethical issues are addressed and given full considerations prior to and during the collection of data required for this study.

**Researcher Positionality**

Being a faculty member at KSAU-HS since 2014 has provided me with means and opportunities to understand the EMI implementation context in the College at the university. Designing my dissertation project to be an instrumental case study provides me with data collection instruments, e.g., semistructured interviews and overt observations, to interrogate firsthand experienced instructors’ and students’ attitudes and issues about EMI in the College. the case study is the only feasible method to elicit implicit and explicit data from the subjects (Tellis, 1997). Through the case study, a researcher is able to go beyond “the quantitative statistical results and understand the behavioral conditions through the actors’ perspective” (Zainal, 2007, p. 1). Indeed, this dissertation project centers around seeking attitudes of experienced instructors of
professional majors in Saudi tertiary education, and how students and instructors in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements.

Furthermore, what attracted me to using the instrumental case study in my project is its pros and how it is a perfect fit for the questions and aims of this project. George and Bennett (2005) have identified four advantages of case studies in comparison to quantitative methods. The advantages are their capability to achieve high “conceptual validity”, robust procedures for “fostering new hypotheses”, practicality for “examining the hypothesized role of causal mechanisms” in the context of individual cases, and their ability to “addressing causal complexity” (Starman, 2013, p. 36). Case study allows the researcher to identify and measure the theoretical concepts that the researcher wants to measure. Also, case studies contribute to the professional development of a researcher since case studies provide a context-dependent experience that increases their research skills (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

I believe that research focused on finding, understanding, and analyzing the perspectives of those being studied (instructors and students in the College) allows me as a researcher to be more informed and aware of the surrounding environment of the research field where English is utilized as the medium of instruction in professional subjects and the students’ L1 is the Arabic language. That leads to tangible and important reformations in the College programs. In fact, as a qualitative researcher using the case studies paradigm, I become the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, and that will lead to “an inductive investigative strategy” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 37).
This will help me to get involved in the College programs and understand the instructors’ and students’ attitudes and needs toward EMI implementation. Also, being the primary instrument of data collection and analysis paves the way to extract, construct, and draw information related to the EMI phenomenon from its primary sources. Indeed, adopting an instrumental case study will facilitate ways to interpret the limiting conditions in relation to power and control that are thought to influence behaviors and beliefs (Crowe et al., 2011).

**Conclusion**

As this chapter discussed, this study is conceptualized primarily as an instrumental case study that observes and investigates EMI implementation in the College in Al-Ahsa city. The chapter commenced with a contextual background illustrating the tendency toward Englishization in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia. After that, I elaborated on the methodology adopted in this research and which type of case study is selected. The purpose of the case study is to understand human interaction within a social unit, a single instance bounded by the caseworker in the research design (Stake, 1995). Then, I explained the rationale behind employing instrumental case study research as the methodology for this dissertation project which stems from the university uniqueness represented in implementing EMI in all of its academic programs, and utilizing English as a lingua franc in official communications, for example, meetings and emails.

I described the main methods of data collection included semi-structured interviews and overt classroom observations. I detailed the data sources, the population
samples, and the linguistic challenges I faced during the interviews. Because the interviews are the main instrument for collecting data in this study, I felt that the piloting of interviews with two experienced instructors was an important procedure for the data collection. Also, I mentioned the interview procedures and techniques and how the interviews are transcribed by me. In addition, I clarified the data analysis process that utilizes generative codes through three stages: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Furthermore, I demonstrated the study setting and participants’ academic backgrounds that provide a vivid image to the reader. Finally, I talked about the ethical considerations, challenges, and limitations I have encountered during the research.

In the next chapter, I analyze the data collected for this study and discuss the findings utilizing the abovementioned methods.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter reports and discusses the findings collected from the thematic analysis of the qualitative data, specifically interviews conducted with 10 participants (six instructors and four students) from the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) in Al-Ahsa campus, and observations of three classes; two language-related classes, and one Emergency Medical Services class. The findings are organized into three main sections in correspondence to the two major research questions: (i) How do science and health specialties instructors at KSAU-HS in the CAMS in Al-Ahsa implement EMI? And what do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach in the College? (ii) How do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements and improving their English language proficiency? The data is reported based on the three major themes that emerged from the data analysis. While the first major theme (4.1) answered the first research question, the remainders (4.2 and 4.3) shed light on the second research question. More specifically, in the first theme, I explored the implementation of EMI from students’ and instructors’ lenses illustrating issues related to the medium of instruction in the classroom, biliteracy practices in the College, and roles and responsibilities of instructors in EMI programs. The second theme focused on the quality of EMI in the College. In this theme, I discussed issues related to instructors’ and students’ beliefs in the EMI approach, EMI and improvement of students’ English language skills, instructors’ and students’ impression of English varieties and proficiency,
and some major benefits of perceived EMI. In the third theme, I addressed some of the drawbacks of EMI related to perceptions and academic experiences of students and instructors in the College, students’ low English proficiency, short-term and rote memorization, relations between students’ English proficiency and academic achievement, and effects on students’ L1. In short, this chapter aims to provide a deeper analysis into a) EMI implementation in the College context, b) the types of values and beliefs that instructors in EMI programs in the College maintain, b) students’ academic needs as well as educational benefits and risks the students encounter (See Appendix D for the outline of the themes).

Contextual Data: EMI Implementation in the CAMS at KSAU-HS in Al-Ahsa

Before discussing the findings related to the EMI implementation in the context of this study, it is beneficial to briefly discuss the context of EMI in the College. In this particular context, English is the medium of instruction for students who speak English as a foreign language. In terms of students’ readiness for studying in the EMI program, student participants indicated that English education in high school did not improve their English proficiency, and it did not prepare them to adequately study through EMI. Although these students have been studying English since fourth grade, they still find studying English in school limited only to grammar knowledge. As Lulu, one of the student participants of this study in the third year studying in the College, stated “we have been taught thousands of times grammar, but it was not helpful.” This means preparing students in high schools for studying in the EMI program was not as helpful as it should be, perhaps because of the overreliance on traditional teaching methods such as Grammar
Translation Method (GTM) and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM). According to Alrabai (2014), one of the main reasons of Saudi learners’ poor proficiency in English is the dependence on traditional teaching methodologies that support a teacher-centered method. Among the four student participants, only one student seemed to think that the English language education in high school is helpful and prepares one to study in the EMI programs in the College. From my conversation with him, I knew that he was an international school graduate, and that he went abroad to take English courses. In fact, the variance in student responses is not surprising, considering the myriad of factors that influence the students’ learning outcome, such as the different systems of high schools students attend (e.g., international school versus public school) or taking English-intensive summer courses in an Anglophone country. In the international school system in Saudi Arabia, the medium instruction for most courses is in English whereas in the public school system, English is treated as an isolated foreign language subject where students study English for two classes per week at the elementary level, and four classes per week at the intermediate and high levels. This finding is also consistent with the current literature which indicates that high school students in the Gulf region usually graduate with low levels of English proficiency to study in the EMI programs (Al-Bakri, 2017; McMullen, 2014). McMullen’s study confirmed the need to the reform of English education, specifically offering statistical proof that “students themselves believe that they leave high school without gaining the requisite English skills necessary to enter their academic majors” (McMullen, 2014, p. 137). Al-Bakri also reported that the majority of interview participants (Omani students in her case study) reported that “studying English
at school did not prepare them well for their study in English at college supporting the literature in this regard…” (Al-Bakri, 2017, p. 127). Because of that, many Saudi universities incorporated a year-long preparatory program to get the students up to speed for EMI (Macaro, 2018).

Going back to the context of this study, high school graduates begin studying in the College in a pre-professional program for two years to improve their English language skills and basic sciences. After that, students specialize in a health science-related major for another two years, which is called a ‘professional program.’ In both programs, the university administration asks instructors to speak only English. In other words, the medium of instruction for all programs in the College is the English language (College of Science and Health Professions, n.d.). The three major interview questions I asked the participants of this study about how EMI implementation takes place in the College in the Al-Ahsa campus are associated with the first research question of this dissertation project. The interview questions were “In what circumstances do you speak and write in English in the College? In what ways are language and content being integrated? What are the roles of EFL and EMI teachers?” In addition to collecting data through semi-structured interviews, I conducted three online and classroom observations to observe how spoken interactions between instructors and students occur inside the classroom. The goal of the first section of the interview and the classroom observations is to shed light on how EM implementation occurs day-to-day in this university, and how the actors (instructors and students) describe this process from their own viewpoints.
The Medium of Instruction inside the Classrooms in the College Includes Multiple Languages: Namely Arabic and English

In presenting the findings related to this section, the classroom observations demonstrated that the medium of instruction in pre-professional and professional program classes varied from one class to another depending on factors such as instructors’ and students’ linguistic backgrounds and English language proficiency, and instructor-led language policing inside the classroom. The language of instruction in the Emergency Medical Services course was a mix between Arabic and English. Since both the instructors’ and students’ L1 is Arabic, they used it almost side-by-side with the English language. It could be considered a language alternation or codeswitching between English and Arabic. I noticed that during the lecture-based class in the health sciences courses, instructors and students occasionally codeswitched from Arabic to English and vice versa. However, in the practical-based or laboratory class, instructors spoke only English, and students responded to their instructors in English. Yet, when students talked to each other, they mixed Arabic and English. In general, the language instruction inside the classroom was bilingual instruction in unsystematic ways. In other words, the data collected in class observations demonstrated that there was some random codeswitching in the theoretical sections, while English-only is restrictively implemented by instructors during the practical sections. I discussed this phenomenon more in depth below in the

---

8 I mean by codeswitching here is the process of shifting from Arabic to English and vice versa in the class settings in the College among students and instructors.
9 In the CAMS, science-related courses are conducted in both a lecture-based where students are taught the theoretical knowledge in classrooms, and practical-based where students practice what they learned in laboratories.
data I reported based on the interviews I conducted with their instructor of the observed class, i.e., Mr. Salim.

In the interviews, I asked the instructors and students about the medium of instruction inside the classroom since this project sought instructors’ and students’ evolving knowledge and lived experiences with EMI. English language and content instructors responded to that by giving me different percentages of English use in their classes. According to the instructors, the percentage of English use varies from 50% to 100%, and this variation seems to arise from the instructors’ linguistic background and from their in-class language policy. In terms of instructors’ linguistic capability, instructors who know Arabic such as Salim, Khli, Azmi, and Muhin switch between Arabic and English due to reasons such as students’ comprehension check of the content matter and time-management. For example, Muhin, a content instructor, justified that by noting “I use bilingual teaching. Start with English and then repeat or summarize in Arabic to make sure that students understand the materials well” (Interview, February 2021). Not surprisingly, instructors who do not know Arabic, use only English during class instruction. So, both students’ and instructors’ beliefs converged to the efficacy of the instructors’ knowledge of the students’ L1. While the majority of bilingual instructors codeswitch between English and Arabic, Nassir, a language instructor, used only English in the classroom instruction until he received a complaint from the program director. As he stated in one of our interviews, “the medium of instruction in my class is English only till I get a complaint from students to speak Arabic, and the administration told me to be

---

10 Participants’ words are not changed in order to be truthful to the way they said things. See Chapter III for more details about my interpretation and analysis process.
lenient with students” (Interview, December 2020). While it is expected that bilingual instructors can naturally switch back and forth between languages, non-Arabic speaking instructors implement English-only in the classroom instruction due to their lack of Arabic language background.

Students’ responses to the interview question related to the medium of instruction in the classrooms were aligned with their instructors’ responses. For example, Thamir, a student in the first year, pointed out that “the medium of instruction depends on the instructor himself, if he is an Arabic-origin, he will teach in both languages English and Arabic, but if he is an English speaker, so English-only” (Interview, February 2021). Another student (Lulu) supported what Thamir said by saying that “Arab lecturers use Arabic to make clarifications for us.” That is, the medium of instruction is English, and Arabic is used for clarification purposes only. In short, both stakeholders, instructor and student participants alike, believed that some kind of bilingual model of education was preferable to English-only instruction, especially in the College case where all students come from the same linguistic background ‘The Arabic language.’ This conforms to several studies investigating EMI instructors’ and students’ opinions about the implementation of students’ L1 in teaching (See Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Al-Kahtany, 2016). Only one student mentioned that speaking Arabic and English at the same time is confusing. Amman, a fourth-year student in Emergency Medical Services (EMS), said “if the instructors speak Arabic and English at the same time, the students will get confused and they will not learn properly.” Amman did not clarify how speaking both Arabic and
English in one class by instructors is confusing. Among ten participants of this study, only one student said that using bilingual instruction is confusing.

After discussing instructors’ and students’ perspectives toward the medium of instruction in the College, it is important to illustrate how instructors and students interact inside the classroom based on my observations of three classes. Data from classroom observations showed that the interactions between the instructors and students were limited which is a common feature in the EMI classroom (Brock-Utne, 2012; Kagwesage, 2012). The students were busy taking notes (either in English or Arabic), highlighting important points in the textbooks/handouts, and nodding to indicate that they understood what the instructor explained. Interaction in English with the instructors was mostly confined to responding to comprehension check questions that came from the instructor, or when the students asked for clarifications. A few students could ask detailed questions in English while the majority of them (twenty-four students in the observed class) remained silent. At the beginning of the EMS class, the instructor started reviewing important information from previous theoretical classes before initiating the practical segment of the class. However, the students’ responses were in the form of short phrases, incomplete sentences, mostly in non-standard English grammar. For example, a student answer to the instructor’s questions of “Does he suffer from chronic diseases?” with “has asthma”, or asks the instructor about the patient’s case in forms such as “How much is he smoke” (rather than the standard form ‘how long has he been smoking?’) In fact, most of the students’ responses were brief and included non-standard grammatical constructions, regardless of the Arabic interference. On the other hand, I noticed that a few students
interacted with the instructor effectively and spoke English fluently. In fact, students’ English proficiency was not the only factor that hindered students from participating in the classroom. I noticed that there were other factors such as the class size, fear of making a mistake, speaking in public in their additional language, and students’ general lack of class preparation, all of which seem to have played a role in students’ classroom participation (Rose, et al., 2019). While discussing student participation in EMI is not within the scope of this study, it is worthwhile to note that there are contextual factors that contribute to students’ willingness to participate and talk in the classroom.

MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei & Noels (1998) pointed out that Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in L1 differs from L2 due to various affective variables such as individual factors (anxiety, motivation, attitudes, interpersonal attraction, etc.) and social contextual factors (ethnolinguistic vitality, language contact, etc.) that either enhance or reduce WTC (MacIntyre, 2007). The data collected from class observations are aligned with their conclusions as many students were not willing to communicate due to various social, linguistic, cultural, and emotional factors.

Related to in-class student-student interactions inside the same class I observed, I also noticed that most of the students provided uptakes by nodding or saying “yes” to indicate their comprehension and attention to class. Moreover, students used Arabic for clarifications in their side conversations during class instruction. This is also a common behavior that is carried out by many EMI students (Al-Bakri, 2017; Macaro, 2018). As much research in bilingual education and second language studies indicates, English language learners often tap on their L1 knowledge to deliver the message in a few words.
and enhance their understanding (e.g., Ortega, 2015; Vogel & García, 2017). The research within second and foreign language education has suggested also that L1 use has a facilitative effect on L2 learning (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Cook, 2001). In other words, L1 serves as “a communicative and pedagogic resource in bilingual contexts, especially where pupils struggle to understand difficult subject matter” (Ferguson, 2009, p. 231). Similarly, the findings in this study illustrated that the use of L1 demystified the content and helps overcome learning obstacles related to classroom communications. These understandings and practices are not unique to the College context. Griffiths (2013) explored instructors’ perspectives on EMI and their practices through the employment of interviews with 20 teachers and 5 classroom observations. The findings showed that Norwegian instructors use Norwegian instead of English to support students’ comprehension. That is, students’ L1 utilization in the instruction is preferable and beneficial for better academic knowledge gain. Furthermore, studies show that instructors knowing students’ L1 could have a positive impact on students’ morale (King, 2014), and leverage students’ total linguistic repertoire for communication and learning (García et al., 2017). Therefore, instructors who can speak students’ L1 have an advantage to use students’ mother language in teaching to demystify difficulties and explain content clearly (Babino & González-Carriedo, 2017). However, this does not mean that instructors who cannot speak students’ L1 have a shortage in teaching or cannot explain the content to students appropriately.
Biliteracy Practices Outside Classrooms: Biliteracy as a Way to Facilitate the Interactions and Enhance Students’ Comprehension

The data coming out of this instrumental case study also focused on circumstances around speaking and writing in English in the College specifically outside the instructed classroom activities. Interviews conducted with instructors and students revealed consistent results about a bilingual environment interaction. For instance, the official communications outside the classroom setting, whether spoken or written, are mostly in English. The Arabic language is used by instructors and students when more clarifications are needed during office hours, for example. When I asked Khli, the instructor of English about the circumstances when engaged in speaking and writing in English, he said that “English all-time but Arabic if needed. It is between 80% to 90% of the time English, yet in the office hours the opposite 90% is Arabic”. When I asked him why the opposite, he stated:

When students come for a one-on-one talk, or they come to ask questions about specific point, then it’s not official teaching, and I feel more free to use Arabic at that time, but sometimes of course if a student does not understand the point that I already explained in English that I’m gonna think to myself well what’s the point in repeating what I said. I also do rely on Arabic to explain grammar.

(Interview, December 2020)

What Khli stated is similar to the students’ responses. For example, Thamir, a first-year student in the pre-professional program, pointed out one of the purposes of using students’ L1. He noted: “it is difficult if the instructor explains in English to some
students who don’t have the ability to know all the words, so if the instructor speaks Arabic, he will explain every single point and the students will understand it” (Interview, January 2021). Thamir’s narrative specifically emphasized the phrase “every single point”. This indicates that students understand better when instructors talk to them in Arabic. Instructors who can speak students’ L1 will be able to communicate with low-English-proficiency students through utilizing students’ L1. At the same time, students with low English proficiency can ask questions about unclear parts of the instruction during office hours because they are confident to speak their L1. Instructors’ familiarity with students’ L1 not only helps with comprehension but also helps to create a culturally sustainable learning environment where students’ languages are validated and used as part of identity building (Canagarajah, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2013; Pennycook, 1994; Wang, 2018). The collected data showed that biliteracy practices take place in the College in and out of the classrooms. The utilization of the Arabic language occurred when more clarification is needed which is a common method in EMI programs when instructors and students share the same native language (Alnajjar et al., 2015; Barnard, 2014).

**Diverse Roles and Responsibilities of Instructors in EMI Contexts**

Instructors in the College are divided into two groups: pre-professional program instructors and professional program instructors. In this project, I was particularly interested in exploring the relationship between EMI content instructors (in the professional program) and EFL instructors (in the pre-professional program) in relation to EMI implementation, and how cooperation between the instructors could lead to program
development. For instance, in collaborative teaching, a language specialist and an EMI content instructor plan together how an existing curriculum is to be delivered. They take into account students’ academic needs and effective teaching strategies to implement for successful education. For more elaboration about instructors’ collaboration, I specified a discussion in the implication section in Chapter Five of this dissertation. With this in mind, part of my data collection also included an investigation of content instructors’ role to improve students’ English proficiency and make the content accessible and comprehensible.

**Roles of EFL instructors in EMI programs in the College: The need of collaboration between EFL and content instructors**

EFL instructors in the College are working under the College of Science and Health Professions (COSHP) where they prepare pre-professional students for the professional programs by teaching them English skills and basic sciences. As the official website of the university indicates, the goal of the pre-professional program is to “help students make a smooth academic transition from high school to university studies by equipping them with the educational tools necessary for pursuing professional studies in health science colleges” (College of Science and Health Professions, n.d.). The COSHP provides students the language skills essential for studying and communicating in an English language medium.

When I asked the EFL instructors about their roles in the pre-professional program, I did not receive a clear answer. Most of the EFL instructor participants’ responses were vague because they said they are unaware of the interconnected
relationship between learning content and acquiring a language. For example, Nassir’s interview excerpt showed the vagueness of the roles instructors assume in this position: “there are no crystal-clear roles for EFL instructors, but I think we are dealing with English courses as subjects rather than as acquiring language skills.” Nassir’s words indicated that English language curricula are isolated from their end-goal which is helping students in acquiring or advancing their English language skills. Another EFL instructor, Khli, reported that the role of EFL instructors is to help students pass tests in English courses. In fact, one of the COSHP missions according to the official university document is to prepare high school graduates with the university-level tools and language skills to be able to communicate in English. It sets seven specific goals related to English language skills, and how EFL instructors are responsible to develop students’ English proficiency in listening, speaking, English syntax, academic reading and critical thinking, and academic writing skills.

On the other hand, when I asked the content instructors about the EFL instructors’ roles in the College, the data illustrated that the EFL instructors seem to take up the following three roles: (i) filtering out students in order to determine who succeeds in later stages and pursues their academic and specialization in the professional studies program. (ii) improving students’ English language proficiency; (iii) giving tutorials in Academic English for students in the professional studies program. Thus, instructors of the pre-professional program (i.e., EFL instructors) play a key role in making sure students are equipped with the necessary academic and language skills for pursuing professional studies in the health science colleges at the university. All content and EFL instructor
participants concurred that improving students’ English proficiency is the key goal of EFL instructors in the EMI program.

**Content instructors’ responsibilities on students’ English proficiency: Students’ English proficiency is not content instructors’ responsibility**

In EMI programs, content instructors are known to be responsible for delivering the required lessons and ensuring academic advancement. Related to this academic goal, I asked the content instructors about their responsibility on students’ English proficiency, and whether they address the language needs of their students. Salim, an Emergency Medical Services lecturer, stated that his goal is not to improve students’ English proficiency. As he puts it in the following excerpt “English proficiency is not my job, and even I do not have the time and skills to teach students how to improve their English.”

When I asked the interview participants of this study about content instructors’ responsibilities towards students’ English proficiency, I found that instructors fell into two groups: English specialists and content instructors. The English specialists said that content instructors must be aware of and responsible for the student’s English proficiency because English is the mean of communication, and if the students’ English proficiency is inadequate to study in an EMI course, they will fail. Khli and Nassir said that “They [content instructors] have to improve students’ English proficiency.” In contrast, content instructors claimed that they are not responsible to improve the students’ English level because they have content to cover, and there is a lack of time to explain language issues to students. Additionally, they are not specialized in English language teaching, so they
do not have sufficient training to teach students English academic skills. As Muhin, the pharmacology instructor stated:

I will not add to their English proficiency, but I will add the science part of the English language. I will not teach students grammar, reading, or language skills, because first, they should come to my class ready in English, second, I am not specialized in the English language. I will add the science part which is my job because I want them to graduate with skills of my course ‘Pharmacology’.

(Interview, February 2021)

Azmi, Zafa, and Salim, the other participants of this study who are content instructors, concurred with the quote above emphasizing that they do not feel responsible to improve the students’ English proficiency. As the interview accounts demonstrate, there is a clear divide about whose responsibility it should be to improve students’ academic English skills as well as language proficiency.

Interestingly, the student participants agreed with content instructors and saw that they are accountable to make the subject clear only and have no direct role to improve students’ English language skills. Suliman, a second-year student in the pre-professional program, explained his perspective toward content instructors’ responsibility “they have no direct responsible [responsibilities] for the English improvement, but, for example, in chemistry when a professor teaches you something that you do not know, he will translate the words. So, it is indirect responsibility.” In fact, what content instructors and students mentioned are in alignment with the widely expressed view in the EMI research (Al-Bakri, 2017; Macaro, 2018). For instance, Al-
Bakri (2017) has investigated the effects of EMI on students’ learning experiences and quality of education at Sultan Qaboos University (SQU) through a mixed-method study where her participants believed that learning through English will improve their learning outcomes, more specifically their English proficiency. She reported that content instructors do not see students’ English improvement as their responsibility rather students must come to EMI classes ready in English. Furthermore, as content instructors assess their students’ academic achievement, they specifically focus on students’ understanding of content rather than language. In other words, content teachers care about students’ subject knowledge, not students’ linguistic skills. This is in line with my observations. I noticed that content instructors were not interested in engaging in language-based practices such as going over students’ non-standard language usage. Instead, they are primarily concerned with students’ content knowledge acquisition. Although content instructors confessed that students graduated from the pre-professional program with low English proficiency, English language teaching ceases once students start taking discipline-specific courses within professional programs.

**Beliefs in the EMI Approach in the College: EMI Improve Educational Outcomes and Support Students in Their Future Academic and Professional Career**

The findings illustrated that the participants of this study believe that EMI is not a barrier to expand ones’ academic knowledge and improve the educational outcomes especially when students’ English proficiency is above intermediate. Zafa and Azmi, content instructors, affirmed that EMI will improve the university educational outcomes since students who graduated from EMI programs will be qualified to continue their
graduate studies abroad and present in international conferences. The reason behind their beliefs in EMI referred to the position of the English language nationally and internationally. At the national level, students’ future career positions in hospitals in Saudi Arabia require an adequate level in English language proficiency to be able to communicate with their non-Arabic colleagues since the language policy in the hospitals is utilizing the English language as a lingua franca (ELF). At the international level, Saudi students who aim to pursue studying graduate program in professional majors need to study abroad, and in most cases the graduate programs are EMI. So, instructor participants of this study see EMI as an improvement tool for the educational outcomes of the institution.

The students’ perceptions towards EMI education revealed similar results as the interview excerpt by Thamir who stated, “studying through English is better because we are going to end up with a job environment that uses English.” Both the instructor and student participants agreed that EMI will help students in their future career and academic achievement. Suliman clarified more how EMI will improve their academic achievement “EMI is not a barrier, actually, it will improve the way we get the knowledge because if we know English, we will have more resources, more than Arabic or any other language.” It is clear that the support of EMI is related to the participants’ assumption that learning academic content in English could help them to also learn English language better and help them have access to English resources and be able to communicate with international colleagues once they graduate (4.2.3.1 discussed EMI and access to knowledge). Lulu, a student majoring in respiratory therapy, confirmed this
belief when he noted the following interpretation during one of the interviews: “It [EMI education] depends on the student’s English competency. Personally, I do not see English as a barrier to quality education because I studied abroad, and my English proficiency is adequate to pursue my study here [in the College].” As these anecdotes demonstrate, students perceived English language not as a barrier to study in the EMI program especially for students who have an intermediate level of English skills.

Another belief related to EMI and improving university educational outcomes is that EMI facilitates international communications for many Saudi students. All of the interview participants indicated that EMI would help them to communicate internationally due to the global status of the English language. This attachment of high value to English as a ‘global language’ is similar to Findlow’s (2006) study exploring 500 students’ perceptions on EMI in three higher institutions in the UAE. He pointed out that the participants of his study tend to associate English with notions of modernity, internationalism, secularism, business, and material success, while Arabic was attributed to localism, religion, tradition, and emotion. Some of the participants of my study also hold a similar belief. For example, Zafa, a content instructor, mentioned that “English has become an international language. EMI also creates direct communications between students and knowledge.” Salim specified the need for communicating in English for Saudi students by “students have to have a good level of English in order to communicate with their international colleagues when they work with them.” Salim’s excerpt illustrated that the workplaces of health specialties embrace ELF since some employees in the Saudi hospitals are from non-Arabic countries, as a result, the primary language in
the hospitals in Saudi Arabia is, *de facto*, the English language. Muhin, who has an experience working in hospitals and medical centers in Saudi Arabia, confirmed that “hospitals in Saudi Arabia use English as a primary language.” Therefore, the support of EMI was related to assumed market needs which is reflecting a common view in the Gulf (Al-Mahrooqi et al., 2016).

Moreover, Salim associated being able to communicate in English with modernization, and it is necessary for everyone: “English is good for everyone, so you are left behind if you do not have good English.” Zafa again mentioned a similar assumption that “EMI makes Saudi education in line with the rest of the world;” thereby, associating the knowledge of English with being well educated. Therefore, many Saudi educators share the same viewpoint as in Alshareef et al.’s (2018) study when they investigated the educational policymakers in Saudi Arabia about the language policy of the English language in tertiary education. This seems to imply that instructors and students of this study tied higher education with a superior language which is English.

Shohamy (2006), in her research about *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and Approaches*, discusses that through language policy, decisions are made about which languages should gain status and priority in society. The society legitimizes the language which they see as important for their economic and social status. In Africa, Seargeant and Erling (2013) investigated the link between learning English and development and prosperity. They addressed effects that increase the use of English and the promotion of English-language education such as the political and economic agendas of some states’ development, which are specifically promoted through language policy. Thus, it is not
surprising that the participants of this study overvalued the English language at the expense of the Arabic language due to the prestigious status that the English language has in the 21st century.

All interview participants showed to some degree their agreement and support of EMI. This finding is in alignment with Al-Bakri’s (2017) and Belhiah and Elhami’s (2014) studies. More specifically, Al-Bakri (2017) has explored college students’ attitudes toward EMI and its implications in the tertiary education. She found that her participants believed that learning through English will improve their learning outcomes, particularly their English proficiency. The participants in Al-Bakri’s (2017) study assumed that language improvement leads to better academic learning outcomes. However, Chapple (2015) noted the problematic consequences of this simplistic assumption because of the risk that neither content nor language learning happens. Overall, the participants of this study seemed to support EMI due to the assumed language gain. They were less concerned about content comprehension and academic achievement through studying in a language that they are still learning.

EMI and Students’ L1 Medium Instruction

Related to the students’ perceptions towards EMI education, I asked the instructor participants how they think that the EMI approach could at least maintain the same subject content achievement as students’ L1 medium instruction. In other words, I would like to check how teaching students through English could be better than teaching them through their mother language. I found that the majority of teachers responded by that English, the foreign language for Saudi people, cannot be equivalent or comparable to the
Arabic language, the native language, in terms of delivering content and teaching scientific subject for Arabic students. Khli, a language specialist, stated that “I think it [making EMI to provide the same subject content achievement as students’ L1 instruction] is impossible. I do not think EMI whatever comes close to the efficacy of Arabic instruction.” Six participants affirmed that teaching and learning through the mother tongue is more efficient than learning through a foreign language. This result is consistent with several EMI studies investigating students’ learning achievement in EMI programs (Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015; Hellekjaer, 2010; Kim et al., 2014; Tarhan, 2003). Indeed, both instructors and students demonstrated overall support for future Arabic curricula once barriers (e.g., resource availability) are removed.

On the other hand, Salim, Azmi, and Muhin, content instructors, reported that EMI could maintain the same subject content achievement as L1 by two conditions: (i) students’ English language proficiency must be sufficient to comprehend the lectures in English, and (ii) students’ L1 use in the instruction should be a welcomed pedagogical practice to ensure students’ understanding and enrich classroom discussion. What the participants’ said about language proficiency and L1 use in instruction echoed the British Council/TEPAV (2015), a report written to assess the state of English in higher education in Turkey. The authors in this nation-wide report concluded that “if students, through assessment of language competence, do not meet the required standards, they should be redirected to Turkish medium instruction programs” (p. 15). That is knowing the basic required English proficiency, for instance scoring 5.0 in IELTS, is necessary to pursue studying in the EMI programs, to help students comprehend the content, and to maintain
the quality of the academic standards of the institution. In terms of L1 use in EMI instruction, Belhiah and Elhami (2014) investigated instructors’ and students’ beliefs toward implementing students’ L1 in teaching, and both of the stakeholders’ beliefs converged in preferring some kind of bilingual model of education. In fact, these findings are in alignment with findings in second language studies around the use of L1 in one’s understanding of L2.

Much research in multilingualism argues that home language is an important source for learning. It is important to understand the role of validating, using, and leveraging students’ mother tongue while they are learning complex academic content. It is important to understand the efficacy of students’ L1 in the learning process, and how implementing mother tongue-based education is beneficial while they are constructing their own linguistic and academic repertoire in the additional language (e.g., Ortega, 2015; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2013; García et al., 2017; Vogel & García, 2017). In short, EMI content achievement could be more attainable with higher English proficiency levels and when instructors implement or integrate students’ L1 in the instruction. With lower levels of English, participants in this study seemed to believe that adjusting to the demands of EMI is challenging.

**EMI and Improvement of Students’ English Language Skills**

One of the benefits of implementing EMI is related to whether learning and teaching through EMI could help students and teachers to improve their English language skills or not. The data showed that there was a consensus among the participants of this study that EMI improves students’ and instructors’ English proficiency. In regard to how
EMI could enhance their English language skills, Azmi, a content instructor, reported “I am practicing my English with my students through teaching biology in English. So, our English language skills will be improved, of course, because we read, speak, and write in English.” A similar response was noted by Suliman, a student in the second year, “It [EMI] helps me to improve my English language in various ways.” Indeed, instructors and students believed that EMI could help them to improve their English language skills.

What the participants of this study mentioned is similar to the findings by Chapple (2015) in Japan, and Belhiah and Elhami (2014) in the UAE. EMI at tertiary education institutions around the globe is considered as a key institutional force to improve student’s English language proficiency, as well as the trend of internationalizing higher education (Chapple, 2015). Besides that, all Saudi universities implement EMI in teaching professional majors, so the student participants unquestioningly believe that EMI is for their own benefit. In other words, the participants assumed that language development happens as a by-product of EMI. The participants’ belief is corresponding to many studies in different regions, and this is one of the reasons why educational policymakers implement EMI in tertiary education based on the assumption that teaching subjects through English could lead to English improvement (See Alsubaiai, 2019; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; British Council/TEPAV 2015; Ghorbani & Alavi, 2014).
Instructors’ and Students’ Impression of English Varieties and Proficiency: The Need to Distinguish between the Naiveness Status, Instructor’s English Language Proficiency, and the Ability to Teach through EMI

It is important to turn the attention to the question of beliefs about instructors’ English varieties teaching in the College. The instructors in the College come from different countries such as Pakistan, South Africa, Turkey, the United States, and other Arab countries, Saudi Arabia is included. Therefore, students are exposed to a variety of English accents which was considered by the student participants of this study as an obstacle for comprehending the lectures. Students are exposed to different types of Englishes in the College which were perceived by some students as an obstacle for comprehending the lectures. Lulu, one of the student participants, noted “some instructors who are non-native English speakers are not clear.” Khli, a British instructor and an English language specialist affirmed that “students are tricked by my accent”. He added “I think students should concentrate more on teachers’ academic competency.” In the interviews with the student participants, some of them claimed that some teachers are not proficient users of English which makes understanding the materials more difficult.

Instructors’ pronunciation is frequently referred to in the literature as an area of concern about EMI instructors’ linguistic competence (Durham, 2014; Saraceni, 2015; Vu & Burns, 2014; Zacharias, 2013). Al-Bakri’s (2017) findings showed that Omani students have the same perceptions of EMI instructors in a public university in Oman. She reported that students have encountered difficulty understanding “Indian instructors” because they speak very fast (p. 137). In fact, Saudi students at secondary school are
exposed only to Saudi, British, and US-accented English through listening texts (Al-Issa, 2005). This could illustrate why students considered any accents of English other than British and American standard accents as incorrect. I believe that students could be better prepared for EMI study in the College once they are familiarized with the varieties of English, especially the English accents of speakers in their immediate environment.

Related to instructors’ English language proficiency, I asked students and instructors about what most students look for in an EMI instructor: their knowledge and control of the academic subject and how to put it across, or whether they speak like English native speakers. The participants of this study believed that the instructors’ being a native English is not a big issue. What more important is that their instructors are proficient users of English, and that they can deliver the content and help them to grasp the materials well. Salim, a content instructor, explained that “the most important factor students look at in instructors is instructors’ knowledge and how they can explain these things.” Students also confirmed that as far as instructors master his/her subject and explain it well, they will be satisfied and their impression toward that instructor will be positive. Indeed, both students and instructors should have a certain threshold of the English language proficiency that helps them to succeed in the EMI program. Later in this chapter, I discussed how limited English proficiency could become a hurdle that prevents students from succeeding in learning and teaching in EMI programs (See 4.3.2).

When I investigated instructors’ perspectives on whether they encounter issues with students related to English proficiency, I found that all instructors do not have an issue with their English proficiency. For instance, Zafa and Azmi shared the same
perspective, as Zafa stated “Being non-English native speakers is not an issue here in the College. We have many English accents.” Similarly, Salim and Muhin, Arabic native instructors, pointed out that they do not face any kind of discrimination because of their English, and they confirmed that students care about how we explain and deliver the lessons to them. As Salim mentioned, “as a medical practitioner and faculty member of the professional year, I do not think students care much about how I speak English and how much English do I have as far as I explain the lesson clearly.” Nassir, a language instructor, had a different opinion and agreed with some students’ perspectives which are that students prefer native English-speaking instructors over non-native English-speaking instructors. When I asked him for the reason, he said that “students prefer English native speakers because they know that there is no way to communicate but through English. So, they will improve their English gradually. The same situation happened to me when I was a student.” In general, while instructors in the College do not seem to encounter any discrimination issues around being non-native English speakers, their perspectives toward their own English language proficiency are complacent.

In addition to issues revolving around language proficiency and naiveness status, pedagogical competency of EMI instructors is an important area of concern in EMI research (Aizawa & Rose, 2018; Barnard, 2015; Williams, 2015). As much research on EMI also indicates, EMI instructors are expected to be competent in both teaching the content and speaking English. The linguistic competence of instructors teaching in EMI has been discussed in the context of Asia (Barnard, 2015; Zacharias, 2013), Europe (Airey & Linder, 2006; Wilkinson, 2015), and Africa (Nel & Müller, 2010). There is a
long history of scholarship about the English proficiency issues of EMI instructors in the world Englishes literature (e.g., Galloway & Rose, 2014), in second language varieties of English (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 2010), English as an international language (Matsuda, 2012), and English as a lingua franca (e.g., Jenkins, 2007). Based on my experience in the Saudi context, the English language proficiency is usually measured in the Saudi job-market by international standardized tests such as IELTS, TOEFL, or a national standardized test like STEP. Indeed, I see that EMI instructors need to have stepped over a certain threshold of proficiency before they can teach successfully (Borg, 2016; Campagna, 2016; Macaro, 2018).

The issue of EMI instructors’ English proficiency was investigated in interviews conducted with university instructors in Iraq by Borg (2016) when several instructors expressed their concerns related to their limitations in spoken English; consequently, they had a negative impact on their confidence to teach. Some of them reported that they have to “teach themselves before being able to teach the students” (Borg, 2016, p. 21). Similarly, Başibek et al.’s (2014) respondents disclosed some difficulties and challenges to express themselves fully in English. In Italy, a qualitative study on EMI in tertiary education interrogated university instructors about concerns related to the poor English of the instructors that could hinder the students’ comprehension (Campagna, 2016, See also Guarda & Helm, 2016 in the Italian context, and Choi, 2013 in Korean context). In Guarda and Helm’s (2016) study, more than ten out of 53 teacher participants considered their own language skills in the English language as one of the major sources of difficulty in teaching through EMI. In fact, it is necessary to distinguish between instructor
language proficiency and an instructor’s ability to teach through EMI. Dimova and Kling’s (2015) study described a test for EMI instructors to assess their language and teaching competency which is called “Test of Oral English Proficiency of Academic Staff” (TOEPAS) (as cited in Macaro, 2018, p. 86). Indeed, EMI instructors’ English language proficiency is a controversial topic, where some studies showed a high level of general proficiency to be unnecessary (Dearden & Macaro, 2016), others some studies reported that EMI instructors do need a high level of English proficiency to be able to deliver the content and communicate the ideas with students appropriately and effectively (Choi, 2013).

**Perceived Advantages of EMI: EMI and Access to Modern Knowledge**

One of the well-known benefits of EMI is that English will provide students and instructors with wide access to ‘modern’ knowledge. For example, Suliman said “nowadays a lot of programs, YouTube channels, or different science sources are in English. So, if you improve your English, you will have access to great knowledge.” Similarly, Zafa pointed out that “EMI provides Saudi universities with modern literature and creates direct communications between students and knowledge.” What Suliman and Zafa mentioned is consistent with the statistic showed that more than 90% of indexed scientific articles are written in English, including those from English as a Foreign Language countries (Ramírez-Castañeda, 2020). Related to the availability of the sources, some interview participants saw learning health-related specialties in English is easier than learning these in Arabic because most of the medical terms are in Greek and Latin. When students are familiar with, for instance, the affixation system of the English
language, memorizing such terminologies in English becomes easier than learning them in Arabic. Muhin mirrored this sentiment when he said, “many medical terminologies in English could be easier for students than in Arabic.” Many students and instructors in the College found English sources easy to access compared to Arabic sources. So, source availability and medical terminologies make the tilt of the EMI over AMI.

Another advantage that resonates with EMI literature is that teaching through English will make Saudi universities competitive globally for ‘internationalization of higher education’. As Khli said, “English just makes Saudi Arabia and Saudi universities more competitive internationally.” Certainly, the implementation of EMI in several contexts around the globe, Japan as an example, has been largely proclaimed at the “macro-level (i.e., national policies)” with aim of globalizing students’ mindsets and developing educational outcomes (Shimauchi, 2018, p. 88). In Europe, globalization and internationalization have a vital role in the increased use of EMI in tertiary education (Coleman et al., 2018; Doiz et al., 2013). That role of EMI is represented in implementing English at European universities to attract international students, and to prepare domestic students for the global market, as well as to raise the profile of institutions (Doiz et al., 2013). So, all participants of this study indicated that EMI would improve the global communications of the university and faculty members by, for example, publishing in high-impact journals, which can in turn impact the university’s reputation and ranking level. All in all, when I asked the interview participants the question whether they are in favor of or against EMI, the results showed that no one was against EMI except Nassir and Lulu. As they explained: “the Arabic language is in
danger because of EMI”. The rest of the participants asserted their preference for EMI for the reasons mentioned earlier in this chapter.

Drawbacks of EMI in the College

Feeling and Experience: Difficulties in Teaching/Learning through English in the College Centered on Learning a New Language

The data of this study showed that instructors and students encounter various experiences in teaching and learning in the EMI context in the College. Two instructors of this study mentioned that they feel stressed and anxious teaching through EMI since teaching in a foreign language is “exhaust[ed] and time and effort consuming” as Azmi stated. Salim further explained this sentiment in one of the interviews:

It [feelings in teaching through English in the College] wasn't that easy when you first teaching in a foreign language even if you have good English, it is still difficult. So, first you will have what they call it presentation phobia and how to overcome that phobia. Then you will have English barrier, and you are not sure if you are qualified enough to teach in English. So, it was not easy, but when you get used to it, like me right now I feel more comfortable sometimes to teach in English than in Arabic (Interview, February 2021).

What Salim said is consistent with Borg’s (2016) study when he investigated Kurdistan-Iraqi university instructors about their feelings of teaching in EMI programs. That means EMI content instructors need to be prepared and provided with pre-service training to be adequately equipped with the necessary skills in teaching through English.
On the other hand, four instructors, two English specialists and two content instructors found that teaching in English is not an issue, and their feelings toward that are normal. Zafa and Muhin did not find teaching through English difficult, which indicated a clear self-assessment about their own proficiency in the English language as well as showed their qualification in teaching in the EMI programs. This is parallel with the views of several EMI instructors in different EMI contexts when they are asked about the instructors’ English proficiency and feelings in teaching in EMI programs (Macaro, 2018). For instance, Wächter and Maiworm (2014) reported that European university program directors have positive views in regard to the language proficiency of instructors. A similar finding is indicated by Dearden and Macaro (2016) when they interrogated university instructors in Austria, Italy, and Poland. Jensen and Thøgersen (2011) conducted an analysis of who chooses EMI among Danish university instructors, and they found that instructors with high English proficiency have positive feelings toward EMI. In other words, high English proficiency instructors feel comfortable in teaching in EMI.

In addition to instructors’ experience in this study, three out of four students described their feelings toward studying in EMI programs as “difficult”, “time-consuming”, and “shocked of the too much information in English.” Only Lulu said that “my feeling is normal”, and he explained that by saying that “because I studied abroad.” Then he mentioned that his classmates find it harsh and difficult “my friends face it harshly because of the English.” Indeed, instructors’ and students’ feelings toward teaching and studying in the EMI programs in the College depend on their experience in
the field and their English language proficiency. So, whoever has previous experience with EMI will be familiar with its obstacles, and s/he encounters a few issues compared with those who have no experience in studying/teaching in EMI programs.

Related to the abovementioned discussion, I asked the instructors about their experiences in teaching in the EMI in the College, and I received six different accounts. The most frequent narrative was the utilization of the students’ L1 in teaching (Discussed in 4.1.1). To clarify, instructors’ experience using students’ L1 is not a disadvantage by itself, rather the unavailability of a systematic and well-written language policy in the College curricula making the use of students’ L1 is difficult. Due to the implementation of students’ L1, another experience exists which is a “difficult balance between Arabic and English instruction in one class” as Nassir and Muhin said. The second most common experience in teaching in the EMI is related to writing and preparing for exams. Salim and Zafa asserted that writing exams take a lot of time to ensure that questions are written in a clear and understandable language in terms of grammar and vocabulary. The difficulty of writing a clear examination maybe because of students’ low English proficiency. Another common experience is that preparing for lectures. Zafa mentioned that “95 percent of the time passed in thinking what to speak because of the students’ low English level. So, EMI is time-consuming.” Similarly, Salim said that “lecture preparation takes more time in English than in Arabic.” In short, instructors and students experienced difficulties in teaching/studying in the EMI programs in the College which are related to unsystematic bilingual teaching, time-consuming in preparing lessons and
exams in a foreign language, and variation of students’ English language proficiency, which are considered as drawbacks of EMI.

**Students’ Low English Proficiency**

One of the important factors that impact students’ and instructors’ attitudes toward EMI implementation is students’ English language proficiency. There is unanimity among the participants of this study about the key disadvantages of EMI in the College which is the students’ low English proficiency. For instance, Salim, an EMS instructor, demonstrated this drawback by two consequences: first, “Students will not understand the whole things when you teach them in English. So, they will miss some important parts of the lectures.” The second one is “some students are hesitant to ask in English if they do not understand especially with online learning.” Other studies in the Gulf region mentioned similar results. For example, Al-Bakri (2017) stated that studying in English profoundly impedes comprehension (See also Al-Nasser, 2015; Troudi, 2009). A similar perspective was reported by a large number of participants in the UEA in Al-Mashikhi et al.’s (2014) study as well as in Qatar in Ellili-Cherif’ and Alkhateeab’s (2015) study who justified their support of Arabic instruction instead of English instruction because of the students’ low English proficiency. All the participants of this study agreed that the major impact of implementing EMI effectively in the College is students’ low English competency.

Students’ low level of English was evident during my classroom observations. Students were hesitant to speak in English, and even if they did, they rarely used a full sentence but rather fragments. I also witnessed that students’ limited English proficiency
prevented them from learning effectively in the EMI environment because students mostly listened to the instructors and took a passive role in the classroom. If they would participate, they used phrases and fragmented questions such as “what meaning of …” or “What we do now…” and did not respond to questions in full sentences. The observation was in a professional class, which means that students I observed had already passed the two-year pre-professional program. Students’ English proficiency in this level should be an equivalent to a 5.0 score in the IELTS which is described by “you have a partial command of the language, and cope with overall meaning in most situations, although you are likely to make many mistakes. You should be able to handle basic communication in your own field” (British Council, 2021). In fact, during my observation of the junior students in the College, I found that students’ English level is close to what the description stated above; however, I am wondering if this level is sufficient and satisfactory to achieve the objectives of the programs and help be successful in learning complex academic texts in the EMI program. For instance, when the team-leader responded to the instructor while examining the patient, they responded by “how much smoke?” and “not high not low.” I also noticed that students with low English proficiency tended to ask clarification questions to their classmates in Arabic when it came to task clarifications and reading comprehension. Therefore, the data asserted that low English proficiency negatively impacts the efficacy of EMI and prevents students from fully engaging in the class materials.
The relation between language proficiency and short-term and rote memorization:

Memorizing the texts without proper understanding of the materials causes short-term memorization

The instructor and student participants reported that information delivered through English, the foreign language for all student participants, is stored in students’ minds for a short time compared to instruction through students’ L1. The participants also confirmed the fact that studying in a foreign language consumes more time and effort than studying in L1. When I asked Lulu, a student in the respiratory therapy program, about the disadvantages of EMI, he replied that “besides the burden of memorizing a lot of new vocabulary, students memorize the texts without proper understanding of the materials.” What Lulu said happened with the student participants studying in the College. Similarly, the students I observed were not linguistically ready to study through EMI according to their instructors’ responses, as it is discussed in this chapter. In fact, students sometimes tend to memorize the academic texts because memorization is rooted in their culture. Students used to be assessed by what they memorize in the school. For example, in Quran class, rote memorization is the only valid way to succeed. Therefore, students occasionally cover their weaknesses in the English language by memorizing the academic texts.

Barnard (2014) pointed out that students in Indonesia encounter difficulty to comprehend and interact effectively in an English-only learning environment since their English language skills are not enough to produce “original work at the appropriate academic standard” (Barnard, 2014, p. 13). Moreover, Kirkgöz’s (2014) study gleaned
many disadvantages of EMI in relation to academic subject content learning. He indicated the following consequences of learning through EMI: 1) difficulties in understanding content knowledge; 2) content knowledge is only retained for short periods and soon forgotten; 3) learning content through EMI takes longer than through students’ L1; 4) participation in open discussion during lectures is harder in English than in the students’ L1. In short, EMI has a negative consequence on students’ learning attainment.

**Positive relationship between students’ English proficiency and academic achievement**

All student participants believed that low English proficiency will lead to poor content achievement because of the strong relationship between students’ English language proficiency and their understanding of the content. For instance, Thamir, a student participant in this study, stated the following: “It [the relationship between English proficiency and academic attainment] is a positive relationship because if your English proficiency is low and does not help you to comprehend the texts and terminologies, how come you will succeed in your study.” Another student added to the necessity of high English proficiency by saying that “studying in English will help you finding information you need with explanations in different ways”, so students with low English proficiency will not be able to access and comprehend English resources and use them effectively which will impact their academic level. Similarly, three instructors agreed with the students’ perspective about the influence of English proficiency on the students’ academic achievement and content learning. Salim asserted this statement by saying that “I faced some students who have poor academic performance and that mainly
because of their poor English proficiency.” Moreover, Zafa explained the need for high English proficiency in studying sciences “English comprehension has a key role in sciences because science courses are descriptive not like mathematics.” So, seven out of ten participants believed that the relationship between students’ English proficiency and academic achievement is positive.

Another angle to demonstrate the relationship between English language proficiency and academic achievement is that students’ performance during formative and summative assessment practices in class. As Muhin, a content instructor, put: “their understanding will be hard not only of the content but also in the exam.” Thamir, a student, asserted that “The Arabic language will be easier, so students will understand each question easier and get the grades they deserve.” The participants of this study believed that low English proficiency impacts students’ academic assessment. This is also consistent with other EMI literature such as Al-Mashikhi et al.’s (2014) study. They found that 48.3% of the participants felt that their GPA is impacted by the course’s use of EMI. One of the issues that students found in the exam particularly is facing new words. Another issue is that some students understood the questions but found it difficult to express themselves in English (Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011). In a mixed-method research, Cho (2012) investigated linguistic challenges Korean students faced in the EMI courses and the effects of EMI on content teaching and learning outcomes. The result of his study showed that the EMI policy implemented in an EFL context proved to be “ineffective and unsuitable in delivering course content due to the limited English proficiency of professors and students” (Cho, 2012, p. 135). Thus, implementing EMI
unilaterally by the university without a careful consideration to the students’ and
instructors’ context could lead to adverse effects on students’ academic assessment such
as misunderstanding the content of the courses and uncomprehending the language of the
tests.

In contrast, three instructors claimed that low English proficiency has no
influence on the students’ academic achievement. Khli illustrated this idea: “Let’s put it
this way, there are important figures in the history of music who probably not able to read
music and don't know a lot about music theory but that didn't stop them from excelling in
music.” He supported his opinion by his personal experience in the College “from my
personal experience here in College, I have noticed some of the brightest students are not
really the best in English, anyway.” Nassir confirmed this phenomenon by students’
grades in the professional courses as he said that “when I put students’ grades in the
system, their grades in the professional courses are higher than English courses. What I
see is that the proficiency of English language has nothing to do with their understanding
of the subject.” In other words, if the necessary scaffolding is provided in class, students
with low English proficiency can still be successful in understanding complex academic
texts. This is also supported by the research done in bilingual education in the US where
newcomers in mainstream classrooms show promising academic achievement if the right
pedagogical conditions are created for multilingual students (Halliday & Matthiessen,
2014; Vogel & García, 2017). Some of these conditions include but are not limited to
using tools such as Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and genre-based pedagogy that
can help decrease the gap between what students know (L1 and some prior content
knowledge) and what they don’t know (L2 and new content knowledge) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In fact, research on the relationship between language proficiency and content knowledge showed how sound knowledge of the content area helps students to overcome deficiencies in linguistic knowledge (Macaro, 2018; Yeh, 2014). So, both arguments are based on studies that support their validity (Al-Bakri, 2013 and 2017; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2017; Khan, 2013).

I also found studies that affirmed that English proficiency influences students’ academic achievement in the context of EMI. To name a few, Khan (2013) reported that the degree of difficulties the students claimed to be facing was directly affected by their level of English. Macaro and Akincioglu (2017) also revealed in their study about students’ beliefs in medium of instruction at a university level, with a sample of 989 students in 18 different Turkish universities, that Turkish university students believed that content is usually simplified in EMI classes, and they would possibly learn more through the medium of Turkish. Several EMI institutions around the globe altered their language policy to reflect students’ academic status. For example, language policy of some colleges in Qatar University, namely, law, international affairs, mass communication, business and economics colleges changed the medium of instruction back to students’ L1 due to the level of students’ English proficiency and its impact on content learning (Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015). Other countries such as Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the UAE design a bridging program (known in Saudi Arabia as Preparatory Year Program (PYP)) to fill the student’s English proficiency gap between secondary and tertiary education. In other words, PYP helps students to meet the linguistic challenges posed by EMI in
tertiary education (Bozdogan & Karlidag, 2013; McMullen, 2014; Rogier, 2012). Despite the English support given in the PYP, some students who graduated from PYP still need to improve their English proficiency (Shamim et al., 2016). Therefore, some instructors and students saw that English language proficiency could jeopardize their performance in the EMI program and become a barrier for them to contribute to the institution and academic field effectively. Indeed, seven out of ten of the participants are convinced that low English proficiency leads to poor content knowledge.

Effects of EMI on Students’ Home Language

It’s important to discuss the impact of over-relying on EMI on the national language (Arabic in this case). In this study, KSAU-HS’s students are from Saudi Arabia and their L1 is Arabic as it is stated in the admission criteria of the KSAU-HS on the official website (“The applicant must be a Saudi national”). So, I asked the participants of this study about the effects of the widespread introduction of EMI on the home language. I have received the following responses: four instructors stated clearly that the Arabic language is in danger because of the EMI implementation. Khli explained part of the effect of the EMI widespread by:

I believe that it will reduce proficiency in both, and I have seen this. I have seen my Saudi students who have lost proficiency in Arabic. So, they are neither proficient in Arabic nor English. Being good at Saudi Arabic that's one side of being professional in Arabic, the other side of being literate, educated, and intellectual in Arabic is to know the Classic Arabic. I think that the effect of EMI probably is detrimental (Interview December 2020).
Nassir and Salim agreed with Khli on the negative impact that EMI may bring on the students’ L1 use and development. Moreover, Salim reported that the prevalence of EMI affects how people communicate in the medical fields such as in hospitals and conferences. He exemplified this with the following account: “When my Syrian instructor utilized the Arabic medical terms, we got lost because we are familiar with English terminology.” In addition to that, I saw two Saudi medical practitioners whose L1 is Arabic speaking to each other in broken English avoiding using their L1 in the work due to hospital language policy. The domination of English in the field of sciences or professional specializations (medicine, engineering, IT, etc.) in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia could have detrimental consequences. For instance, Khli again compared the Saudi context with what happened in Morocco. He said that “What happens in Saudi Arabia, has happened in Morocco. You’ve got a situation where you haven’t elite Borghese who are very much at home speaking French, but very deficient in standard Arabic. I imagine that will happen here as a result of widespread of EMI.” Thus, instructor participants of this study warn about the widespread introduction of EMI, and call for an immediate reformation of the university language policy to protect students’ L1.

Students’ responses were consistent with their instructors. All students mentioned that studying in English negatively influences their proficiency in the Arabic language. Lulu said that “I am personally getting to lose some Arabic words. Arabic publications and conferences in health sciences would be destroyed If we continue this [teaching science-related majors through EMI only].” (also see Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015 for
similar results). Two instructors expressed that EMI affected the Arabic language, but as they put it is not very harmful. In my opinion, the effects of EMI introduction could still be influential on educational policymakers and how they approach home language use, especially in professional majors in tertiary education.

In the Arabic Gulf region, educators and social activists recognized the implicit threats of the English language on indigenous identity particularly in the Arabic language, a language with rich literature (Belhiah & Elhami, 2014). The imposition of English-only in the Saudi universities, particularly in science-related majors, brings several consequences on both Saudi’s L1 and culture (Ryhan, 2014) which is consistent with the participants’ perspectives. The common ramifications of the dominance of the English language are “loss of alternative research methodologies and academic orientations, loss of local language debate and dissemination of ideas, diminished quality in education from lack of fluency, and finally, a barrier to higher education access for students with little exposure to English” (Altbach, 2019, P. 2). Another impact of EMI specifically in Saudi Arabia is that the language policy can be recognizing the state-of-affairs where English and Arabic are interchangeably used as a medium of instruction in professional specializations at different frequencies depending on the instructors’ preference and competence in Arabic and English (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016). This is illustrated in the participants’ responses when I asked them about how they implement EMI and in what circumstances they use English in the College at the beginning of this chapter. This unsystematic alternation between the two languages may cause a confusion to some students as Amman indicated earlier.
Another way that is affecting the Arabic language is that Saudi universities, like other Expanding-Circle countries, urge their faculty members to publish in prestigious English language journals and offer them financial rewards for doing so. At the same time, publishing in local journals yields few benefits (Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Altbach, 2019; Jiang et al., 2016). Language policymakers in Saudi Arabia should consider the rhetorical question raised by Thiong’o (1998): “By our continuing to write in foreign languages, paying homage to them, are we not on the cultural level continuing that neocolonial slavish and cringing spirit?” (p. 101). Educational institutions in Saudi Arabia will not elevate the status and enrich the literature of the Arabic language if they pursue separating it from professional majors and scientific fields.

**EMI Decision-making and Models “Decision Should Be a Collaboration, and Preparatory Model is the preferable one”**

After knowing that students graduate from high school with low English proficiency skills, it is important to know who has the right to decide to introduce EMI, particularly in the College. The responses varied into three opinions (job market, the Ministry of Education, and all educational stakeholders). The first opinion is explained by the fact that the job market influences the educational policymakers to introduce EMI especially in the College which is a specialized university in health sciences; so, they need the form of English that is prevalent in health sciences around the world. Salim, an EMS lecturer, noted that “the accreditation of the university who should decide the medium of instruction because most of the materials we have is adopted from outside sources, so there is no way to teach other than English.” Furthermore, English as a lingua
franca is utilized as inter-community communication in hospitals in Saudi Arabia so that students need to know English to communicate effectively in the workplace (Alshareef et al., 2018). The second opinion argued that the Ministry of Education has the right whether to implement EMI in tertiary education or not. They believed that the Ministry is qualified to choose the most suitable and beneficial language of instruction for students, instructors, and the society. The last opinion claimed the importance of making a collective decision when all educational stakeholders (instructors, students, and policymakers) get involved in the decision-making process. The participants of this study pointed out that it is important to listen to the actors who are directly getting involved in the EMI education process. The instructors’ responses mirrored what McMullen (2014) and Ryhan, (2014) found in their study on role and impact of EMI in Saudi higher education institutions.

Relating to the decision-making matters, I asked the participants of this study about the appropriate EMI model that fits students’ academic needs. I explained the five EMI models\textsuperscript{11} (Macaro, 2018): Selective, Preparatory, Concurrent, Multilingual, and Ostrich to the interviewees individually to familiarize them with the pros and cons of each model. After that, I asked each one of them to give their opinions about these models and select the ones that would best fit into the College context. Before discussing the participants’ choices, I would briefly explain the scenario of EMI programs in the College. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, all programs are divided into two

\textsuperscript{11} The Preparatory Model is designed to improve students’ English proficiency before beginning studying in the EMI program. In the Selection Model, students begin studying in the academic program once they are selected although some EAP or ESP supports are offered. See Macaro (2018) for further details about the other EMI models.
categories: pre-professional program and professional program. In general, what is happening in the College is close to the Preparatory Model. Interestingly, all of the students chose the Preparatory Model, and when I asked about the reason behind that, Suliman replied to me that “Preparatory Model is the best because it will prepare students for professional studies by improving their English language and academic skills.” This selection is partially similar to what is implemented in Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Turkey (Macaro, 2018). Because many students emanating from high schools do not have the required level of English proficiency when they start EMI programs, they take bridging courses in order to get them up to speed for EMI (Macaro, 2018; McMullen, 2014).

The instructors’ choices were divided equally between the Selection Model and the Preparatory Model. Salim, an instructor who chose the Selection Model, justified the choice by saying “it is not fair for students to be in the same class with those students who have higher English proficiency. It will affect their academic performance.” What Salim said in the interview excerpt is consistent with the British Council/TEPAV (2015) report when it advocated Higher Education in Turkey to implement the Selection Model. In the Selection Model, the language specialists will offer some EAP and ESP support, while the content instructors are responsible to deliver the academic subject to students. It is also compatible with what is applied in China and Japan (Macaro, 2018). In contrast, Zafa one of the instructors who chose the Preparatory Model justified the reason behind selecting that by “Preparatory Model is the best one for students here in the College because students’ English proficiency is low when they graduated from high school, so
we must improve their English and close the gap between high school and university.”
What Zafa pointed out is consistent with several EMI studies in the Gulf region (Al-Bakri, 2017; McMullen, 2014; Al-Maadheed, 2013) among others. Implementing the appropriate model can enhance students’ academic achievement and improve the institution’s outcome. Knowing the most appropriate EMI model relies on our investigation and understanding of the context. In short, the findings from interviews showed that the majority of the student and instructor participants preferred the Preparatory Model for the College context.

**Conclusion: Recapitulation of Findings**

As the findings of this study illustrated, while there are a wide range of challenges experienced by both students and instructors teaching and learning in EMI, several opportunities also exist. From my observations notes and the interviews responses, I found that both stakeholders believed that some kind of bilingual model of education was preferable to English-only, especially in the College case where all students come from the same linguistic background ‘The Arabic language’. Data from classroom observations also showed that the interactions between the instructors and students were limited which is a common feature in the EMI classroom (Brock-Utne, 2012; Kagwesage, 2012). Codeswitching and limited classroom participations conform with several studies investigating EMI instructors’ and students’ opinions about the implementation of students’ L1 in teaching, and analyzing students’ participation in a foreign language (See Al-Bakri, 2017; Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014). The data also showed three major roles of EFL instructors: first, filtering out students in order to determine who
succeeded to the later stage; second, helping students to pass the test; third, improving students’ English language proficiency. In fact, it is important to understand the differences between English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and the nature of teaching general English, and what fits best for the EMI programs in the College (Jiang et al, 2016). Data demonstrated the importance of English Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses in the pre-professional as well as professional programs to improve students’ Academic English skills. EAP and ESP should be adopted to help students focus more on what they need in their academic and professional careers.

The second theme of the data was about beliefs on the EMI approach and how students and instructors assumed that EMI could improve the university educational outcomes. The aim of this theme was to interrogate instructors’ and students’ about their beliefs about the EMI approach in the College and how it could improve students’ English proficiency. It also discussed instructors’ and students’ impressions of English varieties and proficiency and how students’ limited exposure to varieties of English causes comprehension issues. All the participants of this study agreed that EMI does not act as a barrier to quality education, rather it helps them to engage in global communications and provides them with better and wider access to modern knowledge compared to their L1. Some instructors believed that EMI could improve the quality of education in the university through a) providing abundant resources, b) enhancing the academic reputation of the university, c) helping graduate students to pursue studying
abroad in universities around the globe. In brief, all interview participants showed their support of EMI at the time of this study.

In the third theme, the findings pointed out several drawbacks of implementing EMI in the College from the instructors’ and students’ perspectives. The majority of instructors showed their competency to teach through English although it is stressful, time-and effort-consuming, and it could hinder student-instructor communications. That is related to the second disadvantage which is related to students’ low English proficiency. All participants acknowledged that low English proficiency hampers the effectiveness of EMI. Consequently, instructors and students believed that students could preserve the information delivered through EMI for a short time compared to the instruction delivered through students’ L1. Therefore, rote memorizations, lack of participation, burden of memorizing a lot of new vocabularies, and others impact students’ information retention in the long-term memory. Another disadvantage was the effect of EMI on the home language (as also discussed in other areas of Applied linguistics Altbach, 2019; Canagarajah, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2013; Pennycook, 1994). Although instructors and students agreed that the widespread introduction of EMI impacts the Arabic language, they considered English as a key instrument to teach professional and scientific specialties for the reasons mentioned earlier in this study.

One of the important findings of this study addressed the preferences on EMI models that would best fit into the local needs of the participants. Among the five models, the participants were divided into two groups in terms of which one of those
models fit into their expectations. Student participants and three instructors preferred the Preparatory Models because it helps them to prepare for professional studies and improve their English proficiency. On the other hand, the other three instructors chose the Selection Model justifying their choice by highlighting the significance of filtering students to create a competitive admission environment, also minimizing the variation level of students’ English proficiency among students in one class. Besides the participants’ preferences, there are many factors that should be taken into considerations by educational policymakers before adopting a specific model such as cost and benefit, the applicability of the model, students’ academic needs, and instructors’ capability (Macaro, 2018). Although the College design two years bridging courses and prepare students for professional studies, some students and instructors found that this preparation is not sufficient. Based on these insights, the university should pay more attention to development of preparatory (pre-professional) programs to improve student's English proficiency and to improve their pedagogy to address EMI students’ linguistic and academic needs.

The next chapter discusses the implications of this research project represented in the effect of L1 in teaching and learning, the necessity of a plan that assesses the effectiveness of a particular change, e.g., EMI implementation, and monolingualism bias in teaching professional majors. The implication of this study also pointed out the prioritization of using the English language can deteriorate the Arabic language, reinforce the Western values in Saudi universities and the job market, and shift the interest of many Saudis toward learning the English language, rather than Arabic. Chapter five also talked
about recommendations for teachers, students, and policymakers in tertiary education, and indicated some important topics for future research. Finally, the limitation of the study, and my reflection on the dissertation journey concluded the chapter.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

This exploratory study revealed the students’ and instructors’ beliefs toward EMI implementation in the College in Al-Ahsa. It also shed light on how EMI is implemented by the educational stakeholders, i.e., teachers and students, and what impact it has on the students’ and teachers’ teaching and learning environment. The findings also discussed the implications of EMI in different settings around the globe and juxtaposed those findings with the data I collected. The benefit of that is to see how EMI may impact a) students’ comprehension of the content, b) modes of delivering the lessons, c) the national language in the entire country, namely Arabic, and d) the education products either negatively, positively, or both.

For Saudi Arabia, as for the rest of the world, the obvious points of reference for the exponential growth of EMI are globalization of economic structures, internationalization of education, and changing demographics (Macaro, 2018). As internationalization becomes a necessary change for the most prestigious universities around the globe, English has become the vehicle of the content in the tertiary education systems of many non-English-dominant countries (Earls, 2016). Saudi Arabia, among other countries, moves forward to the Englishization of tertiary education specifically in the professional majors (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016). Indeed, EMI stakeholders’ (students’ and teachers’) beliefs and attitudes are important to be analyzed and discussed for educational policymakers and the development and success of the institution.
Implications of the Research

Interrogating the teachers’ and students’ attitudes toward EMI implementation in the College and investigating the effect of the EMI policy on teachers’ instruction and students’ academic learning led to several important implications in terms of how EMI can best be utilized in the Saudi context. As the findings of this study also indicated, the utilization of students’ L1 is an important factor in teaching and learning in the EMI programs (Al-najjar et al., 2015; Alhamami, 2015; Canagarajah, 2005), specifically in the College. For example, Alhamami (2015) mentioned that the utilization of students’ L1 in the EMI programs is considered by students and teachers as a facilitative tool for comprehensible communications. All student and teacher participants perceived that students’ L1 is a beneficial source in teaching and learning, so teachers tend to implement both languages, English, and Arabic, in their instructions. Indeed, L1 use enhances students’ understanding and helps them to cope with university level studies easily. In short, the study appears to support the argument for a change in the language policy in the EMI to meet the teachers’ and students’ academic needs since the current language policy embraces the English-only approach.

English language curricula need to be redesigned and updated to meet students’ English language proficiency and EMI program requirements to improve the quality of education the students receive in the College. An overemphasis on the English language may not meet all students’ professional needs. For example, many professions in the public and private sectors in the country require professional Classic Arabic, which is not a skill that can be polished within an EMI-only context (Al-Bakri, 2017). EMI students
need to be equipped with necessary professional knowledge to function efficiently in the local and global job markets. For instance, the findings in this study indicated that many students’ English language proficiency is not high enough to grasp the discipline-specific knowledge, and this makes English an added burden for them. Students’ low English proficiency is common in the EMI programs where English is considered a foreign language in the society (Borg, 2015; Macaro, 2018). Further evidence is shown when students’ comprehension of the academic English textbooks is dependent heavily on their ability to translate English textbooks and instructors’ handouts into Arabic (Al-Bakri, 2017). Indeed, The EMI policy should consider the local context and students’ linguistic competence (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016).

English language teaching has been highly impacted by the ideology of monolingual and monocultural bias, clearly exposed in the insistence on “standard” English as the norm, the refusal to give a pivotal role to the students’ L1 in learning English, the marginalization of “non-native” English teachers, and the disinterest in maintaining indigenous cultural traditions (Canagarajah, 2005). These factors are obstacles to healthy linguistic mediation and interaction that can take place in the Saudi society. Research in language acquisition confirms that “a thorough grounding in one’s L1 and culture enhances the ability to acquire other languages, literacies, and knowledge” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 2) See also (Coleman et al., 2018). Therefore, Saudi educational policymakers should not run away from implementing the Arabic language in professional majors on the pretext that the translation process is inefficient and incompetent. Rather, they should discuss with other agencies of power how to design an
equal language policy to pursue an inclusive pedagogy that empowers learners by giving them agency to use whatever language they can for a richer educational experience.

Some students and teachers revealed their preference to study and teach in Arabic, but they have no other choice than English since all universities in Saudi Arabia offer professional/science-related programs through English only. This evokes Phillipson’s theory (1992, 2009) of linguistic imperialism when he argues that the indigenous languages are negatively impacted by the widespread use of the English language. For clarification, the EMI imposition in Saudi Arabia is not from an outside power but rather self-imposed by local educational policymakers in the Ministry of Education. Unfortunately, the agency and power to resist such a policy is taken away from teachers and students, a situation that Troudi and Jendi termed “choiceless choice” (2011, p. 41). In other words, in order to continue in tertiary education i.e., professional majors, in their own country, students have to study in a language that is foreign to them. In fact, EMI imposition in tertiary education, especially by limiting the education of professional majors in all Saudi universities in the English language, could pose threats on the status of Arabic in education and serious psychological effects on students’ self-esteem (e.g., Channa, 2012; Cots, 2013; Inal et al., 2021; Kırkgöz, 2005; Li, 2013; Phillipson, 1992; Tayem et al., 2020). That does not mean outside factors such as internationalization of tertiary education do not affect the educational policymakers.

The prioritization of English language in the EMI context can weaken students’ knowledge of the Arabic language in the discipline-specific knowledge, overlook local culture needs in Saudi universities and the job market, and shift the interest of many
Saudis toward learning the English language, rather than Arabic. To avoid repeating historical examples of colonizers associating indigenous cultures and languages with negative qualities of backwardness, underdevelopment, humiliation, and punishment, Saudi officials must consider the connection between language and culture and implement just and effective policy to protect the Arabic language from linguistic genocide. In fact, the imposition of English-only represented by EMI in the Saudi universities, particularly in professional majors, brings several consequences on both Saudi’s L1 and culture (Ryhan, 2014). An example of that is what Morgado and Coelho (2013) pointed out that, in Portugal, EMI is more than a linguistic change, rather, it is a double-edged impact on both education and research. Indeed, the impact of EMI on education and scholarship is not exclusive to Portugal, rather it also affects other EFL countries such as Saudi Arabia (see Ryhan, 2014; Al-Kahtany et al., 2016).

Globalization and its roles in spreading EMI around the world are also ones of the primary causes of language extinction or linguistic genocide, that is contributed to greater disparity between the rich and the poor (Phillipson, 1992). Kumaravadivelu (2006) sees English as a ‘Trojan Horse’, a hidden threat to one’s cultural liberty. From this angle, EMI students who are exposed to and taught through English-only may not be able to communicate effectively with their local community and explain specialized medical terminologies clearly in a language they do not study through it, as Salim confirmed it (See also Tayem et al., 2020). Certainly, educational institutions in Saudi Arabia should manage to relocate the center of the English language by decentering it.
The findings also showed that the following consequences may impact the effectiveness of EMI implementation: Students’ low English proficiency, short-term and rote memorizations, and students’ unreadiness for studying in EMI programs. Students’ academic achievement through EMI has to be questioned since the reading load is reduced, and most of the academic skills are avoided. For example, students depend on translation and simplified materials such as teachers’ handouts, as Zafa stated earlier, to bridge the linguistic gap. If the tentative conclusions of my study are confirmed by students and teachers that students are not well-prepared for the EMI program from high school, and their L1 is impacted by English imperialism, then there will be a case for reassessing and reevaluating the application of EMI and the effectiveness of teaching through it. Indeed, the quality of academic knowledge gained through EMI has also to be questioned to ensure that educational outcomes are not affected by EMI implementation (King, 2014; Mouhanna, 2016).

Another implication of this study was the model of EMI implemented in the College. Teachers and students preferred the Preparatory Model since it is more effective and appropriate than other models by providing students with ample English support, and help them to accommodate studying in the tertiary education programs (Macaro, 2018; McMullen, 2014). In fact, students graduate from high school with low English proficiency skills, so the College designs pre-professional programs where students are exposed to intensive English language and basic sciences courses through EMI. Unfortunately, the Ministry of Education plans to cancel the Preparatory Year Program which may influence KSAU-HS to switch to the Selection Model. Consequently, some
students would not be able to get enrolled in EMI programs due to the language barrier (Briggs et al., 2017; British Council/TEPAV, 2015). Indeed, my study offered suggestive evidence for Preparatory Model, at the time of this study, by teachers and students at the College since it helps to improve students’ English level and prepare them to engage smoothly in the EMI programs.

**EFL Curricula in College Needs to Be Reconceptualized in the Pre-professional Program “Let’s Concentrate on Academic English, and Providing Professional Students with English Academic Tutorials”**

Regardless of the varieties of English in the College, I asked the interview participants to mention solutions for teaching the English language in the pre-professional program and help students improve their English proficiency in the professional program in the College. I asked Khli, an English instructor, how EFL instructors could help students to overcome the obstacles of studying in the EMI program and achieve academic success. His response emphasized on teaching Academic English and “changing the syllabi completely” and he said that “let’s concentrate on Academic English and teach one academic English course.” English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses provide language instruction for an academic study designed in a way that serves the program objectives. In other words, EAP aims to improve students’ language skills such as reading, grammar, writing, and vocabulary development, as well as students’ academic study skills include test and note-taking skills, academic vocabulary usage, critical reading and writing, comprehending academic lectures, research and library skills, etc. The focus of the College pre-professional program for the English language
courses is on language skills only (See Appendix E for books’ list for the English language courses). The pre-professional program needs to include courses that prepare students for academic skills (EAP). In brief, the participant instructors of this study confirmed that students need to be equipped with both language study skills as well as academic study skills.

Azmi and Nassir, instructors in the pre-professional program, confirmed what Khli emphasized on the need to adopt EAP courses. In fact, the need for English for academic purposes courses especially in the Saudi context is discussed in Mahi ur Rahman and Alhaisoni (2013). In their paper, they reflected on three major issues in teaching the English language in Saudi Arabia. One of them is the need of designing effective English language teaching programs that adopt and focus on teaching EAP and ESP in order to help students acquire the appropriate knowledge of the English language as well as equip them with academic skills to meet their specific needs. Similarly, Rose et al.’s (2019) study highlighted the key role of EAP and ESP in supporting and preparing EMI students for studying through English. They claimed that having high English language proficiency is a predictor of success in EMI; so, students performing excellently in the EAP classes is a stronger predictor of their success later in the EMI program. It is also highly correlated with self-efficacy and confidence. Therefore, if pre-professional program instructors in the College do not prepare pre-professional students for academic study, students would not be able to cope with challenges in the professional studies later.
Salim and Muhin, content instructors in the professional program, agreed with Azmi that the current English courses are inadequate to improve students’ English proficiency to be able to study professional courses in English. So, they suggested to give professional students tutorials in the English language even if they passed the pre-professional studies. Furthermore, Salim insisted on the importance of giving tutorials in the English language not only for students but also for content instructors. He illustrated that “they [content instructors] should have more tutorials on how to deliver information in English.” Salim also clarified that students’ low English proficiency is not a one-side issue to fix, instead “there are many sides we have to work on in order to develop students’ English.” Another solution that could overcome students’ low English proficiency is to change the College admission criteria as he explained that “that will make the environment more competitive for students, and they will invest more time in their study to get higher grades, in order to be admitted to their favorite program.” What Salim said is significant in creating a rigorous learning setting in the pre-professional studies where students are doing their best to get an admission in their preferable specialization in professional studies.

**Improve Teaching Methods to Be Student-Centered and “Focus on Textbooks, Not Instructors’ Slides and Handouts”**

During my conversations, instructor participants offered solutions to overcome some of the difficulties and obstacles in the EMI programs in the College. One of them is to alter teaching methods to be student-centered instead of instructor-centered. As Nassir indicated “we have to have a friendly students-instructors relationship to implement
student-centered method effectively.” Instructors being familiar with the students’
academic background, having a good relationship with students, and preparing students
well for the class are beneficial to help students engage in the classroom successfully. As
a result, students will be more active and able to improve his/her language proficiency.
Indeed, EMI instructors in the College saw that the student-centered method is preferable
and useful to solve some obstacles of teaching such as students’ lack participation in the
college, yet there are some restraints that prevent them from implementing it such as
students’ low English proficiency, as instructors said.

Another related solution to solve the obstacles of EMI in the College is to focus
more on authentic materials such as textbooks used in the area, not solely relying on
instructors’ slides and handouts. Zafà, a content instructor, explained this by discussing
the necessity of employing a “university policy that students have to read textbooks, and
instructors have to teach from the textbooks.” This means that the students in the College
are not provided with a reading list that they have to read over a specific period as is
common for university students. As Zafa claimed, most of the students just read the
instructors’ handout or power-point slides that the instructor prepares, and they do not
study from the required textbook(s). Supplying students with simplified materials that
summarize the required textbooks and lectures have been noticed by Cobb and Horst
(2001) and Al-Mahrooqi and Tuzlukova (2014). In other words, watering down the
curriculum with easy-to-digest summaries and handouts is neither beneficial for students’
language growth nor does it help with content development. Due to simplified materials,
some students may find reading the required textbook(s) assigned in the course syllabus
is unnecessary. King (2014) examined the reading loads in a UAE university and whether or not that load would meet international standards. Accreditation and validation bodies of degree with regard to reading are dependent on the reading loads in candidate programs. I would argue that this concern, i.e., reading loads in the College, is valid for the context of this study for the same reasons mentioned above.

**Annual Report from Instructors about the Program Progression: Instructors’ Leadership is Associated with Students’ Achievement**

Other solutions to overcome obstacles of EMI in the College, as discussed by the instructor participants, is to write an annual report about the program progress. Zafa suggested that “instructors should write the difficulties they encounter in the annual report to the university administration to tackle the issues.” In the College, instructors are required to write an annual report to describe their accomplishments, suggestions, comments, and inquiries of the academic year. The report includes difficulties in teaching materials to students, and how to deliver the content to students effectively and help students get involved and engaged in the lesson successfully and help them to be active learners instead of passive learners. So, Zafa emphasized on the importance of the annual report to be written in detail by instructors and explain the obstacles they face while they are teaching students. In my conversation with Amman, he pointed out that instructors and students should be involved in the decision-making process of teaching and learning improvement and assessment since they are primary stakeholders in the education system. Similarly, Zafa stated that “university management and administration should include instructors and, in some way, students in the modification and improvement of
the teaching methods and assessment.” What Zafa and Amman asked for is discussed in studies such as Ingersoll et al. (2018) and Tijani (2020) that have investigated who should have a role in decision making in the schools. In Ingersoll et al.’s (2018) study, they focused on a Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Survey including whether instructors can raise concerns that are important to them, and whether leaders support instructors or not. They found that instructors more often have a “substantial role in decisions regarding classroom academic instruction … and engaging in school improvement planning” (p. 15). Their analysis also showed that instructor leadership is clearly associated with students’ achievement. Likewise, Tijani (2020) examined instructors’ involvement in decision making in a school in Nigeria. The study illustrated that instructors’ engagement and commitment in school academic planning “influence their level of job performance positively in secondary schools” (p. 1). The previous studies and the participants of this project see that instructors’ involvement in decision-making is important, so as to keep up the development of the education process that is related to instructors’ job performance and academic instruction.

**EMI and Perpetuating Elitism**

One of the EMI implications is that it may create stratification in society as students from low socioeconomic status could not study through English. The issue of elitism or selection in the EMI has been introduced by several researchers, for example in Spain (Bruton, 2011), in Sweden (Yoxsimer Paulsrud, 2014), and in Denmark (Lueg & Lueg, 2015). The general hypothesis of these studies was to investigate whether EMI creates a division among the society, or whether studying through English is perpetuating
divisiveness or not. Leug and Lueg (2015) confirmed that students at Aarhus University in Denmark perceived that “students from a higher socioeconomic status background were more likely to choose EMI” (as cited in Macaro, 2018, p. 113). Whether some groups of society have access to EMI but not others is a subject of discussion in research, including what Phillipson (1992 and 2009) mentioned as ‘linguistic imperialism.’

According to the data collected from interviews and official documents, the finding of EMI and perpetuating elitism issues varied between agreement and rejection. Khli provided an illustrative viewpoint by saying that “English perpetuates negative aspects like social elitism.” In Saudi Arabia, students from the low socioeconomic status cannot afford the expenses of studying the English language abroad. Moreover, high English proficiency is considered an effective tool to succeed in the EMI according to the majority of researchers in EMI (Khan, 2013; Macaro & Akincioglu, 2017; Solloway, 2017) (See section 4.3.2 and 4.3.2.2 for further discussion). Salim, Muhin, and Lulu stated that studying in the EMI would not be as easy for students from low socioeconomic status as for other social classes due to limited access to EMI education. Thus, low socioeconomic students may encounter more challenges and obstacles through studying in the EMI than those students who study abroad and have high English level of proficiency.

On the other hand, Nassir, Zafa, and Azmi as well as the other three students confirmed that EMI has no relation in perpetuating elitism since every student has equal access to the academic text in the College. As Azmi said “Everybody has access to English in the College”. Zafa confirmed that by “there is no elitism in the College”. In
addition, Amman explained an important point: “I do not think that [EMI creating social elitism/limited access to EMI materials] is correct because even if the students do not have the right materials or the proper access to textbooks or technology, the College itself provides these services for free.” The interview participants, by and large, confirmed that students with good English proficiency will succeed in the EMI education, so in this case, there is no elitism. Primary, secondary, and tertiary education in Saudi Arabia are free, and everybody has the same access to academic materials. In addition, the criteria for admission to the College are four: GPA in high school, Achievement test, Aptitude exam, and interviews. Since English proficiency is not one of the criteria for admission, EMI could not create a social elite barrier or perpetuate divisiveness among Saudi students because students will have an opportunity to improve their English language during the pre-professional program since they will have English intensive courses. According to the College, the weighted criteria for the College admission include the following:

Accumulative percentage of high school certificate grade 30%, General Aptitude Test\textsuperscript{12} grade 30%, and Achievement Test\textsuperscript{13} grade 40%. Indeed, some of the student and teacher participants of this study saw that EMI does not create social stratification, and it provides students with equal access to academic programs. Personally, as far as students

\textsuperscript{12} The GAT is a test that targets secondary school graduates who wish to pursue their studies in institutions of higher education. It measures several aspects that are related to the educational process, such as a student's analytical and deductive skills. The test is composed of two sections: verbal (language-related) and quantitative (mathematic) (Qiyas.GOV.SA).

\textsuperscript{13} The Achievement Test is a unified measure for all secondary school graduates; it has been designed to be a fair and accurate standard for all, which helps educational institutions beyond the secondary school stage to choose the highest achieving students in secondary school subjects. Aim of the Test: Measuring the achievement of secondary school students in specific subjects i.e., Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Mathematics (etec.gov.sa).
have equal access to the required texts and materials, and KSAU-HS also provides students access to research tools and scientific databases for free, EMI is not elitist

**Recommendations and Future Research**

After investigating the teachers’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI implementation, I would suggest possible solutions that could be beneficial and helpful to develop better learning conditions for students studying in the College or similar contexts. First, I believe that the Collaborative Teaching Approach (CTA) is beneficial for all stakeholders i.e., content teachers, English specialists, and students in terms of cooperative work and effective and interactive communications among these three stakeholders. The collaboration between content teachers, language specialists, and university administration would be beneficial to improve the EMI implementation by raising the content teachers’ awareness about the use of functional language in academic content areas, the process of language acquisition, and appropriate design of English language curricula that fit student’s language needs and academic specialties. Also, implementing English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in the professional programs and continue English learning and improving students’ English competence is necessary due to students’ low English proficiency. EAP and ESP tutorials could help students to improve their linguistics repertoires in a specific domain. For example, students in the College need to focus on the medical and health-sciences language. Implementing that will demonstrate the roles of EMI instructors in the College and help English specialists to cooperate with them in an effective way to improve student's English proficiency and academic achievement. One avenue for further
study would be research into the specific plan for how to implement CTA in the College that could develop the programs and help to implement EMI effectively. In short, improving students’ English proficiency could be achieved through revising the current curricula, pedagogies, and teaching materials and providing robust EAP and ESP supports. This could allow a smoother transition from pre-professional studies programs to professional studies programs.

Second, language policymakers are required to consider the policy of implementing EMI in the professional specializations to meet not only global demands but also the local context demands. The strict adoption of EMI is unjust to students with low English language proficiency. Moreover, Arabic is already unofficially imposed by teachers to facilitate learning. At the same time, it plays a supportive role for students in learning and comprehension of course materials. Also, the use of Arabic could help students save their time and effort in translating English materials to Arabic. Therefore, I would suggest that educational policymakers in the College in particular and in the Ministry of Education, in general, include Arabic as a Medium of Instruction with a clear language policy that would enhance the quality of education the students receive and regain students’ confidence in the capability of Arabic to be the language of academia, a matter that has also been promoted by Raddawi and Meslem (2015). The implementation of AMI could be either providing a special track for AMI or by redesigning and replanning the curricula of programs in the College to be formally bilingual. At the root of the problems this project identified with EMI is inappropriate language policy formulation. If the foundation of the policy is weak, then its implementation will be
problematic. It seems to me that a major problem in here in this case is that Arabic and English specialists are not getting involved in the room when educational policymakers formulate these policies. A collaboration between government policymakers, language specialists, and international language consultants will help reduce the inherent problems in the EMI policy. Indeed, the government should invest in research to make AMI for university education rather than invest in a foreign language.

Another key solution for the EMI hegemony is what Canagarajah (2005) calls the ‘Hybrid Discourses Pedagogy’ which is a wise path that avoids “the traditional extremes of rejecting English outright for its linguistic imperialism or accepting it wholesale for its benefits” (P. 174). Hybrid Discourses Pedagogy goes beyond the English-only communicative teaching method as teachers design class activities that enhance students’ awareness of both the English and Arabic languages. It is possible—and necessary—to combine learning English and maintain the indigenous language productively through a healthy and balanced linguistic ecology. Dual-language education could provide students who are not yet proficient in English with equitable opportunities to succeed in and complete their education. While the College and instructors may use a wide variety of dual-language strategies, each with its own specific instructional goals, the programs are typically designed to simultaneously improve students’ English proficiency, content knowledge, and academic language. Although dual-language programs take a wide variety of forms from school to school, the programs generally include the following features: a) dual-language curriculum and instruction, b) bilingual instructors, c) dual-language evaluation, d) culturally and linguistically relevant learning materials, e) dual-
language assessment and accommodations, f) bilingual education and liaisons (Howard et al., 2007). Therefore, rather than finding methods that impose English-only curricula and Western values on the local students, it is important to develop strategies that encourage them to explore bi/multilingual pedagogies and inter-cultural differences.

Finally, I do not claim that English is not important for students especially those who are specialized in health-related specialties. What I call for is an adjustment in the language policy to elevate the status of the Arabic language, the official language of the country and the first language for all students and most teachers in the College, to be side-by-side to the English language. As I discussed in Chapter Two, English has an important role in the Saudi context. For instance, the language policy in hospitals and international companies in Saudi Arabia utilizes English as a lingua franca (ELF). Mastering English maximizes students’ job opportunities as well as improves their academic skills to be able to pursue studying abroad. While the important role of English cannot be ignored, the English language should not be used at the expense of ignoring local languages and the needs of local students. Therefore, I would suggest that EAP and ESP tutorials should be offered for pre-professional as well as professional students to enhance their English competency, while Arabic be used for instruction in some specialized courses. This suggestion is consistent with other studies that support the additive bilingual approach (Al-Bakri, 2017; Al-Mashikhi et al, 2014; Mouhanna, 2016; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Jiang et al., (2016); Troudi (2009).

My goal with this dissertation is to raise awareness on the need to develop the Arabic language in health and scientific literature, at the same time, equip students with
the necessary English language skills to raise the quality of education and enrich students with the required knowledge in both languages, Arabic and English. This would be in line with Phillipson’s argument for “the maintenance of multilingualism” (2008, p. 1), where he emphasized the importance of balancing EMI education with other languages (Arabic in this context). The Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia has the capability and competence to plan and design curricula in Arabic, which also could be done in consultation with universities in Arab countries that have experience with AMI and teacher education programs that can help develop academic expertise in pre-service teacher’s mother tongue. Unfortunately, the current language policy is adding to the English language at the expense of marginalizing the Arabic language which is proving that all professional majors and science-related conferences are adopting ELF and ignoring students’, instructors’, and the community L1.

**Further research: Reconceptualization of EMI in Saudi Universities**

Possible areas for further research include the effects of EMI on the home language. Recent studies focus on exploratory work on EMI in the Gulf region (Al-Kahtany et al., 2016; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Ellili-Cherif & Alkhateeb, 2015). However, critical research that demonstrates the impact of EMI on indigenous language and social communications is still rare in Saudi Arabia. The participants of this study, with no exception, revealed their concerns about the status of the Arabic language in Academia and how it is impacted by the widespread use of EMI although the majority of university students in Saudi Arabia are Saudi and most of the international students are from Arab states and their L1 is the Arabic language according to UNESCO Institute for
Statistics (2013). Due to a lack of coherence and consistency between the language policy in professional majors and students’ English language competency, the imposition of English-only in the Saudi universities brings several consequences on both Saudi’s L1 and culture (Ryhan, 2014). For instance, English and Arabic are randomly used as a medium of instruction in the College at different frequencies depending on the teachers’ preference and competence in Arabic and English, and this phenomenon is consistent with what Alhawsawi and Barnawi (2016) stated about the language policy in tertiary education in Saudi Arabia. Educational institutions in Saudi Arabia will not elevate the status and enrich the literature of the Arabic language if they pursue separating it from professional majors and scientific fields. Furthermore, universities outcomes will encounter difficulties in dealing with their workplaces as some places require the Arabic language such as government sectors, and others require the English language such as hospitals. So, without further research into EMI and language policy, it will not be possible to understand the impact of EMI on the home language and envisage the consequences of it on the national interests related to education.

I intentionally chose four different Expanding-Circle countries (in the Kachruvian paradigm) where English is utilized as a medium of instruction in professional majors at the university level (See Appendix A). These countries included: China, Japan, Portugal, and the UAE. I focused on these countries because educational and occupational factors are similar to Saudi Arabia. They all want to adopt English as a lingua franca in international communications and some sectors of the job markets e.g., hospitals and international companies. Several recommendations could be practical and ideal solutions
for the Saudi English language policymakers to tackle EMI obstacles (See Appendix A for further details).

**Limitations of the Study**

One limitation of this study, particularly in the data collection process, was the COVID-19 pandemic. Most of the instruction became online during the global pandemic, and only a few instructors required students to come to the laboratory. So, one observation and four interviews were conducted online through Zoom and Office Teams due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and two observations and six interviews were done through face-to-face. Conducting observations in a virtual context hindered data collection as I was unable to take detailed observation notes. It was challenging to observe students-students communications. Comparing online observations to face-to-face observations, I was able to monitor students’ reactions and responses more clearly in the face-to-face/traditional classroom. Due to COVID-19, I mostly had to rely on online observations and interviews which can be seen as a limitation of the study.

Collecting data from faculty members in the midterm exam period was challenging since teachers and students got busy preparing for the exams. I emailed seven faculty members to participate in this study and out of nine I conducted six interviews. A similar challenge occurred with students because I have not had an opportunity to teach anyone of them. The Department of Basic Sciences reached out to ten students, and out of ten, I interviewed four, one from each academic year. Since the interview questions were related to specialized terms in EMI and TESOL, content teachers and students asked
for clarifications that took time before the interview was conducted. So, I was not able to check whether they understand the specialized terms appropriately.

The inclusion of gender is a limitation of this study. Due to the segregated educational environment in the College, I found it complicated and difficult to conduct interviews with female instructors and students. Therefore, this study only interrogated male teachers’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI in the College in Al-Ahsa. More studies on women participant voices on EMI would be necessary for future research. This would include more emphasis on women’s education in Saudi Arabia. Because of the gender segregation in Saudi Arabian education landscape, the inclusion of women’s voices can be possible primarily if the researcher is a female.

**Personal Reflection on Dissertation Journey**

As part of my doctoral study, I was introduced to critical issues in de/colonization literature represented in linguistic imperialism and English hegemony in Seminar in Literature, Cross-Cultural Issues in TESOL course, among others in my doctoral program which I see as an awakening call to controversial and critical issues in the field of EMI. After conducting my internship in teaching a semantic course analyzing Saudi students’ lexical development of the English language, I became more interested in understanding how English becomes the medium of instruction in professional majors in Saudi universities where English is used as a lingua franca in two contexts only, hospitals and international companies. I was also determined to further investigate teachers’ and students’ perspectives toward EMI implementation in tertiary education Saudi Arabia.
My interest in the dissertation topic derived from my concern about the issues students encounter due to EMI policy. I hope that addressing issues related to EMI from a critical perspective would advocate for multilingual education and bring in a more inclusive and fair education system. Conducting this dissertation has been an opportunity to question my own beliefs and assumptions about EMI. Although some findings resonated with my expectations due to my previous experiences in studying and teaching in EMI programs in a similar context, others were unexpected. For instance, I thought that students were victims of the EMI policy, which is single-handedly embraced in Saudi tertiary education. I was in the assumption that most of the participants of this study would share a similar belief. However, I was surprised that the majority of them favored the adoption of EMI due to their strong belief that EMI could improve their English proficiency and prepare them better for the job market and graduate studies. After knowing that, I realized the power of English and globalization in shaping education stakeholders’ views on imposing EMI. I also thought that my own views regarding implementing Arabic as the medium of instruction (AMI) are the optimal option for students in this particular context. Having conducted this study, I have a deeper understanding now on how implementing a bilingual approach could serve best for students’ academic needs. My interest in EMI-based research is ongoing. After engaging myself in reading EMI literature and conducting this study, I have a renewed understanding on EMI and its implementation at King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences. After engaging myself in reading EMI literature since I was a graduate student, I believe that it increased my awareness of issues related to English language
teaching, students’ L1 and education, English hegemony, monolingualism bias, among others that I will consider in my future research projects. All in all, the issues surrounding EMI education are important to be discussed and investigated in a larger scale that providing an overarching framework for EMI education and its consequences.
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APPENDIX A: GLANCES OF EMI IMPLEMENTATION IN FOUR EFL COUNTRIES

In the below tables, I mention four countries implementing EMI in higher education systems. I indicate only a few of the Institutional Language Policy that directly related to EMI because my focus is on the Implications and Recommendations. I summarize the Implications and Recommendations which are inspired by the local researchers who have investigated their local contexts and conducted empirical studies to conclude with considerations for effective implementations (Alhawsawi & Barnawi, 2016; Baker & Hüttner, 2018; Belhiah & Elhami, 2014; Coleman et al., 2018; Dafouz, 2011; Galloway et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2016; Macaro, 2018; Morgado & Coelho, 2013; Shimauchi, 2018; Taguchi, 2014). All the selected countries consider English as a foreign language, and they are classified in the Kachru’s model in the expanding circle. Also, the reason for choosing these four countries from three different geographical location (Asia, Europe, and Middle East) is to see if their official language has an impact on EMI or not. They are similar in these with Saudi Arabia. In addition, the selected countries implement EMI in their higher education system before Saudi Arabia, and they are aware of its consequences through empirical and theoretical studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institutional Language Policy</th>
<th>Implications &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| China   | o English is a foreign language.  
|         | o Instructors must speak English | **Implications**  
|         |                               | • Non-native English-speaking instructors’ linguistic inadequacy has become an overriding impediment to the smooth implementation of EMI. |
| Japan | ONLY in EMI classrooms.  
| o Elevating the university’s status and global ranking.  
| o English is Lingua Franca in International Companies, hospitals, and the international market. | • Neither EMI nor ESP are adequately achieved in terms of teaching quality and learning achievement.  
| o English is a foreign language.  
| o Internationalizing higher education, | • The poor English proficiency can be deemed as the primary cause for the inconsistency between policy and practice.  
| Implications | • Actual use of English in EMI institution is limited.  
| | • Adjunct ESP courses when participants’ English proficiency is inadequate.  
| | • Examine the role of language in EMI to transmit knowledge and to make meaning.  
| | • Contextualized EMI settings.  
| | • Form-focused Instruction in EMI settings.  
| | • English as a Lingua Franca in Academic (ELFA) for achieving communicative effectiveness.  
| | • Codeswitching, accommodation, and morphosyntactic convergence assist comprehension when students learn unfamiliar and complex subject knowledge in EMI contexts.  
| | • Instructors’ mediation is pivotal in assisting students to level off in the shift from personal everyday language to impersonal academic language.  
| | • EMI instructors need not only be equipped with an adequate level of English proficiency but also English teaching skills.  
| | • The poor English proficiency can be deemed as the primary cause for the inconsistency between policy and practice.  
| Recommendations |
and receiving foreign students.

- Lecturing in English may be more strenuous.

**Recommendations**

- EMI remains ill-defined and its meaning is still evolving.
- Particular attention should be paid to the educational impact of internationalization on the system’s stakeholders, specifically, the educational risks and benefits for those who actually received EMI education.

**Portugal**

- Portuguese is the official language in all education levels.
- English is a foreign language.
- Demand for a global workforce.

**Implications**

- EMI instructors take longer to explain the same subject matter.
- In L2, the instructors’ language is more formal – with a number of similarities to written, textbook style.
- Increase in preparation time needed for EMI.
- Students change their learning strategies to cope with the language shift in a number of ways:
  1. Reading the documents before lectures;
  2. Reduction in the amount of interaction in lectures taught in English;
  3. Greater concentration from students on the process of notetaking.
- Difficult to express ideas adequately.
- Students may complain or feel that they do not comprehend content fully because instructors do not speak good English.
- EMI is more than a linguistic change; it has a huge impact both on education and research.
### Recommendations

- Professional majors need a clear and strong language policy.
- CLIL is a key tool for creating a consistent language policy.
- Scaffolding specialization contents with linguistic learning.
- Looking at plurilingual talk interaction in EMI classrooms and to plurilingual uses of course materials as ways to improve simultaneously content and language knowledge of students.
- Translingualism (dynamic forms of bilingualism in the classroom) shifting systematically from one language to the other.
- Complex evaluation tools and frameworks need to be put in place to account for the benefits described for students and the efforts undergone by lecturers or the teamwork of content lecturers and language specialists.

### UAE

- English is a foreign language.
- Preserve national identity and indigenous culture in all education levels.
- English medium curriculum for science, IT, Health and Physical

### Implications

- Unreadiness from students to learn in EMI context.
- Foreign, monolingual English-speaking instructors usually fail to build rapport with students, which can have detrimental effects on their academic career.

### Recommendations

- Implementing a bilingual curriculum in which instruction is delivered in English and Arabic in order to enhance students’ linguistic and biliteracy skills.
| Education, and Mathematics in grades K-10. | • Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLT), and CLIL provide further support for medium instruction policies.  
• Exploring students’ and instructors’ views are essential since they are the two population directly linked to and affected by this policy.  
• English as a Lingua Franca will maximize students’ job prospects upon graduation. |
APPENDIX B: OBSERVATION GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher action</th>
<th>Student behaviour</th>
<th>Student responses/questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- lecturing</td>
<td>- listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- asking questions</td>
<td>- asking information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- responding to</td>
<td>- asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questions</td>
<td>- asking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- eliciting</td>
<td>- responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information</td>
<td>- responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>- explaining</td>
<td>- responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>- collectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>- correcting</td>
<td>- taking notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language</td>
<td>- reading textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>- assigning tasks</td>
<td>- asking peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>- code-switching</td>
<td>- peer/group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>- others</td>
<td>- others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atmosphere:
The place looks like a laboratory. It’s empirical.

Personal reflection:
1. Classroom environment is well-equipped.
2. Teacher to students number is good.
3. Code-switching between English and French is limited and
   limited.
4. Students communicate in limited and
   limited.
5. Teacher and students use what comes to their
   mind according to their vocab whether Arabic or English.
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Classroom actions (10 min span)

1. The teacher starts recalling required info from previous lesson. The teacher and students speak both Arabic and English during the theoretical part of the lesson.
2. The teacher explains some previous lessons and brings the body.
3. The teacher asks students about vocab "medical vocab" with abbreviations.
4. The teacher reviews important info with students.
5. After reviewing previous material, the teacher begins empirical/practice. Students analyze talk to each other in Arabic except for medical terminologies.
6. The teacher starts the practical lesson by giving the leader of the team the case. All communications are in English only now.
7. The vocab is limited due to students' language proficiency. For example, the said "not very high level but low students couldn't find vocab that describe medium status.
8. Other students are watching the first team.
9. The teacher talks with the leader only,
10. and the medium of communication is English only.
11. Another example of code-switching or limited vocab.
12. Students and 25% means half of it.
13. After finishing the practical lesson, the teacher starts discussing the practical lesson with the class in both languages. Arabic & English.
14. Students asking in both languages merging in the same question between Arabic and English. The teacher necs another in both Arabic and English. Then code-switching between two languages.
15. In the scenario, when the leader heard from the teacher he talked to his team members in both Arabic & English.
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

How do science, health, and IT instructors at KSAU-HS in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) in Al Ahsa implement EMI?

1. Can you tell me about yourself?
   a. What is your major? How long have you been teaching here in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS)?

2. What is the medium of language in your class?

3. In what circumstances do you speak and write in English in CAMS?
   a. Is it being used in the interaction between teachers and learners? Or is it merely confined to the teaching materials that the students are presented with?
   b. How much English instruction is used in the CAMS? For example, office hours communications between teachers and students?
   c. Is English the only language being used in the classroom? What about the students’ L1?
   d. What do you think as a teacher about “L2 text (English), L1 talk (Arabic) around the text”? (Cook’s, 2010)

4. In what ways are language and content being integrated? (Teachers Only)
   a. Are some subjects more suitable or adaptive to English Medium Instruction (EMI) than others?
   b. Is it easier to explain ideas in English? Explain.

5. What are the roles of EFL teachers? (Teachers Only)
a. Are they there to prepare the students before they embark on an EMI program?

b. Are they there to concurrently supplement the learning of English via EMI when a deficit is spotted? Explain.

What do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach in CAMS at KSAU-HS?

1. Who should decide to introduce EMI? What variety of English should be taught or used in a formal learning context?

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of implementing EMI in the CAMS programs?
   a. Are you in favor of EMI?

3. There are five EMI models:
   * **Selection Model** is when students are chosen to get enrolled based on their English language proficiency after secondary education.
   * **Preparatory Model** means that the institution design one-year intensive English and sciences programs.
   * **Concurrent Model** which means that students receive English support during their academic study.
   * **Multilingual Model** is when the EMI teachers utilize two languages in teaching.
   * **Ostrich Model** means directors and teachers of EMI programs pretend that there is no problem to introduce English to non-native English speakers, so they teach EMI courses without preparations or entry-requirement proficiency.
Based on that, Which EMI models would you prefer or fit with the CAMS programs (Selection, Preparatory, Concurrent Support, Multilingual, Ostrich), and why?

4. How do you think that EMI could contribute to your language proficiency?
   a. How does EMI impact the way you deliver your instruction?

5. Does EMI act as a barrier to accessing quality education, or does it constitute a way of removing that barrier? Elaborate according to your experience.

6. Does EMI perpetuate a divisive elitism? Do students from lower socioeconomic status have the equal access to EMI higher education as other social classes?

7. How do you think that EMI approach could at least maintain the same subject content achievement as L1 medium instruction?

How do those who participate (students and instructors specifically) in EMI education perceive their educational benefits and risks in terms of achieving the program requirements?

1. How did you feel when you first began teaching in an EMI program?

2. What are some of your experiences of EMI in the CAMS? What is the impact of implementing EMI on students’ academic achievements and teachers’ instructions?

3. What challenges EMI teachers envisage in the CAMS at KSAU-HS in Al Ahsa?

4. What is/are the effect(s) on the home language/culture of the widespread introduction of EMI?
5. What are the *content teachers’* responsibilities towards students’ English proficiency?

6. What is the relationship between students’ language proficiency and their content knowledge? In other words, do you think low English proficiency lead to poor content knowledge?

7. Are EMI teachers whose first language is not English discriminated against?
   What do most students look for in an EMI teacher: their knowledge and control of the academic subject and how to put it across, or whether they speak like English native speakers?

8. How could teachers and students in the CAMS overcome the obstacles of studying in the EMI program and achieve the academic success?

9. Would you like to add anything else?
APPENDIX D: THEMES OUTLINE OF CHAPTER IV

How do science and health specialties instructors at KSAU-HS in the College of Applied Medical Sciences (CAMS) in Al Ahsa implement EMI? and what do lead instructors believe to be an ideal EMI approach in CAMS at KSAU-HS?

4.1 Contextual data: EMI Implementation in the CAMS at KSAU-HS in Al-Ahsa

4.1.1 The Medium of Instruction inside the Classrooms in the CAMS Includes Multiple Languages

4.1.2 Biliteracy Practices Outside of the classrooms in the CAMS “…”

4.1.3 The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructors in EMI Contexts is Diverse

4.1.3.1 Roles of EFL Teachers in EMI Programs in the CAMS “…”

4.1.3.2 Content Teachers’ Responsibilities on Students’ English Proficiency: “…”

4.2 Beliefs in the EMI Approach in the CAMS: “Improve the university educational outcomes”

4.2.1 EMI and Improvement of English Language

4.2.2 Teachers’ and Students’ Impression of English varieties and proficiency: …

4.2.3 EMI Helps Students to Engage in Global Communication

4.2.4 Perceived advantages of EMI:
4.3 Drawbacks of EMI

4.3.1 Feeling and Experiencing “difficulties in teaching/learning through EMI …”

4.3.2 Students’ Low English Proficiency

4.3.3 Short-term and Rote Memorization “…”

4.3.4 Relationship between students’ English Proficiency and Academic Achievement

4.3.5 Effects on Students’ Home Language

4.4 Overcoming Obstacles of EMI in the CAMS

4.4.1 Readiness for EMI (high school preparation)

4.4.2 EMI Decision-making and Models “Decision should be a collaboration, and Preparatory Model is the preferable one”

4.4.3 EFL Curricula in CAMS Needs to be Reconceptualized in the Pre-professional Program

4.4.4 Improve teaching methods to be student-centered and “…”

4.4.5 Annual report from teachers about the Program Progression
# APPENDIX E: BOOKS’ LIST FOR THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOOK COVER PICTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Name/ Course Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISBN</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Course Name/ Course Code** | **ADVANCED ENGLISH GRAMMAR & WRITING FOR HEALTH SCIENCES: ADVANCED GRAMMAR COMPONENT ENGL 211** |
| **Title** | Understanding & Using English Grammar- Workbook |
| **Authors** | Azar/Koch/Hagan |
| **Edition/Year** | 5th Edition /2017 |
| **Publisher** | Pearson Education ESL |
| **ISBN** | 978-0134275444 |

| **Course Name/ Course Code** | **ADVANCED ENGLISH GRAMMAR & WRITING FOR HEALTH SCIENCES: ADVANCED WRITING COMPONENT ENGL 211** |
| **Title** | Academic Writing: A Handbook for International Students |
| **Authors** | Stephen Bally |
| **Edition/Year** | 5th Edition/2018 |
| **Publisher** | Routledge |
| **ISBN** | 978-1138048744 |

<p>| <strong>Course Name/ Course Code</strong> | <strong>ADVANCED ENGLISH READING &amp; VOCABULARY FOR HEALTH SCIENCES ENGL 212</strong> |
| <strong>Title</strong> | Mosaic 1: Reading |
| <strong>Authors</strong> | Wegmann and Knezovic |
| <strong>Edition/Year</strong> | 6th Edition |
| <strong>Publisher</strong> | McGraw Hill |
| <strong>ISBN</strong> | 978-0077565111 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Edition/Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>ISBN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH COMMUNICATION SKILLS 1</td>
<td>ENGL 101</td>
<td>Interactions 1: Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Tankel/Moest</td>
<td>Middle East Diamond Edition/ 2012</td>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>9780077147044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH COMMUNICATION SKILLS 1</td>
<td>ENGL 101</td>
<td>Great Writing 2: Great Paragraphs</td>
<td>Keith S. Folsom, April Muchmore-Vokoum, Elena Vesti Solomon</td>
<td>4th Edition / 2013</td>
<td>Heinle &amp; Heinle Publication</td>
<td>978-1285750729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH ACADEMIC READING &amp; VOCABULARY 1</td>
<td>ENGL 103</td>
<td>Interactions 1 : Reading</td>
<td>Kimi Hartmann</td>
<td>Middle East Diamond Edition</td>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>9780077147044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMESTER</td>
<td>BOOK COVER PICTURE</td>
<td>COURSE NAME</td>
<td>COURSE CODE</td>
<td>REFERENCE BOOK DETAILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         | ![Book Cover](image1) | **ENGLISH ACADEMIC WRITING** | **ENGL111** | Title: Longman Academic Writing Series 3: Paragraphs to Essays  
Authors: A. Oshima / A. Hogue  
Edition/Year: 4th Edition  
Publisher: Pearson  
ISBN: 9780132915663 |
|         | ![Book Cover](image2) | **ENGLISH ACADEMIC WRITING** | **ENGL111** | Title: Great Writing 3: From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays  
Authors: Keith S. Folse, Elena Vestri Solomon, & David Clabaux  
Edition/Year: 3rd Edition / 2014  
Publisher: Cengage Learning  
ISBN: 978 – 12848073x |
|         | ![Book Cover](image3) | **ENGLISH GRAMMAR II** | **ENGL112** | Title: Fundamentals of English Grammar  
Authors: Betty S. Azar  
Publisher: Pearson Education ESL  
ISBN: 978-0137071692 |
|         | ![Book Cover](image4) | **ENGLISH GRAMMAR II** | **ENGL112** | Title: Fundamentals of English Grammar – Workbook  
Authors: Azar/Koch/Hagen  
Publisher: Pearson Lonsman  
ISBN: 978-0138022129 |
|         | ![Book Cover](image5) | **ENGLISH READING & VOCABULARY II** | **ENGL 113** | Title: Interactions 2: Reading  
Authors: Kim/Hartmann  
Edition/Year: Middle East Diamond Edition  
Publisher: McGraw-Hill  
ISBN: 9780077147174 |
APPENDIX F: LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>Arabic Medium Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS</td>
<td>College of Applied Medical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Content-Based Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIL</td>
<td>Content and Language Integrated Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>English for Academic Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELF</td>
<td>English as a Lingua Franca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>English Medium Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>English for Specific Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSAU-HS</td>
<td>King Saud bin Abdulaziz for Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Additional Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>