

# “Don’t let them fool you: Abandoning Dutch at our university is a painful loss”

Lecturers’ and Students’ Evaluation of Lecturers’ Teaching  
Skills in English-Medium Instruction at Radboud University

---

Senne van Amerongen  
4255585  
General Linguistics  
Master Thesis  
Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen  
sennevan.amerongen@student.ru.nl  
16 January 2017

Supervisor: dr. P. J. M. de Haan  
Second reader: drs. S. van Vuuren



**Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen**

## GENERAL LINGUISTICS

Teacher who will receive this document: dr. P. J. M. de Haan

Title of document: “Don’t let them fool you: Abandoning Dutch at our university is a painful loss”: Lecturers’ and Students’ Evaluation of Lecturers’ Teaching Skills in English-Medium Instruction at Radboud University

Name of course: MA Thesis Linguistics

Date of submission: 16 January 2017

The work submitted here is the sole responsibility of the undersigned, who has neither committed plagiarism nor colluded in its production.

Signed

Name of student: Senne van Amerongen

Student number: 4255585

## **Acknowledgements**

The present research looked into English-medium instruction in higher education in Europe. It tried to answer the question whether lecturers' way of teaching in English differs from their way of teaching in Dutch.

At the start of the process, some problems were encountered. However, without the help of others, this thesis would not have been the product it is now.

Therefore, and first of all, I would like to thank my supervisor dr. De Haan for his support and feedback. He was always willing to help whenever I ran into a problem. Furthermore, I would like to thank my second reader, drs. Van Vuuren, who helped me find a topic and a supervisor when things did not work out at the start. I also acknowledge the study advisors and project managers at Radboud University for their help in finding the right participants and lecturers and students of Radboud University for participating in this study. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family and friends who kept supporting me until the end.

Senne van Amerongen

16 January 2017

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Abstract	1
1. Introduction	2
2. Background	6
2.1 Globalisation	6
2.2 Internationalisation and Englishisation of Higher Education in Europe	9
2.3 EMI: A General Overview	13
2.3.1 EMI in Europe	13
2.3.2 EMI in the Netherlands	15
2.4 EMI Research	17
2.4.1 Research on EMI	17
2.4.2 Studies on the effects of EMI implementation	21
2.4.2.1 Studies concerning lecturers' views on EMI and their performance	22
2.4.2.2 Studies concerning students' views on lecturers and EMI	25
2.4.2.3 Studies concerning both lecturers' and students' views on EMI	26
2.4.2.4 Summary of the research findings of previous literature	29
2.5 Internationalisation and EMI at Radboud University Nijmegen	31
2.6 Summary	33
3. Methodology	35
3.1 Participant Recruitment	36
3.2 Lecturers' Views on their Way of Teaching in English	37
3.2.1 Procedure and questionnaire distribution	37
3.2.2 Lecturers' questionnaire	38
3.3 Students' Views on Lecturers' Way of Teaching in English	39
3.3.1 Procedure and questionnaire distribution	39
3.3.2 Students' questionnaire	40
3.4 Observational Study of Lecturers' Teaching Behaviour	41
3.4.1 Participants	41
3.4.2 Materials	42
3.4.2.1 Coding instrument	42
3.4.2.2 Rating instrument	43
3.4.2.3 Word count	44
3.4.3 Observation procedure	44
3.4.4 Data analysis	45
3.5 Ethical Considerations	46
4. Results	47
4.1 Lecturers' Views on their Way of Teaching in English	47
4.1.1 Response rate	47
4.1.2 Lecturers' background information	47

4.1.2.1	General background information	48
4.1.2.2	Lecturers' practice and use of English	49
4.1.2.3	Lecturers' perception of their proficiency in English	49
4.1.3	Preparing for instruction	50
4.1.3.1	Preparation techniques	51
4.1.3.2	Preparation time	53
4.1.3.3	Additional preparation techniques	54
4.1.4	Teaching skills	55
4.1.4.1	Extent to which lecturers are able to make use of teaching skills	55
4.1.4.2	Experiencing teaching skills	58
4.1.5	Lecturers' comments	60
4.2	Students' Views on Lecturers' Way of Teaching in English	62
4.2.1	Response rate	62
4.2.2	Students' background information	63
4.2.2.1	General background information	63
4.2.2.2	Students' practice and use of English	64
4.2.2.3	Students' perceptions of their own English proficiency	64
4.2.3	Students' perceptions of lecturers' English proficiency	65
4.2.4	Students' views on lecturers' teaching skills	66
4.2.4.1	Students' perceptions of lecturers' language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills	66
4.2.4.2	Students' reflection on lecturers' other teaching skills	68
4.2.5	Students' comments	70
4.3	Observational Study	73
4.3.1	Coded teaching behaviour categories in Dutch and English	73
4.3.2	Rated teaching behaviour categories in Dutch and English	77
4.3.3	Word count	80
5.	Discussion	82
5.1	Lecturers' Views on their Way of Teaching in English compared to Dutch	82
5.1.1	Findings of the questionnaire related to previous literature	82
5.1.2	Conclusion	86
5.2	Students' Views on their Lecturers' Way of Teaching in English compared to Dutch	86
5.2.1	Findings of the questionnaire related to previous literature	86
5.2.2	Conclusion	90
5.3	Observational Study	90
5.3.1	Coding instrument	91
5.3.2	Rating instrument	93
5.3.3	Word count	95
5.3.4	Conclusion	95
5.4	General discussion	96
6.	Conclusion	98
	References	103

Appendix A – Lecturers’ Questionnaire	114
Appendix B – Frequency Table Lecturers	122
Appendix C – Recoded Tables Lecturers	126
Appendix D – Students’ Questionnaire	128
Appendix E – Frequency Table Students	135
Appendix F – Recoded Tables Students	138
Appendix G – Coding Instrument Definitions	140
Appendix H – Coding Instrument	142
Appendix I – Tables Coding Instrument	143
Appendix J – Rating Instrument Definitions	145
Appendix K – Rating Instrument	147
Appendix L – Tables Rating Instrument	148
Appendix M – Verbatim Transcripts	150

## **Abstract**

This study revolved around the research question: Is lecturers' way of teaching in English different from their way of teaching in Dutch? The study was a replication of Vinke (1995), which was expanded by means of findings from recent studies. To answer the research question, the study looked at lecturers' and students' views on lecturers' way of teaching in English compared to lecturers' way of teaching in Dutch. Furthermore, it examined whether lecturers displayed differences between their teaching in English and Dutch. The study was conducted at Radboud University and made use of lecturers' and students' questionnaires and an observational study. The results suggest that in general lecturers and students do not feel that lecturers' way of teaching differs in English. However, a close analysis of the results showed that teaching in English has a moderate, negative effect on lecturers' way of teaching. Lecturers and students felt that lecturers have difficulties with language-related and improvising teaching skills. Furthermore, the observational study found that, in English, lecturers are less redundant, use fewer asides, read more aloud, move around less, and speak in a monotonous tone.

**Keywords:** English-medium instruction (EMI), EMI implementation, teaching, questionnaire, observational study, teaching skills, proficiency, higher education, internationalisation, Englishisation, Radboud University

## 1. Introduction

English has probably been the most important language of the world for the last decades. Today, it is used in almost any domain of daily life (Coleman, 2006; Gardt & Hüppauf, 2004; Hüppauf, 2004; Montgomery, 2004; Tamtam, Gallagher, Olabi, & Naher, 2012). English has become the lingua franca of domains such as science, (international) business and trade, media, technology, entertainment, and tourism (e.g. Hüppauf, 2004; Montgomery, 2004). Montgomery (2004) claims that “English is now the most popular, and most required, foreign language to be studied anywhere [...]. Its uptake in technical circles, meanwhile, has been aided by the rise of ‘big science’ in the United States and the resulting vast increase in scientific output” (p. 1333). So, English dominates life in many countries across the world. It is for this reason that many academics have also been speaking of Englishisation (e.g. Coleman, 2006; Coleman, 2013; Dimova, Hultgren, & Jensen, 2015; Hultgren, Jensen, & Dimova, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999), i.e. “an increased use of English” (Hultgren et al., 2015, p. 1) across the world.

However, for English to become so widely used has taken decades and the spread was due to a sequence of consequences. The process started with globalisation (Gardt and Hüppauf, 2004), which led to a shift from a national focus towards an international one in many aspects of daily life. This shift led to the internationalisation of society. Internationalisation soon affected higher education as well (Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011), which began to focus on international relations and the attraction of foreign staff and students. As a result, many higher education institutions switched to teaching in English, i.e. English-medium instruction (henceforth EMI). Hellekjær (2010) defines EMI as non-language courses or programmes that “are taught in English, to students for whom it is a foreign [or second] language. As often as not, it is also taught by a lecturer who does not have English as a first



language” (p. 11). Nowadays numerous higher education institutions in non-English speaking countries are providing EMI (Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011, p. 14; Hughes, 2008, p. 11).

EMI implementation is often a rash decision (Klaassen, 2003, p. 119) and after implementation, critical questions are being asked about, for example, the effects of teaching in a foreign language on the quality of courses in higher education (Klaassen, 2003, p. 119), “the effect of using a foreign language on content learning” (Klaassen, 2003, p. 120), what “EMI mean[s] for language policies in higher education” (Airey, Lauridsen, Räsänen, Salo, & Schwach, 2015, p. 2), and lecturers’ and students’ proficiency and ability to give or receive education in a foreign language (Hellekjær, 2007, p. 68).

In the Netherlands, too, these questions started to be asked and therefore the introduction of EMI has provoked a debate (e.g. Engels invoeren, 2016; Kleis and Sikkema, 2016). The discussion between people of different disciplines, classes, and backgrounds has been well represented in the Dutch media lately. Furthermore, the debate is often among politicians, academics, and people who are not involved in EMI. The questions and critical points in this debate also focus on whether teaching in English is beneficial for Dutch society, whether lecturers are able to teach in English, whether lecturers’ and students’ proficiency is high enough, and whether students benefit from courses taught in English for example. The debate divides Dutch society into two camps, i.e. advocates (e.g. Cornips, 2013; Drees, 2016) and sceptics (e.g. Huskens, 2015; Huygen, 2016). The advocates are pro EMI and internationalisation. They encourage society to use as much English as possible and they see internationalisation as an opportunity that adds a greater value to education. The sceptics are against EMI and have a general consensus that EMI deteriorates Dutch language proficiency (Kuiper, 2016) and, to a greater extent, interferes negatively with lecturers’ and students’ performance. The latter argument is very important, since the sceptics are convinced that this will lead to a lower level of education (e.g. Sommer, 2016).

In 2001, Klaassen and De Graaff stated that “little research has focused on the impact of this development [i.e. EMI] on teachers and students in Dutch higher education” (p. 281). Until today, there has not been a significant extension of this research. What is more, research into whether EMI has an effect on lecturers’ teaching performance has mostly been done at universities of engineering, technology, or agriculture and to a lesser extent in faculties of business and law. These universities are at the forefront of EMI implementation (e.g. Airey et al., 2015; Ammon & McConnell, 2002; Coleman, 2006). It would be interesting to see how EMI is implemented and received at a general university. Nevertheless, little research has focused on these universities. Likewise, at Radboud University Nijmegen no research on lecturers’ and students’ perceptions and proficiency has been done. This university, however, presents itself as an international university and is implementing EMI to a great extent. Therefore, the current study solely focuses on this university. As there is no way back from EMI at Radboud University (Van der Weerden, personal communication, September 20, 2016), it is very important to find out whether EMI affects lecturers’ way of teaching. Therefore, the present study contributes to the debate and the research gap.

The current study revolves around the following question: Is lecturers’ way of teaching in English different from their way of teaching in Dutch? The hypothesis based on the theory available (see Chapter 2) is that lecturers’ way of teaching is influenced negatively by EMI. To answer the research question, lecturers’ and students’ views on lecturers’ teaching are taken into consideration. Furthermore, lecturers’ teaching performance should be studied to see whether they display differences between EMI and Dutch-medium instruction.

Therefore, the following sub-questions need to be answered:

1. What are lecturers’ views on their way of teaching in English compared to Dutch?
2. What are students’ views on lecturers’ way of teaching in English compared to Dutch?
3. Do lecturers exhibit differences between teaching in English and Dutch?

In order to see whether lecturers' way of teaching differs between EMI and Dutch-medium instruction at Radboud University, the present study replicates Vinke's (1995) study. However, Vinke's (1995) study is more than 20 years old and much has changed in those decades. Therefore, the study is expanded and based on more recent studies. In addition to Vinke's (1995) study, the present study includes the dimension of students' views on lecturers' performance in detail (based on Hellekjær, 2010; Klaassen, 2001; and Lehtonen, Lönnfors & Virkkunen-Fullenwider, 1999), which is something that has not yet been done in previous studies.

The current study is structured as follows: Chapter 2 provides background information and discusses previous research. It presents research on EMI in combination with lecturers' performance. Chapter 3 provides a detailed outline of the methodology that is used. The fourth chapter presents the results, which are discussed in Chapter 5. Finally, Chapter 6 is a summary of the study and provides a conclusion, the relevance of the study, and suggestions for further research.

## **2. Background**

As discussed in the introduction, English has become the most influential language in the world. Several developments accounted for its dominance and thus for Englishisation. The main developments that made English so important are globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education. These and connected developments are dealt with in the following sections.

### **2.1 Globalisation**

The past centuries have seen the rise of globalisation which takes up a large part of everyday life now. As Gardt and Hüppauf (2004) state, “[g]lobalization manifests itself in the increased use of English as a second language world-wide, in the corresponding decrease of importance of other languages in second language acquisition and in the increasing presence of English in everyday life in non-English speaking societies” (x). However, when globalisation is shown through the increasing use of English, there should be reasons that clarify this increasing use. Coleman (2006) argues that English became an important language “through colonization, industrialization and oppressive language policies, and has received an additional impetus from technology, media and concentration of economic power” (p. 2). In agreement with other researchers (e.g. Crystal, 2004), Coleman shows that these developments had to take place in order for English to become a global language.

The first signs towards modern globalisation were visible in the fifteenth century when European countries started to explore the world and “brought distant places within the reach of all” (Hüppauf, 2004, p. 11). However, the Europeans did not only explore the world, they also claimed the ‘new’ lands and colonised them. The British also made voyages to discover the world and colonise the places they went to. This started the spread of English (Montgomery, 2004), for the British colonised a large part of the world and consequently a

new world emerged in which English had a dominant position (Hüppauf, 2004, p. 11). The British left their last colonies in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Crystal, 2004, p. 30) and thus had had a great influence there. Presently, many former British colonies still have English as an official and sometimes even the first language (L1) (Tamtam et al., 2012).

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, colonisation was reduced as the most important reason for globalisation. Instead, the industrial revolution and the ever growing technology (Crystal, 2004; Montgomery, 2004) became the main reason for globalisation. “The Industrial Revolution gave English prominence in technological matters crucial to modernization” (Montgomery, 2004, p. 1333). Montgomery (2004) shows, that because of the importance of some technological matters, English has been spreading across the globe. As Crystal (2004) argues, “most of the innovations of the industrial revolution were of British origin” (p. 31), which confirms the English prominence Montgomery (2004) talks about. Many of the manufactured goods were exported, but the knowledge about technology remained in Britain. Therefore, Britain saw an increase of immigrants that started “to learn about the new technologies” in English (Crystal, 2004, p. 31). Inventions such as the printing press, the radio, televisions, computers, software, and especially internet and its many uses, e.g. social media, increased the spread of English (Crystal, 2004). Most of the time the language of usage was English for these inventions were English or American. These events show that many technological devices have an English or American origin, or were first used by English speaking people and therefore stimulated the use of English around the world.

Thirdly, economics, politics, and business have also been influencing the spread of English as a global language (Crystal, 2004). Yet again, Britain and the USA have been occupying a prominent place. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the international banking system rapidly grew and London and New York became the “investment capitals of the world” (Crystal, 2004, p 31). Nowadays, America is one of the most vital economies in the worlds’ economy

(Hüppauf, 2004, p. 7). In addition political aspects played a large role as well. First of all, there are many political organisations that are globally or regionally oriented, e.g. the UN, the NATO, the WTO, and the EU (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999). There is evidence that the lingua franca of these organisations is English (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999, p. 23). As Crystal (2004) argues, “English now plays an official or working role in the proceedings of most other major international political gatherings, in all parts of the world” (p. 30).

As well as economics and politics, business has been influenced by internationalisation as well. Many companies and corporations have been focussing on the international market, which kept growing as a result of the mass production and export (Crystal, 2004). In order to be able to communicate on this international market and to be able to succeed in business (Linn, 2015, p. vii) the need existed for a common language. Due to the presence of many internationally oriented companies in the USA and the power the USA has globally (Hüppauf, 2004), the natural option was to choose for English.

Finally, the fourth development that is discussed here and that contributed to the globalisation of English is cultural power and in particular pop culture. Pop culture has its rudiments in the development of motion pictures in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Films became more and more important in everyday life and the dominance of making them was soon in hands of the USA, for Hollywood became bigger and bigger (Crystal, 2004). Until today, Hollywood is still the most productive film-capital in the world. Besides the film business, popular music is also dominated by the English language, because “most of the subsequent technical developments took place in the USA” (Crystal, 2004, p. 35). Modern English popular music especially gained ground with the appearance, and popularity, of bands such as the Beatles. Both the UK and the USA are now among the largest music-producing countries and Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) even claim that “pop music is increasingly English-

only” (p. 29). Finally, travel and tourism increased the use of English to a far extent. As a result of colonialism and globalisation many countries opened up their borders, which made it easier to travel. However, travelling brings with it the problem of linguistic diversity. To overcome this, people are in need of a lingua franca and English has been growing into this status (Crystal, 2004).

As Coleman (2006) stated, and what applies here as well, is that not all the above named “drivers of Englishization apply to the same extent in Europe” (p. 3). None of the European countries are ex-colonies of Britain and “science and technology, broadcasting and economic power are more evenly spread than in other continents” (Coleman, 2006, p. 3). Still, English is widely used across the European continent, which once again shows its importance. What does apply to the European countries is that they are “distinguished by shared policies on language and on higher education” (Coleman, 2006, p. 3) which is explained in the following section.

## **2.2 Internationalisation and Englishisation of Higher Education in Europe**

As a result of globalisation and internationalisation of the business market, higher education has been subjected to internationalisation as well (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Coleman, 2013, p. xiii; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013, p. xvii; Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011; Knight, 2003; Thøgersen & Airey, 2011; Vinke, 1995; Vinke, Snippe, & Jochems, 1998). Especially the last two decades, higher education has been rapidly changing. As Coleman (2006) puts it, “[higher education] belongs to a globalized market” (p. 3). Hultgren et al. (2015) go even further by stating that “European universities [...] [are nowadays] centred on internationalization, marketization, competition and standardization” (p. 1). Coleman (2006) argues that universities have become like companies; the student is the customer (p. 3). Universities have to prove themselves in order to be eligible to compete.

Internationalisation in the context of higher education is a difficult term and is defined in many ways, such as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2); “a process of organisational change motivated by an increase in the proportion of non-native students and staff” (Tange, 2010, p. 138); or “the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions – and even individuals – to cope with the global academic environment” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). The definitions show that internationalisation of higher education revolves around adding non-nativeness to tertiary education and focuses on global dimensions. The definition that will be applied in the current study and which is derived from the definitions above is as follows: internationalisation is the process of integrating international, intercultural, and global dimensions into tertiary education undertaken by academic systems and institutions. Henceforth, when internationalisation is discussed in this paper it will be following this definition and therefore is in light of higher education.

Internationalisation developed from and contributes to the cooperation of different countries and to the sharing of knowledge which in its turn contributes to the quality of education (Vinke et al., 1998). The initial intention was to encourage student and staff mobility (Vinke, 1995; Wächter, 2008), which would become apparent in classes with foreign and domestic students who differ in background, linguistic skills, and learning approach (Tange, 2010, p. 138). The attraction of foreign students enables institutions to “operate successfully in an international community” (Vinke et al., 1998, p. 383). However, due to the globalised market, higher education institutions are now mainly focused on taking a high place at world university rankings in which institutions can be compared (Wilkinson, 2013, p. 3). A higher ranking means a higher status (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Coleman, 2013, p. xiv; Van der Wende, 2007; Vinke, 1995). There is an interrelationship between



internationalisation and ranking; the higher the ranking, the more international students and staff a university attracts and the higher the incoming fees are, and conversely, the more foreign students and staff come to a university, the higher it is ranked (Coleman, 2006; Coleman, 2013, Tamtam et al., 2012). Internationalisation also affects “pedagogical practices, curriculum development, knowledge flows and the work routines of a growing number of students, administrators and academic staff” (Tange, 2010, p. 138); “teaching and learning expectations, and access policies” (Hughes, 2008, pp. 4–5).

The foundation of internationalisation of higher education in Europe is especially due to the Bologna Process and the signing of its declaration in 1999. The Bologna process was held by 29 Ministers of Education of different European countries who agreed to create a European Higher Education Area (EHEA), so that a “more complete and far-reaching Europe” was established (EHEA, 1999). This was, then, able to compete with educational strongholds like the USA and China (Hultgren et al., 2015) and was a reaction to the marketisation of higher education (Coleman, 2006, p. 3). The EHEA enabled countries to cooperate and increased staff and student mobility (EHEA, n.d.; Hultgren et al., 2015). It also enabled people to move between countries while their degrees remained valid (EHEA, n.d.; Hultgren et al., 2015, p. 2) and gave them access to the European labour market (EHEA, n.d.). Furthermore, the national higher education reforms were subjected to a broader European context (EHEA, n.d.). Finally, the EHEA aimed to “enhance the competitiveness of the European Higher Education Area, emphasising the need to further the independence and autonomy of all Higher Education Institutions” (EHEA, 2016). These aims were discussed in the Bologna Process and six objectives were formulated. Firstly, the Bologna Process promotes a system of “easily readable and comparable degrees” (EHEA, 2016), which means that in the EHEA citizens are free to be employed in all countries, because degrees are similar and recognised. Secondly, the EHEA adopts a system that consists of two cycles, i.e.

undergraduate (at least three years) and graduate (master or doctorate level) (EHEA, 2016; Hultgren et al., 2015). This objective has been changed into a three-cycle system, i.e. bachelor-master-doctorate (European Commission, n.d.; EHEA, n.d.). The third objective shows agreement on a joint system of credits; the ECTS system (EHEA, 2016). Fourthly, the EHEA promotes free mobility of students, lecturers, researchers, and administrative staff (EHEA, 2016). The penultimate objective makes sure there is a “European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies” (EHEA, 2016). The last objective encourages the “necessary European dimensions in higher education” (EHEA, 2016), such as programme and curriculum development and mobility schemes.

Following the Bologna Process and globalisation and internationalisation of higher education in general, European universities have opted for English as a medium of instruction (Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 5; Margić & Vodopija-Krstanović, 2015, p. 44). In non-English dominant contexts, internationalisation of universities is equated with Englishisation (Coleman, 2006; Hultgren et al., 2015; Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 3; Linn, 2015, Smit & Dafouz, 2012). Internationalisation eventuates foreign language learning, but because of the prominence of English this has been solely restrained to English (Doiz et al., 2013, p. xvii). Vinke et al. (1998) agree by stating that for international higher education to succeed an international language of instruction must be introduced, also in Europe. The language that is most likely to be chosen is English, since the medium of instruction for most international students is English (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012, p. 429). Even though the Bologna Declaration nowhere states English to become the language of instruction in Europe, English still required that status (Phillipson, 2015). Coleman (2013) explains this in the following way, “the inexorable global dominance of English across a majority of linguistic domains makes it the inevitable preference in the specific and influential domain of academe” (xiv). He

argues that because English is the global language and the language of science, it also becomes the language of education. As a result, the last two decades have seen the rise of English-taught programmes in Europe (Margić & Vodopija-Krstanović, 2015). The following sections of this research focus on EMI in Europe in which the focus is solely on Northern and Western Europe for most research has been done there.

### **2.3 EMI: A General Overview**

Since the rise of globalisation, courses and programmes that are taught in English have been emerging all around Europe. From the 1950s onwards, Sweden and the Netherlands have already been teaching courses in English. Countries like Finland, Hungary, and Norway followed in the 1980s (Airey, 2011; Coleman, 2006, p. 6). However, since the 1990s, and especially after the Bologna Process in 1999, EMI in higher education in Europe has been increasing rapidly (e.g. Airey et al., 2015; Coleman, 2006; Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Maiworm & Wächter, 2002; Wächter & Maiworm, 2008; Wächter & Maiworm, 2015). Ritzen (2004) states that “probably all universities promote some form of internationalization, and increasingly more universities are offering programmes wholly or partly in a foreign language, almost always English” (p. 33) in which he shows that EMI is implemented to a great extent.

#### **2.3.1 EMI in Europe**

The growth of EMI in Europe has been mapped out by various studies, such as Ammon and McConnell (2002), Maiworm and Wächter (2002), and Wächter and Maiworm (2008, 2015), of whom the last three executed it under the authority of the Academic Cooperation Association. All studies have investigated the situation of EMI programmes provided in Europe. Ammon and McConnell (2002) examined 22 European countries in 1999-2000. They

concluded that “English as a foreign language and major European lingua franca has now widely spread into most European countries as a language of university teaching” (p. 171). They found that the southern countries were more reluctant in using English as a medium of instruction than the northern countries and that western European countries were more willing to teach in English than eastern European countries (Ammon & McConnell, 2002, p. 173–174).

Maiworm and Wächter (2002) found that in the 19 European countries examined in 2001 some 700 English-taught courses or programmes were provided. The countries that came out at the top when proportion was taken into account were Finland and the Netherlands. They also found that there was a natural division across Europe in which Northern and Western Europe had the most courses/programmes in EMI and Southern and Eastern Europe had the least. In 2007, Wächter and Maiworm (2008) examined 27 countries which provided some 2400 programmes taught in English. The Netherlands and Finland, again, occupied the first two places, only they had swapped places (Wächter & Maiworm, 2008, p. 11). The North-South divide was also still accurate. The findings of the 2014 study were not much different. Wächter and Maiworm (2015) found that of the 28 countries examined, EMI programmes were still “largely concentrated in Central West Europe (with the Netherlands and, Germany in the lead) and the Nordic countries” (p. 16). Furthermore, the Netherlands was still the leading country, followed by Denmark, Sweden, and Finland (Wächter & Maiworm, 2015, p. 17). In addition the North-South divide did not change much, but Eastern Europe came closer.

The number of English-taught programmes grew exponentially over the years. In 2014 no fewer than 8089 EMI programmes were provided across Europe (Wächter & Maiworm, 2015, p. 16). In 13 years time, EMI programmes in Europe became 11 times as frequent. As Smit and Dafouz (2012) put it, this “reveals that the European higher education scene has

been a highly fertile breeding ground for introducing English as a new medium of instruction and must thus be regarded as an ideal site for investigating the realities and implications of teaching and learning in an additional language” (p. 2) which is something that has been done in this research.

To summarise, the four studies indicate that EMI in Europe has been increasing greatly over the last couple of years. Furthermore, the four studies note that there is a north-south divide as well as a east-west divide. However, Wächter and Maiworm (2015) observed that the divisions became smaller, especially for the east-west divide. Despite of the divisions becoming smaller, the leading countries remained the north-western countries, i.e. the Nordic countries and the Netherlands and Germany. The following section, therefore, discusses the introduction of EMI in the Netherlands.

### ***2.3.2 EMI in the Netherlands***

The Netherlands introduced their first English-taught courses at an early point in time. As soon as the 1950s, courses in English were provided at universities (Ammon & McConnell, 2002; Coleman, 2006). Wächter and Maiworm (2008, 2015) mentioned that the Netherlands is one of the countries that has implemented EMI to a great extent. With no fewer than 1078 (30%) of the programmes taught in English (Wächter & Maiworm, 2015, p. 44), the Netherlands was the top country in providing EMI in Europe. The question that arises is why EMI is so widely and successfully implemented in the Netherlands.

First of all, “the Netherlands is located at the crossroads of three large and economically strong linguistic areas” (Ammon & McConnell, 2002, p. 98). This means that as a relatively small country, the Netherlands easily get into a tight corner. What is more, the Dutch economic survival is depending greatly on the surrounding countries and on export of Dutch goods (Wilkinson, 2013). This implies that they are in a “strong need for

internationalisation, which results in attracting human and manufacturing resources from abroad and exporting expertise and finished products beyond its borders” (Ammon & McConnell, 2002, p. 98). Consequently, in order to survive, the Netherlands have to work closely with other countries and therefore are in need of speaking a common language. Given the growing importance of English globally, the use of this language is highly stimulated in the Netherlands, resulting in English being almost as much as the second national language (Ammon & McConnell, 2002, p. 99).

Secondly, related to the first reason, Airey et al. (2015) state that because of the small number of L1 speakers of the Nordic languages it is “a difficult and costly enterprise for the Nordic countries to maintain and develop the status of their national language in all of the specialist areas within the higher education domain” (p. 3). The same can be said for the Netherlands. In order to be able to compete in the international market (Wilkinson, 2013), the Dutch need to speak the lingua franca, i.e. English. It is therefore perhaps not a surprise that the Netherlands have been actively promoting EMI in higher education and more and more into secondary and primary education as well.

Finally, internationalisation of higher education is also a motive for the promotion of EMI in the Netherlands (Wilkinson, 2013). As the surrounding countries are focussing more on English and on sending their students abroad, the Netherlands have to participate. As Teleman (1989) stated “[...] the universities of the smaller countries will shift towards Anglo-American, in connection with their striving to create education programmes that sell within the whole market” (cited in Airey et al., 2015, p. 9). So, in order to remain equal to other countries and to attract as many foreign students and staff, Dutch universities have to provide EMI. Not providing EMI means not competing with other universities worldwide. Foreign students are then less likely to come and study in the Netherlands and other countries remain more attractive.

To summarise, the fact that the Netherlands have “led the way in Europe in offering programs with English as a medium of instruction” (Ingvarsdóttir & Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2010, p. 3) can be explained by its relative small size. In order to survive, the country depends on foreign contacts and trade treaties, for which English is the most important language.

## **2.4 EMI Research**

This section discusses the research on EMI that has been emerging. Section 2.4.1 presents studies that have been done on EMI. The section touches upon general studies and studies concerning specific aspects of EMI research. Secondly, the studies that are especially relevant for answering the research question are discussed in section 2.4.2.

### ***2.4.1 Research on EMI***

Simultaneous with the rise of the introduction of EMI in Europe, research on EMI emerged as well. Many aspects of EMI have been subjected to research in recent years. Some researchers have discussed the general aspects, reasons, and consequences of EMI. Hughes (2008) provides background information on internationalisation and internationalisation of higher education. She focuses on the Anglophone asymmetry, arguing that “[a]t country level it can be argued that non-English-speaking countries find it difficult to compete in terms of the benefits of higher education internationalisation [as] the market is simply skewed against them” (Hughes, 2008, p. 9). However, she concludes that the world is shifting towards EMI in higher education. Wächter (2008) also discusses internationalisation of higher education to a great extent. What is more, he sheds light on the mobility in and beyond Europe. Finally, he discusses the differences between EHEA and the Bologna Process.

Tamtam et al. (2012) discuss the adoption of EMI in three parts of the world, i.e. Europe, Asia, and Africa. They state that Europe perceives EMI as a positive change whereas

Asia is struggling with it. Their conclusion is that Europe has made the greatest advances in EMI, followed by Africa and Asia comes last. Correspondingly, Kirkpatrick (2011) also investigated EMI in the European and Asian context. He concludes that internationalisation in both continents is connected to EMI. However, Kirkpatrick states that Asia is lagging behind. In Europe, countries have set up language policies and universities are working together, aspects that both still have to be implemented in Asia.

Coleman (2006) gives a general overview of the situation of EMI in Europe. He enunciates the reasons for implementing EMI, i.e. “CLIL, internationalisation, student exchanges, teaching and research materials, staff mobility, graduate employability and the market in international students” (Coleman, 2006, p. 4). He concludes that the world will become diglossic, i.e. “one language for local communication, culture and expression of identity, and another – English – for wider and more formal communication, especially in writing” and higher education (Coleman, 2006, p. 11).

In contrast, Phillipson (2015) refutes, among others, several of Coleman’s (2006) arguments. He states that Coleman’s statement on the world becoming diglossic is based on nothing (p. 25). In his conclusion he states that he has discussed many statements on EMI made by fellow researchers. He however, expresses the need for more detailed research into EMI. He also conveys the need for language policies.

Shohamy (2013) discusses some issues of EMI. First of all, she notes that the quality of EMI should be questioned; can academic content be acquired successfully when taught in a non-native language? In addition she mentions that it is often the case that academic professors either have knowledge of an academic subject or of English (p. 203). Furthermore, students are often more reluctant to interact in EMI settings. Shohamy’s second issue with EMI is concerned with ‘minority’ students who have English as their third language (p. 204). When taught in English, these students often have lower achievements (Shohamy, 2013, p.



204). Finally, Shohamy discusses the problem of testing in English. She states that next to academic knowledge, language knowledge is highly important in these tests. Lower grades may be due to the lack of proficiency in English. She concludes by stating that despite these issues, EMI programmes are still expanding.

Airey et al. (2015) discuss EMI in the four Nordic countries, i.e. Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. They state that the governments of the Nordic countries have been implementing EMI, however little guidance or reflection has been offered. Domain loss caused by English is solved by parallel language use. Following these themes, researchers have been looking into lecturer and student attitudes of EMI and the prevalence of EMI via surveys and interviews. They conclude that when switching to EMI, universities have to be careful and take into mind the difficulties that can arise (Airey et al., 2015, p. 10).

Wilkinson (2013) also provides a general overview of EMI, although he uses a university in the Netherlands as an example. He discusses reasons universities have for implementing EMI, i.e. attract foreign students, prepare domestic students for the global or international market, make the university more attractive, “secure the research base”, “provide high-level education for students [of] Third World” countries, “attract foreign students to become part of the workforce of the country”, “counterbalance the lack of enrolment of domestic students”, provide specialised courses, and “improve the income base of the institution” (Wilkinson, 2013, p. 8). Furthermore, he presents how the development of EMI took place over the last three decades. Finally, he elaborates on some of the consequences of EMI (e.g. the loss of domain for the L1, design of the curriculum, the collaboration between content and language staff, and the quality of the courses). Wilkinson concludes that even though implementing EMI has been thoroughly done, “issues still arise concerning the economic, social and political desirability of EMI in higher education” (p. 18).

In addition to general papers on EMI, research on more specific aspects of EMI have been conducted as well. Klaassen and Bos (2010), for example, screened the scientific staff of Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands. Their impetus was that students had been complaining about lecturers' proficiency in English. They concluded that even though the students felt that the lecturers' proficiency was too low, the majority of the lecturers had a sufficient proficiency (Klaassen & Bos, 2010, p. 73). However, lecturers' oral and listening skills were of a lower level than reading and writing. They opted that it might be the case that students' proficiency was too low.

A second example is Hendriks, Van Meurs, and Hogervorst (2016). These authors looked at whether Dutch lecturers' degree of accentedness in English affected students' attitudes and comprehensibility. They found that Dutch non-native listeners of English were more positive towards slightly and native accented instructors. Moderately accented instructors were perceived negatively. Slightly and native accented instructors were also more comprehensible in view of the students than moderate accented instructors.

Finally, Hellekjær and Westergaard (2003) distributed questionnaires among department heads in order to get information about EMI in Nordic countries. They found that no extra effort went into hiring new staff when a university switched to EMI. Universities also did not change courses for EMI. Overall, lecturers' and students' proficiency was sufficient. However, some lecturers had some language problems, such as fluency and a limited vocabulary.

Researchers have been looking into many more aspects of EMI. However, not all these articles can be discussed here. Therefore, the focus of the next section is on literature that relates to the research question. The section presents research on lecturers' performance, lecturers' attitudes, and students' attitudes.

### ***2.4.2 Studies on the effects of EMI implementation***

Internationalisation of higher education has raised quite some questions over the years which “led to a large number of surveys and interviews with students and teachers that attempted to document the linguistic landscape in higher education” (Airey et al., 2015, p. 11). The studies especially focus on two domains; lecturers’ and students’ views on EMI and the effects EMI have on higher education (Airey et al., 2015, p. 11). Below, a selection of these studies is presented, i.e. studies which are relevant to the research question and studies that are conducted in northern and western Europe. To begin, the first study on EMI, an exploratory study from the Netherlands from 1991, is discussed. Then, section 2.4.2.1 presents studies that examined lecturers’ views on and performance in EMI. Section 2.4.2.2 provides a discussion of the studies done on students’ views on EMI and lecturers using it. Section 2.4.2.3 discusses studies investigating both lecturers’ and students’ views on EMI. Finally, section 2.4.2.4 provides a summary of the main research findings of the literature discussed.

The first study on EMI has been conducted in the Netherlands in 1991 by Zonneveld. Her study is, especially in the Netherlands, the first exploratory study on English-taught courses at university. Zonneveld examined whether didactical effects would occur if a considerable number of courses of the regular programme would be taught in English. The data showed lecturers’ and students’ expectations. Zonneveld concluded that many lecturers and students were hesitant towards a switch in medium of instruction. She found that both lecturers’ and students’ proficiency might not be adequate enough. Furthermore, lecturers might not be able to be as detailed and nuanced as in Dutch and students would comprehend less of the subject matter as well. Finally, due to the various backgrounds of the students, teaching will change, e.g. there would be more contact between lecturer and students and lecturers would need different didactical skills for the variety of students (Zonneveld, 1991).

The study by Zonneveld (1991) thus found that lecturers and students felt somewhat reluctant towards the implementation of EMI. The following section discusses lecturers' views on EMI from later studies. These studies have been done via a variety of methods, i.e. questionnaires, interviews, observations, and audio and video recordings.

#### *2.4.2.1 Studies concerning lecturers' views on EMI and their performance*

Following Zonneveld (1991), one of the first and most influential studies that was done on the effects of EMI implementation is that by Vinke (1995). In this study, Vinke examined how internationalisation, i.e. in this case EMI, affected the quality of Dutch higher education (Vinke, 1995, p. 3). She investigated whether any problems would occur if lecturers' switched from Dutch-medium instruction to EMI and whether this switch had any effect on the quality of instruction. Vinke carried out the research in three parts. First she examined whether the change of medium of instruction affected lecturers' experience of teaching skills. Secondly, she carried out an observational study to see whether Dutch lecturers' teaching behaviour was affected by the change of instructional language. Finally, Vinke examined whether students' learning was affected when taught in English. The first study found that, in general, lecturers did not experience large differences between EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. However, there were some exceptions; lecturers spent more time on and effort in preparing lectures, and lecturers' language-related and improvising teaching skills were poorer in English compared to Dutch. Lecturers also felt that their teaching skills were more negative in English than in Dutch. Furthermore, Vinke found that certain background characteristics correlated with other items and had more favourable results, e.g. the more practice lecturers had, the better they assessed themselves. Finally, lecturers that were comfortable to switch between the languages felt more capable to use the language-related teaching skills (Vinke, 1995, p. 78). The second part concluded that switching from Dutch-medium instruction to EMI had a moderate effect

on lecturers' teaching behaviour. The lecturers structured their lectures more in English than in Dutch. There was more student-lecturer interaction in English as well. The lecturers did not use silence more in English, nor did they have to compensate, e.g. postpone reaction or consult their notes. However, the lecturers were less redundant in English compared to Dutch and they were also rated lower on verbal fluency in English by Vinke. Finally, in the last part of the study, Vinke concluded that a "switch from the mother tongue to English as a medium of instruction [...] [had] a moderate, negative effect on Dutch students' learning" (p. 135). Furthermore, switching to EMI affects Dutch students' perceptions of instruction in a limited and inconsistent way. So, Vinke found that switching from Dutch-medium instruction to EMI had some moderate and negative effects on teaching and learning.

Similar to Vinke (1995), other studies have been investigating lecturers' views on and experiences with EMI as well. Wilkinson (2005) investigated whether teaching in English had an impact on instructional methods. He found that lecturers did not feel different about teaching in English or Dutch. Lecturers, however, changed some of their teaching techniques, e.g. there was more time for interaction, lecturers presented less new information, and they adjusted their language to their students. Lecturers also indicated that a switch to EMI lowered the quality of education (e.g. because of inadequate language skills, less digression, anecdotes, humour and spontaneous examples), takes more time (e.g. to explain terms and concepts), and demands changes in tasks and assignments (Wilkinson, 2005, p. 3).

Hellekjær (2007) found that lecturers who had more experience and practice in English had fewer difficulties with EMI. He also concluded that lecturers did not adapt their teaching in English and that students' English proficiency often was a problem (e.g. less interaction).

Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2010) found that generally lecturers felt their English proficiency was adequate and not problematic, but that they needed help with writing

academic papers in English. Lecturers also found that students' proficiency was too low and therefore they supplied their students with extra material.

Tange (2010) shed some light on what effects internationalisation has on "lecturers' ability to act and interact in the classroom" (p. 137). She found that lecturers were more positive towards EMI when they had had sufficient experience. All lecturers indicated that they felt restricted in communicating knowledge to students (e.g. they were not able to nuance their statements or translate words well), they felt they missed terminology for casual conversations, or their lectures became more formal because jokes and anecdotes were omitted. Furthermore, some thought the cultural diversity in classrooms was hard, others who had had more experience had adapted their teaching style (Tange, 2010, p. 144).

Jensen and Thøgersen (2011) found that most lecturers felt that content should be taught through the L1. Lecturers also admitted that not everyone is suitable for teaching in an EMI setting and that English had a more developed technical language. Furthermore, lecturers agreed that more courses in English had to be given, if universities want to compete internationally. Finally, younger lecturers were more positive towards EMI just as lecturers that have a high teaching load.

Thøgersen and Airey (2011) investigated whether the teaching style becomes more formal when teaching in EMI and whether the rate of presentation becomes slower. The conclusions made in this study are that the lecturer takes more time in explaining the same information in English and that the lecturer uses a more formal style than in Danish, i.e. it represents a more written textbook style.

Gürtler and Kronewald (2015) found that the lecturers in their study felt that foreign language medium of instruction should "be employed at later stages of education or in elective courses" (Gürtler & Kronewald, 2015, p. 98). Most lecturers indicated that they taught in a foreign language because of personal interest. The lecturers also indicated that

students' workload and English proficiency were a problem, the last resulting in less interaction. Several lecturers mentioned there was a difference in their teaching style.

Kling (2015) found that lecturers were comfortable teaching in EMI settings, but they noted some difficulties, i.e. "lack of nuance, limitations of vocabulary, grammatical inaccuracy, and the like, and cultural and educational diversity" (p. 210). Lecturers indicated that they talked slower in English and that students' English proficiency is sometimes too low.

Furthermore, in two studies a language training course was provided to lecturers to see what the effects of EMI implementation were. Klaassen and De Graaff (2001) found that lecturers who already taught in English had developed "coping mechanisms which are not necessarily most effective" (p. 288). Furthermore, the courses helped lecturers overcome anxiety and focus more on students. Airey (2011) found that lecturers had to change to EMI on short notice and that they received no training. Furthermore, lecturers spend more time on preparing, felt they did not go into depth in English as much as in their L1 (this was refuted by the author who found there was no difference in depth), changed their pedagogical style, were less fluent (e.g. hesitations and false starts), had fewer gestures, and were uncomfortable correcting students' English. However, the training course boosted lecturers' confidence.

#### *2.4.2.2 Studies concerning students' views on lecturers and EMI*

In addition to studies on lecturers' performance and attitudes, students' performance and attitudes towards EMI and their lecturers have been investigated as well. Airey and Linder (2006, 2007) investigated whether EMI affects students' learning. They found that students felt that there was no difference in their learning when taught in English rather than their L1 (Airey & Linder, 2006, p. 555). Students also felt that lecturers' proficiency in English was the limiting factor in learning (Airey & Linder, 2006, p. 555). However, when students saw the recordings of the lectures they attended, they noticed that there were differences between

EMI and instruction in their L1. They asked and answered less questions, depended more on lecturers' lecture notes, and they spent more time concentrating on writing down notes than trying to understand the content (Airey & Linder, 2006, p. 556) and thus reasoned that they spent more time on the content outside classes and read the relevant literature before class.

Hellekjær (2010) investigated whether students have problems understanding their lecturers in EMI settings. He found that students felt EMI to be slightly more difficult than teaching in their L1. Furthermore, he notes that the interesting result is that students also have difficulties in their L1 to a similar extent as in English. He also found that students feel the need to ask questions in both EMI and L1 settings to a great extent when not understanding the subject matter (Hellekjær, 2010, p. 18). Furthermore, students indicated they had to put more effort into English-taught courses and they relied more on slides in English than in their L1. Finally, the students experienced more difficulties in EMI because of lecturers' unclear pronunciation, unfamiliar vocabulary, and they were less able to follow lecturers' train of thought (Hellekjær, 2010, p. 24).

Finally, Jensen, Denver, Mees, and Werther (2013) examined how students perceive their lecturers' English proficiency. They found that when students perceived lecturers' English proficiency as better, they also perceived them "as having higher general lecturing competence" (Jensen et al., 2013, p. 98) and vice versa. Furthermore, they found that students with the same language background as the lecturer gave a lower rating concerning lecturers' proficiency than students with another L1.

#### *2.4.2.3 Studies concerning both lecturers' and students' views on EMI*

Researchers also looked into lecturers' and students' views on EMI. Lehtonen et al. (1999) tried to identify problems perceived by lecturers and students concerning EMI implementation. They found that students indicated their own proficiency quite positively.



However, students had difficulties with skills that have to do with free speech and improvisation, e.g. academic discussions, and presentations (Lehtonen et al., 1999, p. 9). Students also expressed their preference for language support courses to improve their English, which was endorsed by lecturers. Lecturers' results showed that they were satisfied with their English proficiency, which is something that is confirmed by the students' perceptions of their lecturers. Lecturers, however, indicated they had more problems with academic writing. They, too, expressed their need for support courses, which was endorsed by students. Overall, the Lehtonen et al. deduced that the lecturers felt quite positive towards EMI, teaching, and their students' proficiency.

Klaassen (2001) investigated "the relationship between effective lecturing behaviour and English language proficiency of non-native speaking lecturers of English" (p. 44). She found that initially students experience an effect due to EMI, but these are gone after one year. Therefore, she concludes that learning in another language does not have an effect on students' learning. Lecturing behaviour, on the other hand, is very important for effective learning in both the L1 and EMI. Lecturers should make use of student-centred teaching, for Klaassen found this to be more important than lecturers' language skills. Moreover, clarity is perceived as most important factor when lecturers teaching in English is judged by students. Klaassen also found that even though lecturers' proficiency was quite high, students tended to give some a lower rating, because of lecturers' lack of didactical skills. Klaassen concluded that lecturers with better didactical skills were perceived more positively. Didactical skills are therefore more important than language, which means that when lecturers' didactical skills are worse in EMI it is disastrous for students' results.

Klaassen (2003) described a study that was done by student councils at a Dutch university to reveal lecturers' and students' views on EMI. She found that the majority of the students had a positive view of EMI at graduate level. Furthermore, students' reading

proficiency and understanding were good enough. However, they thought that when EMI would be implemented, the quality of education would decline due to lecturers' lack of proficiency (Klaassen, 2003, p. 133). Lecturers were also very positive of EMI at graduate level, however, they felt EMI was not necessary. Lecturers also felt that the quality of education would decline, because they would be less able to use nuances, go into less depth of subject matter, and use less improvising skills (Klaassen, 2003, p. 134).

Lehtonen, Lönnfors, and Virkkunen-Fullenwider (2003) examined whether EMI affected higher education and whether support systems should be developed. The first study discussed in Lehtonen et al. (2003) is a summary of Lehtonen et al. (1999). The second study found that lecturers were comfortable, confident, and fluent in English, even though they were not always accurate (Lehtonen et al., 2003, p. 111). Furthermore, lecturers had difficulties with teaching skills (e.g. using the classroom and time management). Students noted that they had no problems understanding lectures taught in English. However, Lehtonen et al. found that students had difficulties with lecturers' pronunciation (i.e. word stress and tone patterns), their speed of speech, and the monotonous tone of voice.

Sercu (2004) found that both lecturers and students were quite positive towards EMI implementation, but note that undergraduates should be taught in their L1. Lecturers and students hold different opinions of lecturers' proficiency in English. Lecturers state that content is the central point and that proficiency should therefore be sufficient but not near-native, whereas students state lecturers should be near-native speakers.

Jensen, Denver, Mees, and Werther (2011) measured "students' perceptions of their own and their [lecturers'] English skills, as well as [...] [lecturers'] self-assessments of their English proficiency" (p. 21). They found that most students felt they were very sufficient in English. Lecturers rated their proficiency somewhat lower than students. Even though most of

the lecturers felt they were “linguistically well equipped to teach in English” (Jensen et al., 2011, p. 32), they indicated they had some problems with fluency and correctness.

Tatzl (2011) found that, overall, lecturers and students were positive about EMI implementation, even though their motivations were slightly different. Students mentioned that they benefit from EMI, because it improves their English proficiency. Lecturers noted they did not experience differences between teaching in their L1 or in English. However, they had problems motivating students and coping with students’ varying proficiencies (Tatzl, 2011, p. 258). Furthermore, lecturers covered less subject matter during English-taught courses. Students had problems with vocabulary and both lecturers and students opted for language support courses.

Bolton and Kuteeva (2012) surveyed “the use of English for academic purposes and students’ and [lecturers’] attitudes to [EMI]” (p. 429). They concluded that results differed greatly among various faculties, i.e. Science and the Social Sciences used more EMI than Humanities and Law. Students felt they were more able to discuss content in their L1. They also felt lecturers had a poor proficiency. Most of the lecturers did not report difficulties due to teaching in English. Furthermore, most lecturers and students of the faculties supported the policy of teaching content courses in English.

#### *2.4.2.4 Summary of the research findings of previous literature*

In general, lecturers and students are very positive about the implementation of EMI. Several studies concluded that lecturers and students deemed their own command of English to be quite adequate. Lecturers and students experienced no differences or difficulties between teaching or being taught in their L1 and in English. Both groups stated that their proficiency in English was high enough to be able to teach or be taught in English. Furthermore, the more practice lecturers and students had, the better they assessed themselves and the fewer

difficulties were noted. Lecturers and students also expressed their preference for EMI at graduate level and L1 instruction at undergraduate level.

However, teaching in English also poses problems for lecturers. In previous studies difficulties were observed either by the researchers or by the lecturers themselves after they took a closer look at their teaching. Lecturers had a great number of language-related difficulties in EMI. They were less fluent, less able to use nuances, were not able to translate words, missed terminology for casual conversation and subject matter, lacked grammatical accuracy, could not explain content to the same extent, were less clear and accurate in their explanations in English, and, for this reason, were less redundant (e.g. they were less able to summarise or clarify their statements). Lecturers also covered less subject matter as they talked more slowly in English. In addition, they spent more time preparing for EMI and were less able to deal with cultural diversity in class. Furthermore, improvisation skills (e.g. using jokes, telling anecdotes, and setting up discussions) were much harder in English than in the L1, which resulted in a more formal teaching style. Teaching was also experienced to be harder because of several student-dependent reasons, i.e. students' proficiency varied to a great extent and students' proficiency was perceived to be too low for EMI. Several studies mentioned that these difficulties lowered the quality of education in English. In addition, lecturers and students expressed that language support courses for lecturers would be preferable.

Difficulties were also observed in students' proficiency and learning. Students experienced difficulties with language, because they asked and answered fewer questions in English, they had to put more effort into English-taught courses, and relied more on slides and notes. Students' own proficiency was a problem as well for they were less able to discuss content in English. They were also less proficient in free speech and improvisation. Furthermore, students experienced difficulties with EMI due to lecturers' proficiency in

English, i.e. unclear pronunciation, unfamiliar vocabulary, slower speech rate, and monotonous tone, which all made it difficult to follow the train of thought. Finally, students also expressed the need for language support courses for themselves, which is encouraged by lecturers as well.

In conclusion, despite the general tendency of lecturers and students to evaluate their English proficiency and EMI positively and problem free, problems were still discovered. Maiworm and Wächter (2002) already stated that “the fact that the overall mastery is viewed to be sufficient does not mean that teaching in English is in all cases problem-free” (p. 15). The contradiction is noticed by more researchers (e.g. Airey et al., 2015; Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Hellekjær, 2010; Ingvarsdóttir & Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2010). Only Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2010) provide an explanation. They state that despite the various problems, “the perceived benefits [...] outweigh the constraints and increased amount of work” (Ingvarsdóttir & Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2010, p. 3). Airey et al. (2015) stressed that “it is taken for granted that lecturers and students are able to seamlessly switch into English in higher education teaching and learning without any problems” (p. 4). Hellekjær (2010) adds that “[s]ometimes even the students share the assumption that changing the language of instruction to English is entirely unproblematic” (p.11). In order to answer the question why generally lecturers and students state that problems do not arise when implementing EMI, more research should be done on this topic.

## **2.5 Internationalisation and EMI at Radboud University Nijmegen**

Raising students’ awareness “towards a more international orientation has become a widespread initiative in the Netherlands” (Klaassen & De Graaff, 2001, p. 281). Klaassen (2003) shows that in November 2000 the Dutch Ministry of Education published a memo called ‘Towards an Open System of Higher Education’ (p. 128). This memo encouraged the

introduction of EMI in order to compete with other universities around the world (Klaassen, 2003, p. 128). This was and is in contrast with the Dutch law on education which states that education in the Netherlands should be in Dutch, unless it concerns a foreign language, it is taught by a foreign lecturer, or if the teaching must be conducted in a foreign language (e.g. because of foreign students) (cf. Klaassen, 2003, p. 127; WHW, 1992). The memo stated that institutions needed

to acquire a good position in the international educational market. [...] [It] is of the utmost importance to develop an open higher education system [...], which is achieved by mobility of students, co-operation in the development of degree programmes and dual-diplomas (degrees). An open higher education system allows institutes to offer knowledge as an international product, such that the institutes may be recognisable and competitive. English-medium instruction is one of the tools to achieve this goal. (cited in Klaassen, 2003, p. 128)

This memo cleared the way for universities to implement EMI, including Radboud University Nijmegen.

Radboud University has been the best general university in the Netherlands for three years in a row (RU, 2016c). In October 2016 the university had 19,899 students of whom 2,123 were international students and 676 exchange students (RU, 2016a). The last two numbers show that the university has a large number of foreign students (almost 2,800 and 14%). Of the 37 undergraduate degree programmes, 8 are offered entirely in English (RU, 2016d). Furthermore, more than half of the graduate degree programmes are taught in English.

The fact that Radboud University hosts so many foreign students is due to their 'strategic plan' (Radboud Universiteit, 2015). In the introduction of the plan, the board of Governors states that internationalisation is the leitmotiv of the plan (Radboud Universiteit,

2015, p. 5). They state that a variety of cultures contributes to the quality of the academic society and, therefore, internationalisation is encouraged (Radboud Universiteit, 2015, p. 5). The strategic plan states that in 2020 Radboud University should still be among the best universities in the Netherlands. What is more, it should be among the best universities in Europe (Radboud Universiteit, 2015, p. 11). In order to do this they formulated four goals of internationalisation, i.e. in 2020 at least half of the students should spend part of their study abroad, at least half of the faculties should offer a minimum of two English-medium bachelor's programmes, Radboud Summer School should be known worldwide, and mobility possibilities should be enlarged and simplified because of collaboration with foreign universities and institutes at which the academic quality is guaranteed (Radboud Universiteit, 2015, p. 19).

Following these goals, Radboud University should be an international university in 2020. In order to achieve this, they have to implement EMI, something Radboud University is already doing to a great extent. Six of the eight English-medium undergraduate degree programmes have been started in September 2016 (RU, 2016d). However, in order to be at the Dutch and European top, EMI should be perfect and free of problems. Therefore, research into this topic is needed at Radboud University, something that has not yet been done to a great extent.

## **2.6 Summary**

This chapter has outlined the theoretical background of EMI that is used for this research. It showed that English became a global language, the lingua franca, and the language of education through globalisation, internationalisation, and Englishisation. It also depicted how EMI has been implemented in Europe. Furthermore, it described several studies of Northern and Western Europe that focussed on lecturers' performance in and attitudes towards EMI and

on students' attitudes towards EMI and their views on lecturers after the implementation of EMI. Finally, the situation and implementation of EMI at Radboud University have been discussed.



### 3. Methodology

To answer the various sub-questions, the present study was conducted in three ways, i.e. it looked into lecturers' and students' views on lecturers' performance in EMI and it examined whether lecturers' teaching behaviour changed when they were teaching in English. In order to gain insight into lecturers' performance in EMI, each part has its own method. Lehtonen et al. (1999) already stated that "no one method alone is sufficient" (p. 5). Therefore, this study has a mixed method approach, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The first two parts made use of a quantitative method i.e. a questionnaire. The third is an observational study which made use of qualitative methods, i.e. a coding instrument and a rating instrument. Another reason for the mixed method approach is that the questionnaires are self-assessment questionnaires. Jensen et al. (2011) state that this type has its drawbacks, i.e. "the subjects may not always provide truthful or reliable answers (whether this is intentional or not)" (p. 21). Therefore, it was necessary to use another method in addition to the questionnaires, in order to find out whether the data obtained from the questionnaires were reliable.

The present study is a reproduction of Vinke (1995) who examined a possible change in lecturers' teaching behaviour at Delft University of Technology. Therefore, Vinke's (1995) methods were replicated. In addition to Vinke (1995), the questionnaires and observational instruments have been expanded with items taken from or based on other studies. What is more, the students' questionnaire that was added to the study was based on several other studies, i.e. Hellekjær (2010), Klaassen (2001), Lehtonen et al. (1999), and Lehtonen et al. (2003).

Further discussion of the methods is provided in the separate sections. Section 3.1 gives a description of how the participants were recruited. The following sections give a detailed description of the three parts of the study. Finally, the last section discusses the ethical considerations that were taken into account during the study.

### 3.1 Participant Recruitment

As explained in the introduction, the study focuses on lecturers at Radboud University. In order to select participants for the survey, the prospectuses of all faculties and academic subjects of the university were studied. Consequently, a list of undergraduate and graduate degree courses was made dividing courses that provided education in Dutch only, education both in Dutch and in English, and education in English only. Soon it became clear that, in line with previous research (e.g. Wächter & Maiworm, 2008; Wächter & Maiworm, 2015), most graduate degree courses were in English. However, the focus is solely on undergraduate degrees, because these are the most interesting. As previous studies have pointed out (e.g. Coleman, 2006; Wächter & Maiworm, 2008), graduate degree courses were the first to teach through English. Undergraduate degree courses implemented EMI later and, thus, this movement is still an ongoing process. Furthermore, as a result of the change to EMI in graduate degree courses, very few offer modules in Dutch. This limits the option to make a comparison between EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. What is more, in light of the students' questionnaire, undergraduate degrees last three years and thus provide more students than graduate degrees. In addition, graduate degree courses are also host to foreign students who cannot participate in this study, because they do not receive education in Dutch. Eventually, 29 undergraduate degree courses of various faculties provided education both in English and in Dutch in their curriculum.

After the 29 undergraduate degree courses were chosen, an email was sent to the study advisors at the end of the second period to ask whether their department was willing to take part in the survey. Three degree courses responded that they did not offer education in English. One responded that the department had just finished a survey with a similar topic and therefore did not want to take part in the survey. After a meeting with the project manager of the Faculty of Science it became clear that none of the six science degrees were enthusiastic

about participating. Eventually, one degree course was willing to take part in the survey. Furthermore, after a while, 10 degree courses indicated they had no time to partake in the survey. Two undergraduate degree courses did not respond. Consequently, eight undergraduate degree courses were willing to participate.

### **3.2 Lecturers' Views on their Way of Teaching in English**

The first part of the study is based on the first sub-question: What are lecturers' views on their way of teaching in English compared to Dutch? In order to formulate an answer this part of the study used a questionnaire.

#### ***3.2.1 Procedure and questionnaire distribution***

After the participating undergraduate degree courses were confirmed, the questionnaire was sent either to the study advisor, who forwarded it to lecturers, or to lecturers themselves. As Vinke (1995) already mentioned, "[t]his implied that it would not be possible to determine the exact response rate" (p. 47) since no knowledge of the number of lecturers that teach both in English and in Dutch is available for the programmes for which the study advisor forwarded the questionnaires. For two programmes the study advisor forwarded the questionnaire. In one degree course a lecturer was willing to forward the questionnaire to his colleagues. The questionnaires for the remaining degree courses were sent directly to the lecturers. The questionnaire was distributed on 10 November 2016 and could be completed until 25 November 2016. Accordingly, lecturers had 16 days to fill in and complete the questionnaire. After eight days a reminder was sent to all lecturers.

### ***3.2.2 Lecturers' questionnaire***

The basis for the questionnaire is the questionnaire designed by Vinke (1995). Most of the questions have been replicated. However, Vinke's (1995) study was conducted some 20 years ago. Therefore, in order to make the questionnaire more representative of this time and to include developments of recent years, questions of other studies have been included as well. The studies that were used were Airey (2011), Hellekjær (2010), Jensen et al. (2011), Jensen et al. (2013), Jensen and Thøgersen (2011), Klaassen (2001), Klaassen (2003), Klaassen and De Graaff (2001), Lehtonen et al. (1999), Tatzl (2011), Thøgersen and Airey (2011), and Wilkinson (2005). Because the study is a replication study, it is inevitable to ask the same questions. Therefore, the lecturers' questionnaire given in Appendix A contains a version in which per question the reference to the studies on which it is based or from which it is taken has been provided. A version without references was presented to the lecturers, as it was not necessary for them to know where the questions were drawn from and because it would have distracted them.

The questionnaire contained 81 multiple choice questions and two open questions. In the first, lecturers had to name their subject of teaching and in the second they could comment on the questionnaire or on EMI generally. The multiple choice questions were divided into two main categories. The first, background information, was divided into three subcategories, i.e. general background information, lecturers' practice and use of English, and lecturers' perception of their English proficiency. The second category, comparison of English-medium and Dutch-medium instructional courses, was divided into three subcategories, i.e. preparing for instruction; language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills; and lecturers' experience of teaching skills.

The questionnaire was constructed in Microsoft Word so that the references could be included. However, it was distributed via Google Forms. Furthermore, the questionnaire was

in English, because most of the relevant research is in English and while lecturers also teach in English, the rationale was that they would be able to understand the questionnaire. It was designed to take 10 to 15 minutes to fill in. Most questions were constructed in such a way that lecturers had to indicate on a scale of 1 to 4 how they felt about a certain item. A 4-point Likert scale had been chosen deliberately so that participants were not inclined to choose the middle answer. This was done in accordance with Klaassen (2001) who found that participants tended to choose the middle answer.

Once the questionnaire had been closed, the data were collected in a spreadsheet and Google Forms provided each question with a table that indicated the number of lecturers that chose an answer and its accompanying percentage. These tables were combined after which the results were analysed per subcategory.

### **3.3 Students' Views on Lecturers' Way of Teaching in English**

In order to answer the second sub-question, what are students' views on lecturers' way of teaching in English compared to Dutch?, a questionnaire was distributed among students. This was done to get a complete view on lecturers' way of teaching in English at Radboud university. The students' questionnaire was based on the lecturers' questionnaire, i.e. it was adapted for students.

#### ***3.3.1 Procedure and questionnaire distribution***

After confirmation of the participating degrees courses, either study advisors or lecturers were asked to forward the questionnaire to students. Two degree courses indicated that they did not want their students to participate in the questionnaire. Of three degree courses, lecturers were found ready to forward the questionnaire to the students. The study advisors of three other degree courses forwarded the questionnaire to the students. Again, this made it impossible to

determine the response rate. The students' questionnaire was also distributed on 10 November 2016 and could be filled in until 25 November 2016. Accordingly, students had 16 days to fill in and complete the questionnaire as well. Halfway through the period of 16 days, a reminder was sent to all students.

### ***3.3.2 Students' questionnaire***

As previously stated, the students' questionnaire is an adaptation of the lecturers' questionnaire. Vinke (1995) is therefore also its basis and the studies mentioned in section 3.2.2 are also used in the students' questionnaire. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix D which also provides the references per question. Similar to the lecturers' questionnaire, the students were provided with a version without references so that the references would not distract them.

The students' questionnaire contained 63 multiple choice questions and two open questions, one in which students had to indicate what academic subject they studied and another in which they could comment on the questionnaire or on EMI generally. Like the lecturers' questionnaire, the multiple choice questions were divided into two main categories. The first, background information, distinguished three subcategories, i.e. general background information, practice and use of English, and students' perceptions of their own English proficiency. The second category, comparison of English-medium and Dutch-medium instructional courses, contained three subcategories, i.e. students' perceptions of lecturers' English proficiency; students' perceptions of lecturers' language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills; and students' reflection on other teaching skills.

The questionnaire was also constructed in Microsoft Word, but was copied to Google Forms, via which it was distributed. The questionnaire was in English as it was assumed that the students would be able to understand. Furthermore, the questionnaire was designed to take

10 to 15 minutes to fill in. Most of the questions were designed to require a 4-point Likert scale as answer model. The 4-point Likert scale was chosen for the same reasons as mentioned in 3.2.2. The questionnaire was analysed in the same way as the lecturers' questionnaire.

### **3.4 Observational Study of Lecturers' Teaching Behaviour**

The third part is based on the third sub-question: Do lecturers exhibit differences between teaching in English and Dutch? The observational study was a replication of Vinke (1995) and therefore used the same instruments. The study is composed of three methods, i.e. a coding instrument, a rating instrument, and a word count instrument.

#### ***3.4.1 Participants***

All of the participants of the observational study were lecturers at Radboud University and taught in one (or more) of the departments in which this study was done. The emails that were sent to the study advisors or lecturers contained a section that was directed at the observational study. In this section, study advisors were asked whether they knew lecturers who were available and wanted to partake in the observational study. When an email was send to lecturers directly, lecturers were asked whether they wanted to participate in this study and whether an observation could be done in their lectures. Eleven lecturers (eight male, two female) replied and agreed to an observation of their lectures. These lecturers had experience with EMI and Dutch-medium instruction and had been lecturing in both English and Dutch (either at the moment or earlier in their career). Furthermore, the lecturers were of Dutch origin and their first language was Dutch.

Initially, the plan was to observe lecturers both in an EMI setting and a Dutch-medium instruction setting. This was done in order to see whether lecturers exhibit a difference in

teaching in English and in Dutch. Unfortunately, this turned out to be impossible, because, of the lecturers that replied, most only taught in one of the languages during the period of the research. Only three lecturers taught in both languages during the observation period. These lecturers were therefore observed in both languages ( $n = 6$ ). The remaining eight lecturers were observed either in an English-medium class ( $n = 4$ ) or a Dutch-medium class ( $n = 4$ ). This means that a total of 14 lectures were observed, seven in English and seven in Dutch.

### **3.4.2 Materials**

The instruments for this study have been taken from Vinke (1995) and in order to be representative of the present time, the rating instrument was updated through Klaassen (2001). There is a subtle difference between the coding and the rating instrument. Vinke (1995) developed the coding instrument to show what teaching behaviour is displayed at a certain time in the lecture (p. 100). It gives a clear overview of the frequency and duration of certain teaching behaviour aspects lecturers display. Furthermore, Vinke (1995) developed a rating instrument that “focuses on the degree to or intensity with which continuous teaching behaviour[...] occur[s]” (Vinke, 1995, p. 96). This gives an overall view of the extent to which lecturers display behaviour.

#### **3.4.2.1 Coding instrument**

In order to code what behaviour lecturers displayed in their lectures, 17 behaviour categories of Vinke (1995) were included in the coding instrument which are distributed over five larger teaching behaviour dimensions or groups, i.e. presentation of information, interaction, compensation, silence, and other. Appendix G shows a table with explicit definitions of the categories that were used in the coding instrument. Below, some important aspects of the coding instrument are given.



First of all, the present study uses Vinke's (1995) adjusted coding instrument. Vinke explained that she combined several categories of the behaviour dimension 'presentation of information'. Therefore, the current study only used the new categories. Furthermore, one category was added to the behaviour dimension of interaction in the present study, i.e. student reacts. It is, like student talks, not a lecturer behaviour, but it was deemed a necessary component of the lecturer-student interaction, for it showed whether students reacted to lecturers' jokes or anecdotes or not.

#### *3.4.2.2 Rating instrument*

In addition to the coding instrument, Vinke (1995) also developed a rating instrument. Klaassen (2001) conducted similar research. She examined the occurrence of lecturing behaviour for which she used a high-inference rating instrument. Some of the items Klaassen (2001) used were added to Vinke's (1995) instrument. Appendix J shows which individual behaviour categories are derived from Vinke (1995) and which are derived from Klaassen (2001).

In order to rate to what extent lecturers display teaching behaviour, 20 categories were included in the rating instrument. The categories are distributed over six behaviour dimensions, i.e. compensation, expressiveness, clarity, presentation, interaction, and general teaching skills. After each category a 4-point Likert scale was given on which the observer had to indicate whether the lecturer displayed the category hardly (a rating of 1) or to a very large extent (a rating of 4). The definitions of the categories that were copied from Vinke (1995) and Klaassen (2001) and were applied in the rating process are given in Appendix J.

Two remarks about the rating instrument have to be made. Variation in speed of delivery (category 5) and variation in intonation (category 6) made up one category in Vinke (1995). Due to the finding that lecturers talk more slowly in English (e.g. Thøgersen and

Airey, 2011), the two were separated. Furthermore, verbal fluency (category 7) and fluency (category 8) were also one category in Vinke (1995). However, as lecturers' ability to come up with technical or non-subject-related terminology was questioned separately in the questionnaire, the choice was made to separate these aspects.

#### *3.4.2.3 Word count*

In accordance with Vinke (1995), word counts are used in addition to the coding and rating instrument. Per lecturer a three-minute sample of continuous lecturer speech was taken. The samples were transcribed in Microsoft Word after which the number of words was established. The number of hesitations were counted as well. Accordingly, the percentage of hesitations was calculated.

#### ***3.4.3 Observation procedure***

Observations were scheduled from 8 November until 28 November 2016. After the lecturers had replied, a date was scheduled on which a lecture/lecturer would be observed.

At the start of the lectures, the lecturers were informed, yet again, that the lecturers would be filmed with a video camera. Only the first 45 minutes of a class were observed. After 45 minutes, the rating instrument was completed (Appendix K). Afterwards, the clips were transferred to an external hard disk. Then, in order to see what behaviour lecturers show, 25 minutes of the clips were coded (Appendix H). Furthermore, three minutes of the clips were transcribed in order to find out what the word count of the lecturers was.

In four lectures a camera of Radboud University was already present, because the lectures would be filmed anyway. In this case, the researcher was granted access to the BlackBoard environment of the course on which the clips were available.

### ***3.4.4 Data analysis***

The first data that was analysed was that of the rating instrument. The rating instrument had been filled in directly at the end of the observation. The ratings (1 – 4) were gathered in a table per lecturer. Later, a frequency table per language (English or Dutch) was made in order to see the distribution of the ratings. Then, a general table was made in which the median rating of EMI and Dutch-medium instruction per category was provided in order to analyse and compare the data.

The method that was analysed second was the coding instrument. In order to see what teaching behaviour categories are displayed in a lecture, 25 minutes of a lecture were watched. Every 15 seconds the teaching behaviour displayed by the lecturer was coded by writing down the time next to the teaching behaviour in the coding instrument. This interval was chosen in order to produce 100 coding instants per lecture. When the 25 minutes were watched and coded, the occurrences of the behaviour displayed were counted per behaviour category. Accordingly, the percentages were calculated. Then, the results of the individual lecturers were combined in two tables, one for EMI and one for Dutch-medium instruction, and the mean percentages were calculated. In addition, when the mean percentages were calculated, a general table was made showing the behaviour categories and the associated mean percentages of EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. Following, the results could be analysed via a comparison of the two languages. However, this type of observation has its perks and its flaws, i.e. it takes into account the duration of behaviour, but it also fails to code behaviour that is displayed shortly (Vinke, 1995, p. 89). This might give a skewed reflection of what is actually displayed by the lecturers.

Finally, a three-minute sample of lecturer speech was transcribed per lecture. After the transcription, the words were counted and the number of words per minute was calculated. Furthermore, the number of hesitations per minute were counted after which they were

divided by the number of words per minute in order to calculate the percentages. The results have been gathered in a table, after which the average word counts were calculated. After this was done, the results of EMI and Dutch-medium instruction could be analysed and compared.

### **3.5 Ethical Considerations**

In order to be able to guarantee the anonymity of the participants of the first two studies, the questionnaires did not require personal details such as names, addresses, telephone numbers, and student/staff numbers. The questionnaires were constructed in such a way that it was impossible to discover participants' identities. The students' questionnaire, however, asked for a personal email address when students wanted to stand a chance of winning a gift voucher. These email addresses have been solely used to get into contact with the winner. This question has been deleted in this thesis.

In order to guarantee the anonymity of participants of the observational study, again, no personal details were asked. Furthermore, all participants were notified beforehand that the lectures would be filmed and all had to agree and had agreed before the observations took place. The lecturers were also informed that none of the students would be filmed and that the information acquired would be treated anonymously. Additionally, it was pointed out to the lecturers that the recordings would be treated with care and that they would be watched by the observer alone.

## **4. Results**

The preceding chapter described the methods used for the present study. Furthermore, in each section it is portrayed how the data of the three methods were processed. The data were analysed and the findings are reported in this chapter. Section 4.1 presents the results of the lecturers' questionnaire. Then, section 4.2 shows the results of the students' questionnaire. Finally, section 4.3 deals with the data obtained via the observational study.

### **4.1 Lecturers' Views on their Way of Teaching in English**

Before presenting the results, four remarks have to be made. Firstly, not all 42 lecturers completed the questionnaire, i.e. they did not fill in all questions. Therefore, the sample sizes differ between various questions. Secondly, percentages have been rounded off, so they will not always be equal to 100. Thirdly, analyses are done with raw data and the results are not tested for significance.

#### ***4.1.1 Response rate***

As explained in the previous chapter, the exact number of lecturers who received a questionnaire is unknown, for this was done via study advisors and lecturers. It is, therefore, impossible to provide or estimate the response rate. However, what can be given is the number of lecturers that filled in and returned the questionnaire, which is 42. These 42 lecturers together form the sample on which further analyses were carried out.

#### ***4.1.2 Lecturers' background information***

The background questions have been divided into three categories, i.e. general information of the lecturers, practice and use of English, and proficiency in English. This section presents the data for each of these sub-sections of the background separately. Section 4.1.2.1 presents the

findings on the general background information of the lecturers. Secondly, section 4.1.2.2 discusses lecturers' practice and use of English. Finally, lecturers' view on their proficiency in English are examined in section 4.1.2.3.

#### *4.1.2.1 General background information*

The questions in this part of the questionnaire are concerned with lecturers' background information, such as gender, age, faculty, the number of years they have been a lecturer and the number of years they have been teaching in English (questions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 in Appendices A and B). Question 4 has been left out of the analysis, for this question was not an multiple choice question. The answers differed to a great extent and eventually did not make things any clearer.

Almost all of the lecturers were male ( $n = 34$ ). As more lecturers at university are male, this sample is representative for the university (RU, 2016b). Division of age groups is spread more equally, i.e. 12 lecturers were 25 – 35, 10 fell in the category 36 – 45, nine were 46 – 55, 11 were 56 – 65, and none were older than 65. It should be noted that the 42 lecturers were distributed among four faculties, i.e. Law, Science, Social Sciences, and the Nijmegen School of Management. The one which showed the largest number in response was Nijmegen School of Management, which accounted for half of the respondents. The Faculty of Social Sciences was the second largest and the Faculty of Law was third, with 13 and seven lecturers respectively. The Faculty of Science was smallest with one respondent.

The sample contains many experienced lecturers. No fewer than 33 have been teaching for more than 5 years. Five lecturers have been teaching for two to five years and only three lecturers have been a lecturer for less than two years. Furthermore, more than half of the lecturers ( $n = 24$ ) have been teaching in English for more than five years. Almost one-

third of the respondents ( $n = 12$ ) have been teaching in English for two to five years. Finally, six lecturers have been teaching in English for less than two years.

#### *4.1.2.2 Lecturers' practice and use of English*

The following questions, 7 through 11 (Appendices A and B), focussed on the practice and use of English the lecturers have. Overall, it can be stated that lecturers have practised and used their English in various ways and thus can be characterised as regular users of English. No fewer than 37 lecturers teach in an EMI setting regularly. There are 19 lecturers who teach 1 or 2 courses a year, 17 who teach two to five courses per year, and one who teaches more than 5 courses in English a year. Only five lecturers who filled in the questionnaire indicated that they only teach in EMI settings on an occasional basis. Furthermore, 22 lecturers have taken an additional English course after they finished secondary school, whereas 19 did not. Half of the lecturers has ever stayed in an English-speaking country for 2 months or longer while the other half has not. Of the lecturers, 38 speak English regularly ( $n = 37$ ) or always ( $n = 1$ ) in the exercise of their profession. Only four speak English occasionally. Finally, 38 lecturers give lectures at English-medium conferences and four do not. Of the lecturers that present at English-medium conferences, five do that less than once per year, 19 give lectures once or twice a year, and 14 give three or more lectures a year at English-medium conferences.

#### *4.1.2.3 Lecturers' perception of their proficiency in English*

This section of lecturers' background information deals with questions of lecturers' perceptions of their own proficiency in English (questions 12 through 20 in Appendices A and B). Eight questions were asked, which focussed on various aspects of proficiency, e.g.

pronunciation, speaking ability and grammatical correctness. Generally, lecturers tend to rate their proficiency in English as fairly good.

For six questions (questions 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19), most lecturers gave themselves a rating of 3, which implicates that they perceive these aspects of proficiency to be good. In these cases, a slightly smaller group gave a rating of 4, which means that they felt they are near-native, and equally confident or adequate. However, there are five questions with striking results. For these questions more than one fifth of the lecturers indicated that they were either moderate or adequate (rating 1 or 2). Lecturers' pronunciation, confidence, and adequacy of vocabulary were rated most negatively, i.e. respectively 12, 14, and 16 lecturers gave a rating of 1 or 2. Furthermore, lecturers' understanding of English was rated very positively, for none gave a rating of 1 or 2. Most lecturers ( $n = 30$ ) found their understanding of spoken English to be excellent. One question, lecturers' ability to speak English, was perceived good or near-native by an equal number of lecturers ( $n = 16$ ). Nevertheless, 10 lecturers found they were moderate or adequate in speaking English. Finally, two-fifths of the lecturers ( $n = 18$ ) felt they would benefit from taking a English language course.

In short, lecturers are quite positive about their proficiency in English, because lecturers mostly gave a rating of 3 and 4. Their understanding of English was perceived as excellent. However, lecturers are less positive about their pronunciation. They also felt that they were less confident and had a less adequate vocabulary.

#### ***4.1.3 Preparing for instruction***

The next set of questions deal with preparation of instruction for EMI compared to Dutch-medium instruction. Again, these questions are divided into categories. Section 4.1.3.1 deals



with the preparation techniques. Section 4.1.3.2 presents the data on additional teaching preparations. Finally, section 4.1.3.3 is concerned with preparation time.

#### *4.1.3.1 Preparation techniques*

The questions of this category are concerned with the way lecturers prepare for their instruction. The first nine questions (questions 21 through 29 in Appendices A and B) deal with techniques that can be included in preparing lectures. The lecturers were asked to indicate whether they applied these techniques in their preparation and whether this was present in English and/or Dutch or in none of the languages.

Analysing the questions, it is striking that in all questions more than half of the lecturers chose the third option; Applies to the same extent when compared to Dutch-medium instruction. Furthermore, one lecturer indicated he applied elaborating links or connections between various subject matter units in writing only in Dutch-medium instruction. Six lecturers think up or think about appropriate and/or clarifying examples more in EMI than in Dutch-medium instruction, whereas the remaining 36 apply it to the same extent in both languages. Finally, the questions that had the largest number of respondents indicating they did not apply the techniques were question 28 (writing down opening sentences) and question 29 (rehearsing parts of the subject matter). At the same time, a large number of lecturers also indicated these techniques were only applied to preparing for EMI.

For the purpose of a general characteristic of these questions, the data have also been analysed without the lecturers who have filled in 'not applicable', because these lecturers do not apply some of the techniques in their preparation. (Appendix C, Table C.1). This has been done, in accordance with Vinke (1995). The data of the remaining 26 lecturers have been averaged for the four ratings (1 through 4). The results are presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Average Findings of Questions 21 – 29**

Number of respondents	Ratings			
	1	2	3	4
26	1.7	9.8	88.0	0.4

*Note.* Numbers are in percentages.

What is striking is that in general most lecturers, 88%, apply the preparing activities to a similar extent in English and in Dutch. However, 11.5% apply the activities either to a greater extent in English (9.8%) or to English instruction only (1.7%). Furthermore, 0.4% applied the activities to Dutch-medium instruction only. It can thus be tentatively concluded that most of the lecturers of the sample do not prepare in a different way when preparing for EMI or Dutch-medium instruction courses.

Furthermore, questions 30 and 31 (Appendices A and B) also dealt with preparing for instruction. These two questions asked whether lecturers had to look up terminology belonging to their subject matter and terminology not belonging to their subject matter. The results are shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Looking up Terminology**

Question number	n	Ratings				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
30	42	9.5 (4)	7.1 (3)	61.9 (26)	21.4 (9)	3.0
31	42	7.1 (3)	16.7 (7)	54.8 (23)	21.4 (9)	2.9

*Note.* The percentage of lecturers per option for question 30 and 31. The findings in brackets are the number of lecturers that chose an option.

It can be drawn from the table that most lecturers look up technical terminology occasionally (rating 3). Looking at the results for question 31 it becomes clear that slightly more lecturers need to look up terminology that does not belong to their subject matter nearly always or regularly (rating 1 and 2).

#### 4.1.3.2 Preparation time

The second category of preparing is concerned with the time lecturers spend preparing their lectures. Questions 32 and 33 (Appendices A and B) asked the lecturers to indicate the ratio of preparation time. The ratio was explained in the questionnaire as the ratio of preparation time to teaching time (Vinke, 1995; Appendix A). Question 32 asked the lecturers to estimate the ratio for the first time they prepared for a course. In question 33 the lecturers had to estimate the ratio for when they prepared for an EMI course that they have been giving several times. The results can be found in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Ratio of Time spent on Preparing Lectures in EMI compared to Dutch-medium Instruction**

Question number	n	Ratings				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
32	42	19.0 (8)	21.4 (9)	23.8 (10)	35.7 (15)	2.8
33	42	2.4 (1)	7.1 (3)	16.7 (7)	73.8 (31)	3.6

*Note.* The percentage of lecturers per option for question 32 and 33. The findings in brackets are the number of lecturers that chose an option.

It is striking that when lecturers have to prepare for an EMI course for the first time almost two thirds ( $n = 27$ ) estimate their ratio to be higher to various degrees. When lecturers have been teaching a certain EMI course several times the numbers change drastically. Almost three quarters ( $n = 31$ ) feel their ratio to be the same for teaching in English and in Dutch.

In short, the ratio of preparing to lecturing is thus found to be higher when lecturers teach a course for the first time. When they have been teaching the course for a while this ratio drops to the extent that the ratio is the same for Dutch-medium instruction and EMI.

#### 4.1.3.3 Additional preparation techniques

Questions 34 up to and including 37 deal with other preparation techniques that do not immediately belong to teaching (Vinke, 1995) (Appendices A and B). The results are provided in Table 4.

**Table 4: Additional Preparation Techniques**

Question number	N	Ratings				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
34	42	7.1 (3)	11.9 (5)	31.0 (13)	50.0 (21)	3.2
35	42	0 (0)	7.1 (3)	23.8 (10)	69.0 (29)	3.6
36	42	4.8 (2)	26.2 (11)	23.8 (10)	45.2 (19)	3.1
37	42	7.1 (3)	7.1 (3)	19.0 (8)	66.7 (28)	3.5

*Note.* The percentage of lecturers per option for question 34 – 37. The findings in brackets are the number of lecturers that chose an option.

The first two questions (34 and 35) deal with the time that is spent making lecture notes and the quality of lecture notes in English compared to Dutch. Half of the respondents take up a similar amount of time while writing lecture notes in English compared to Dutch. Thirteen say it takes up slightly more time, five say it takes up more time, and there are three lecturers for whom it takes up much more time. Almost a third of the lecturers ( $n = 13$ ) think their lecture notes are of a lower quality. However, the majority ( $n = 29$ ) feel their lecture notes to be of the same quality.

Questions 36 and 37 are concerned with the constructing and grading of written exams. More than half ( $n = 23$ ) of the respondents experience writing a written exam in English to take up more time. Only for 19 lecturers does the constructing of written exams in English take up a similar amount of time compared to Dutch. The grading of written exams in English is mainly perceived as equally complicated. Three thirds ( $n = 28$ ) of the lecturers indicated that it is complicated to the same extent. The remaining lecturers ( $n = 14$ ) feel grading a written exam in English is more complicated.

#### ***4.1.4 Teaching skills***

The last set of questions deal with lecturers' teaching skills. The questions are divided into two categories, i.e. to what extent the lecturers are able to perform and implement language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills (section 4.1.4.1) and, secondly, the way in which they experience other teaching skills (section 4.1.4.2).

##### *4.1.4.1 Extent to which lecturers are able to make use of teaching skills*

The first category (questions 38 through 64, Appendices A and B), is divided into three subcategories; language-related teaching skills (questions 38 through 41), general teaching skills (questions 42 through 55), and improvising teaching skills (questions 56 through 64). Firstly, the data is first discussed per subcategory. Then, in order to give a general characteristic of the three subcategories, the averages are calculated and presented.

The first subcategory deals with language-related teaching skills. The majority of the lecturers felt they were able to get across their train of thought ( $n = 20$ ) and explain something in different ways ( $n = 15$ ) to a similar extent in EMI as in Dutch-medium instruction. However, a slightly smaller group of lecturers rated their ability to get across their train of thought with a 4 indicating they were able to the same extent to do this. Explaining something in different ways was perceived as harder, as 14 lecturers gave this question a rating of 2, implying they were able to do this to a lesser degree. Differentiating or qualifying statements was rated by an equal number of lecturers ( $n = 15$ ) with a 2 or a 3 indicating that they were able to do this to a lesser degree or to the same extent. Finally, the majority ( $n = 17$ ) feel they can express themselves clearly and accurately in English to a lesser degree. For each question, only 10 to 13 lecturers felt they were able to perform the skills in EMI to the same extent as in Dutch-medium instruction.

The second subcategory is concerned with general teaching skills. For 10 questions (i.e. question 42 – 47, 49, and 53 – 55) most of the lecturers choose rating 4 indicating that they are able to perform the teaching skills in English to the same extent as in Dutch. Furthermore, for these questions it holds that rating 3, to a similar extent, has been chosen second most ( $n = 14 - 19$ ). For one question, the extent to which lecturers are able to motivate students, most lecturers ( $n = 22$ ) felt they were able to perform the teaching skill to a similar extent in English compared to Dutch (rating 3). However, a smaller group gave a rating of 4 which meant that they are able to motivate students in English to the same extent as in Dutch. The last three questions, retaining students' attention, preparing students for their academic future, and delivering information at the same speed, all had the same number of lecturers choosing either rating 3 or 4 ( $n = 17$ ,  $n = 18$ , and  $n = 15$  respectively). For all 14 questions almost no lecturers ( $n = 0 - 1$ ) indicated that they were able to perform the skills to a much lesser degree in English than in Dutch. What is striking is that for questions 49, 52, and 53 the number of lecturers that felt they were able to apply the skills to a lesser degree in teaching in English (rating 2) is still rather large for it is more than 20% of the respondents (26.2%, 26.2%, and 21.4% respectively). For questions 42 and 43 almost 20% of the lecturers (both 19%) gave a rating of 2.

The third subcategory deals with improvising teaching skills. Most of the lecturers gave themselves a rating of 4 for six questions, i.e. 57 – 60, 62, and 64. After rating 4, for five questions (57 – 60, and 64) rating 3 had been chosen most ( $n = 12 - 17$ ) and rating 2 came in third ( $n = 7 - 11$ ). For questions 57 and 64, rating 2 was chosen by more than 20% of the lecturers (23.8% and 26.2% respectively). In question 62, the rating that was chosen second most was 2 ( $n = 13$ ), indicating lecturers were able to make a humorous remark to a lesser degree in English. Furthermore, the same number of lecturers chose rating 3 or 4 in question 61 ( $n = 17$ ). What is striking is that there were two questions in which most of the lecturers

did not choose rating 4. In question 56, most lecturers gave a rating of 2 ( $n = 16$ ), indicating they were to a lesser degree able to encourage or get a discussion going. In question 63, most lecturers ( $n = 18$ ) rated their ability to tell anecdotes with a 3, indicating they were able to a similar extent to do this. Making humorous remarks and telling anecdotes had the highest number of lecturers that chose rating 1. Questions 57, 62, and 64 had the highest number of lecturers that chose rating 2, which indicated that lecturers are able to a lesser degree to use these skills.

As the questions discussed belong to subcategories, the average per subcategory has been calculated in order to see what lecturers' view is per subcategory. The two lecturers that had missing values have been deleted from the sample after which the results have been recoded (Appendix C, Table C.2). Only questions 42 – 55 have been recoded, because all lecturers filled in questions 38 – 41 and 56 – 64. The new results can be found in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Average Findings of Questions 38 – 64**

Questions	n	Rating				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
38 – 41	42	1.8	33.3	38.1	26.8	2.9
42 – 55	40	0.9	15.0	40.0	44.1	3.3
56 - 64	42	3.2	22.2	34.0	39.7	3.1

*Note.* Numbers are in percentages.

It is striking that the results of the three subcategories are quite different and three remarks have to be made. Firstly, language-related teaching skills are perceived worst, for the smallest percentage can be found under rating 4 and the highest under rating 2. Secondly, improvisation teaching skills take the intermediate position. However, these results show the highest percentage of lecturers that gave themselves the lowest rating. Thirdly, the majority of lecturers experience no difference between the two language settings for general teaching skills.

Generally speaking, the overall results show that lecturers do not experience many difficulties regarding general teaching skills when they teach in English. They do, however, judge themselves to be less able to apply language-related teaching skills in English. Of these skills, lecturers felt expressing themselves clearly and accurately was hardest. Improvising teaching skills is variously judged by the lecturers and show the greatest division. Lecturers indicated they were less able to encourage or get a discussion going, make humorous remarks, and tell anecdotes.

#### *4.1.4.2 Experiencing teaching skills*

The last questions of the lecturers' questionnaire, questions 65 up to and including 82 (Appendices A and B) deal with lecturers' experience of other teaching skills than those in questions 38 – 64. The questions were quite different, but the answers were set up similarly. A rating of 1 indicated that teaching in English was different from Dutch and a rating of 4 indicated that there was no difference between teaching in English and Dutch. First, questions with noticeable results are presented, then the average of all the questions is given.

First of all, 12 out of 18 questions (i.e. 65 – 68, 70, and 72 – 78) are rated positively. For these question more than half of the lecturers ( $n = 22 - 40$ ) gave themselves a rating of 4 indicating that there is no difference between EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. For 10 of these questions (65 – 68, 70, 73 – 76, and 78) no or very few lecturers ( $n < 6$ ) gave themselves a rating of 1 or 2, which indicated that there is a difference to a great difference between EMI and Dutch-medium instruction.

Views on the other questions are more divided, but the percentage of lecturers that give themselves a rating of 4 (no difference) never falls below 30%. For four of the six remaining questions (71, 79, 80, and 81) rating 4 is still the most frequent. However, the number of lecturers that chose rating 1 or 2 is higher than of the questions discussed above.



Eleven lecturers feel they hesitate more in English, 13 feel teaching is more demanding, eight feel their quality of EMI is lower, and nine lecturers feel their academic level in English is lower.

The last two questions, 69 and 82, are different in the way that not rating 4 but rating 3 was chosen most frequently. Fourteen lecturers feel that it is somewhat harder to find words that express their ideas adequately in an EMI setting. What is more, 15 lecturers feel it is harder (rating 1 and 2). Finally, 19 lecturers think their students comprehend them slightly less well (rating 3). Seven think students comprehend them less well (rating 1 and 2).

Similar to the questions on preparing and the teaching skills, the average scores of these questions have been calculated as well. Again the lecturers that failed to fill in one or more questions have been deleted from the sample and the scores have been recoded for the remaining 39 lecturers (Appendix C, Table C.3). The results have been averaged and are presented in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: Average Findings of Questions 65 – 82**

Questions	n	Rating				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
65 - 82	39	4.0	12.2	23.5	60.3	3.4

*Note.* Numbers are in percentages.

As can be deduced from the table, the majority of the lecturers (60.3%) felt that there are no differences between teaching in English and in Dutch for these teaching skills. However, 23.5% thinks teaching in English is similar to Dutch and 4% argues in favour of a major difference.

So overall lecturers are quite positive about their experience of teaching skills. The only skills that were rated less positive were the extent to which it is harder to find the right words to express ideas adequately, the extent to which lecturers hesitate, lecturers' level of formality, the extent to which English is more demanding, the quality of the lectures, lecturers' academic level, and the extent to which the students comprehend lecturers.

#### 4.1.5 Lecturers' comments

At the end of the questionnaire, lecturers had the possibility to leave a comment. Eighteen lecturers left a comment in which they either commented on the questionnaire itself or on the topic at hand. Some comments are worth mentioning here. The numbers below do not add up to 18, because some comments were extensive and touched upon more than one topic.

Firstly, lecturers commented on EMI quite negatively. One even called teaching in English a 'pedagogical disaster'. The lecturer explained that he attained a C2+ (i.e. near-native) level, but that his teaching in English is a disaster. He loses his *agility, flexibility and much of [his] irony and humour*. He also mentions that this happens to every Dutch colleague he has heard teaching in English. He ends his argument by saying, *[d]on't let them fool you: Abandoning Dutch at our university is a painful loss*. Another lecturer remarks that teaching should be in English only when *it is really needed for the audience*, not because the university wants to attract foreign students. A third lecturer points out that he is willing to undergo changes and is open to experiences, but that the time he spends preparing for English-taught courses is much higher, because he has a discussion of all his slides with another lecturer, for example. Finally, a lecturer notes that he prefers to teach in Dutch, because he can be more nuanced and because he is a better lecturer in Dutch.

Secondly, lecturers commented on the participation and English proficiency of their students. All of them indicated that students' proficiency is below the level that it should be at. One lecturer mentioned he did not know what level of English is required of the students. Lecturers also pointed out that the level of students' English varies greatly, which makes it difficult for the lecturer to adapt to. It also makes it difficult to engage students, because most of them are less willing to talk in English, which changes the atmosphere in EMI classes compared to Dutch-medium classes.

Thirdly, lecturers also made some general comments on English. Two lecturers argued that experience made up for the difference between teaching in English and Dutch. One stated that nuances are always harder in another language than one's first and another lecturer pointed out that his preference is to teach in Dutch, because of the nuances. Furthermore, one stated *that lecturers tend to overestimate their skills when teaching in Dutch while they are more aware of certain deficiencies when teaching in English*. The differences, then, could be due to EMI or not. Finally, one lecturer points out the numerous advantages EMI has. He mentions the possibility for foreign students to take a course, which enriches the subject matter due to other views. He also touches upon the fact that teaching in English prepares students for their career whether they are going to work abroad or not, which is, he argues, a *general tendency (and necessity) in our current globalising world*.

Finally, lecturers commented on the questionnaire and argued it was not exhaustive. The lecturers indicated that the questionnaire did not provide an option that points towards EMI being easier than Dutch-medium instruction. They mentioned that they felt teaching in English was easier than teaching in Dutch for different reasons, i.e. most literature is in English these days, the jargon is English derived, and most lecturers have had much experience in English or even received most of their education in English. Several pointed out that the questions of the questionnaire were biased and only pointed in one direction, i.e. that teaching in English *can never be better than Dutch*. However, since none of the previous literature mentioned the possibility of English being easier for lecturers or reported lecturers indicating EMI being easier than Dutch or any other first language, these options had not been included in the questionnaire. In light of the rapidly growing Englishisation of the world, it can be argued that for younger lecturers English could be easier, as they have probably, and most likely, been taught in English. After looking at the data, it was found that the lecturers

who made comments regarding EMI being easier than Dutch-medium instruction were of various age groups and therefore this theory is rejected on the basis of the available data.

To conclude, the comments of lecturers are very diverse. Some comment on English as a medium of instruction, others comment on the (lack of) proficiency of students. A third category in the comments is directed at English in general. Finally, some lecturers commented on the questionnaire and its biased and one-sided questions.

## **4.2 Students' Views on Lecturers' Way of Teaching in English**

Similar to the lecturers' questionnaire some remarks have to be made. First of all, not all students completed the entire questionnaire, i.e. some have not filled in all questions. Therefore, there is a difference in the sample sizes of the questions. Secondly, the percentages of this questionnaire have also been rounded off which accounts for the fact that they are not equal to 100. Finally, analyses are done with raw data and none of the questions have been tested for significance.

### ***4.2.1 Response rate***

Because the questionnaires were distributed by lecturers and student advisors, it is unknown how many students received a questionnaire. Hence, it is not possible to estimate the response rate. Nevertheless, the exact number on how many students filled in and returned the questionnaire can be given, i.e. 278. Not all responses were useful, thus some students were discarded for various reasons. It was required that at least 75% of the questions were filled in, however, four students did not meet this requirement. Furthermore, another four have been discarded because they mentioned they compared native and non-native speakers.

Unfortunately, this was not the intention of the research and it would have given a wrong impression of EMI at Radboud University if these responses were to be retained. Finally, two

more responses have been deleted, because the students indicated they were foreign students and could not compare Dutch-medium instruction to EMI. After the deletion of these 10 student responses the remaining sample consisted of 268 student responses.

#### ***4.2.2 Students' background information***

The background questions have been divided into three categories as well. The results of the categories are presented separately. Firstly, section 4.2.2.1. presents the results of the general background information of students. Then, the results of students' practice and use of English are discussed in section 4.2.2.2. Finally, students' perceptions of their proficiency in English are presented in section 4.2.2.3.

##### ***4.2.2.1 General background information***

The first questions of the questionnaire deal with students' background information, such as gender, age, faculty, and in what year of their study students are (questions 1, 2, 3, and 5 in Appendices D and E). Question 4 was deleted for the same reason mentioned in section 4.1.2.1.

More than half of the respondents were female, i.e. 164 against 104 male. Two age groups were well represented, i.e. 15 – 20 and 21 – 25 with 113 and 145 students respectively. The 268 students were distributed among four faculties. Nijmegen School of Management provided almost half of the sample ( $n = 128$ ). The Faculty of Social Sciences came in second with 93 students. Forty-six students studied in the Faculty of Law and one studied in the Faculty of Arts. This distribution is similar to the distribution of the lecturers, of whom most come from Nijmegen School of Management, followed by Social Sciences and Law. Most students studied in the fourth year or higher ( $n = 86$ ) followed by year 3 ( $n = 83$ ). Sixty-two students studied in their second year and 36 were in their first year.

#### *4.2.2.2 Students' practice and use of English*

Questions 6, 7, and 8 (Appendices D and E) dealt with students' practice and use of English. Most students have had quite some practice with English over the years, which mostly came from university experience. Almost three fourths of the students ( $n = 190$ ) indicated that 21 or more percent of their classes of their entire degree course is in English. More than half ( $n = 141$ ) have been taught in English from the first year onwards, 117 have been taught from the second year onwards, and 8 from the third year. Nevertheless, the majority of the students ( $n = 205$ ) has never stayed in an English-speaking country for 2 months or longer.

#### *4.2.2.3 Students' perceptions of their own English proficiency*

The last questions of the background section concerned students' perceptions of their own English proficiency (questions 9 through 16 in Appendices D and E). Students had to assess their overall proficiency, pronunciation, speaking ability, grammatical correctness, overall oral proficiency, understanding of spoken English, confidence, and adequate vocabulary.

Students were less positive about their English proficiency than lecturers were about their own proficiency. Most of the students gave a rating of 3 for all questions but one (question 9 – 13, 15, and 16), implying that they felt their proficiency in English was good. For five of these seven questions (i.e. 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16) a slightly smaller group gave a rating of 2, indicating that their proficiency was adequate, and that they were less confident and had a less adequate vocabulary in English. In the other two questions (9 and 11), rating 4 was chosen second most, which implied that students felt their overall proficiency and their ability to speak in English to be near-native. Question 14, understanding of spoken English, was perceived very positively, since most students gave it a rating of 4 ( $n = 146$ ) and almost all others gave it a rating of 3 ( $n = 108$ ). Four questions (10, 12, 15, and 16) showed the highest number of students who chose rating 1 ( $n = 23 - 28$ ). These students felt that their

pronunciation and grammatical correctness was moderate. They also felt that their vocabulary was much less adequate and they were much less confident speaking English.

Most of the time the students gave themselves a rating of 3, indicating that their English proficiency is not equal to Dutch, but that it is very much alike. Furthermore, the number of students that gave themselves a rating of 2 or 4 was most of the time very similar. Students' pronunciation, grammatical correctness, adequate vocabulary, and confidence were felt to be of a lower level in English.

#### ***4.2.3 Students' perceptions of lecturers' English proficiency***

Questions 17 through 24 focussed on students' perception of lecturers' English proficiency (Appendices D and E). The questions were the same as questions 9 through 16. However, questions 14 and 16 were replaced by two other questions concerning lecturers' ability to come up with terminology.

Most students gave a rating of 3 to all questions but one (i.e. 17, and 19 – 24) indicating that lecturers' proficiency was good, that their lecturers were slightly less confident, and that their lecturers had to search for technical and non-subject-related terminology occasionally. Furthermore, for five out of the seven questions (17, 19 – 21, and 24) rating 2 was chosen second most which indicated that the students felt that lecturers were adequate in English and that they needed to look up terminology not related to the subject matter regularly. The other two questions (22 and 23) were rated with a 4 as second best rating, which indicated that students felt lecturers were quite confident teaching in English and never had to look up technical terminology. Finally, students were quite negative about lecturers' pronunciation. Most of them ( $n = 106$ ) gave this question, i.e. question 18, a rating of 2, implying that lecturers' pronunciation is adequate. Furthermore, 104 students gave a

rating of 3. Compared to the other questions, lecturers' pronunciation also had the highest number of students that gave a rating of 1, i.e.  $n = 42$ .

So lecturers' English proficiency is generally assessed as average (either rating 2 or 3). Most students gave their lecturers a rating of 3 for all questions but one. Students felt lecturers were quite confident when teaching in English and they did not need to look for technical terminology much. However, lecturers' pronunciation was perceived rather negatively.

#### ***4.2.4 Students' views on lecturers' teaching skills***

The last questions of the students' questionnaire deal with students' views on the extent to which lecturers are able to perform and implement language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills and the way in which students perceive lecturers' other teaching skills. The categories are discussed in 4.2.4.1 and 4.2.4.2 respectively.

##### ***4.2.4.1 Students' perceptions of lecturers' language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills***

Questions 25 – 50 deal with the extent to which lecturers are able to perform and implement teaching skills (Appendices D and E). Equal to the lecturers' questionnaire, this category is divided into three subcategories; language-related teaching skills (questions 25 – 28), general teaching skills (questions 29 – 41), and improvising teaching skills (questions 42 – 50). The data of the three subcategories are discussed separately, after which the averages of the three subcategories are presented.

Overall, questions 25 through 28 are assessed relatively positively. In all cases between 119 and 132 students found their lecturers to be able to perform the teaching skills in English to a similar extent as in Dutch. It holds for all questions that the second highest rating is 2 indicating lecturers are able to perform the skills to a lesser degree ( $n = 73 - 89$ ). Students



felt lecturers were least able to explain something in different ways, because the highest number ( $n = 21$ ) chose rating 1.

The next subcategory deals with general teaching skills. All questions but one show that students think their lecturers are able to perform the teaching skills to a similar extent (questions 29 – 34, 36 – 41). Retaining of students' attention (question 35) is the only teaching skill of which most students ( $n = 98$ ) felt lecturers are able to perform it to a lesser degree (a rating of 2). Students were also less positive for questions 32 and 36 – 39. In these questions students gave their lecturers a rating of 2 more often than they gave them a rating of 4, indicating they thought the lecturers to be able to a lesser degree to perform the teaching skills in English.

The last subcategory shows the results of students' perception of the ability of lecturers to perform improvising teaching skills. Students assessed these questions fairly positively as all questions were given a rating of 3 (to a similar extent) by the majority of the students. For questions 42, 43, 45, 48, 49, and 50, rating 2 came in second place. For the other questions (44, 46, and 47) this was rating 4. Questions 42 (encouraging or getting a discussion going) and 48 (making a humorous remark) were perceived more negatively, because 30 and 27 students, respectively, gave these questions a rating of 1.

The averages per subcategory have been calculated for the students' questionnaire as well. This was done to get a general view of how students rated their lecturers per subcategory. There were nine students who did not fill in one or more questions in these categories. Therefore, the results have been recoded (Appendix F, Table F.1 and F.2). Questions 29 – 41 and 42 – 50 have been recoded because all students filled in questions 25 – 28. The results are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7: Average Findings of Questions 25 – 50**

Questions	n	Rating				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
25 – 28	268	4.7	29.7	47.7	17.8	2.8
29 – 41	259	5.4	22.7	45.5	26.3	2.9
42 - 50	259	6.2	26.5	45.6	21.7	2.8

*Note.* Numbers are in percentages.

Students assessed lecturers' general teaching skills most positively, as this shows the highest percentage under rating 4. Furthermore, students felt lecturers' language-related teaching skills were the worst, for it shows the lowest percentage under 4 and the highest percentage under 2. Finally, lecturers' improvisation skills take the middle position, but these skills show the highest percentage under rating 1.

Generally, students felt that most lecturers are able to perform teaching skills to a similar extent in English and in Dutch. General teaching skills were assessed more positively than the other two subcategories, with language-related teaching skills coming last. Students felt lecturers were less able to explain something in different ways, retain students' attention, encourage or get a discussion going, and make a humorous remark.

#### *4.2.4.2 Students' reflection on lecturers' other teaching skills*

The last questions of the questionnaire, 51 – 64 (Appendices D and E), deal with students' perceptions of other teaching skills of lecturers. The Likert scales of the questions indicated different ranges (e.g. to the same extent, the same, not harder at all), but the questions were set up in the same way. What applies to all questions is that a rating of 1 indicated that teaching in English was different from Dutch whereas a rating of 4 indicated that there was no difference between teaching in English and Dutch.

What holds for half of the questions (i.e. 51, 53, 54, 56, 58, 59, and 61) is that students mostly gave their lecturers a rating of 4 indicating there was no difference between teaching in English and Dutch. For these seven questions a slightly smaller group of students gave their

lecturers a rating of 3 indicating the teaching skills in English are perceived as similar to Dutch. However, the ability of lecturers to get across their enthusiasm is a close call. The difference between rating 3 and 4 is only one student which implies that lecturers are able to get across their enthusiasm either to the same extent or to a similar extent. The largest differences between rating 3 and 4 in these questions can be found in three questions, i.e. the extent to which lecturers provide handouts, slides, outlines etc. (question 53); the level of formality or lectures (question 56); and the use of gestures (question 59). The differences were 137, 40, and 46 students respectively which accounts for the strong position of the skills being equal to Dutch-medium instruction.

Furthermore, most students gave their lecturers a rating of 3 for six questions (52, 55, 57, and 62 – 64), i.e. students felt that lecturers perform these teaching skills in English to a similar extent as in Dutch. The second best rating of five of these questions is a 4 (52, 57, and 62 – 64). Going into subject matter, however, is a close call. The difference between the two ratings is one student. Furthermore, the largest differences between these two ratings can be found for the quality of English-taught classes (37 students) and the academic level of lecturers in English (37 students). Finally, there is one question for which the second best rating is a 2, i.e. the extent to which lecturers hesitate (question 55). Students felt lecturers hesitate more when teaching in English than in Dutch.

There is only one question for which most students chose rating 2, i.e. the extent to which it is hard for lecturers to hold students' interest when teaching in English. 93 students gave their lecturers a rating of 2 for this question and 74 gave their lecturers a rating of 3. It can thus be said that overall students felt lecturers are worse in holding students' interest when teaching in English.

What holds for all questions is that a rating of 1 has been chosen least by the students. Most have been chosen by a much smaller number than the other ratings. One question,

holding students' interest, represents 34 students giving a rating of 1, implying that the students view this teaching skill most negatively.

As these questions belong to the same category the average scores of the subcategory have been calculated per rating. Students that did not fill in certain questions have been deleted from the sample and the scores have been recoded (Appendix F, Table F.3). The results are presented in Table 8 below.

**Table 8: Average Findings of Questions 51 – 64**

Questions	n	Rating				Mean
		1	2	3	4	
51 - 64	257	4.0	19.7	37.2	38.6	3.1

*Note.* Numbers are in percentages.

This table shows that the perception of these skills is very positive, as three quarters of the students gave their lecturers a rating of either 3 or 4. The mean rating is 3.1, which indicates that students think lecturers' teaching in English is quite similar to their teaching in Dutch.

To sum up, students are quite positive about the way lecturers apply their teaching skills. Half of the teaching skills have been rated mostly with a 4 and the other half have been rated mostly with a 3 indicating the lecturers apply these skills to a similar extent in English as in Dutch. However, students felt that lecturers hesitate more in English and that lecturers are worse in holding students' interest when teaching in English.

#### ***4.2.5 Students' comments***

After answering the questions, students had the possibility to leave a comment in which they were asked to comment on the teaching of courses in English and Dutch. Ninety-seven students left a comment, however seven of those comments belonged to students who have been deleted from the sample and five comments were empty. Therefore, a total of 85 comments have been analysed. The comments that are worth mentioning are presented in categories below. However, as some comments were extensive they were placed into more

than one category below which accounts for the fact that the number of comments below do not add up to 85.

Firstly, students commented that there are great differences between their lecturers. Some were seen as very proficient in English and others were nowhere near to being proficient in English according to the students. Most students indicated that they tried to give averages of the lecturers when filling in the questionnaire. However, they remarked it was very hard to do so. Many provided examples to justify their statements. Others dilated upon the fact that some of their lecturers are native speakers of English and others are not. There were also students that elaborated by touching upon lecturers' proficiency.

Secondly, lecturers' proficiency was commented on second most by the students. Students remarked upon lecturers' proficiency and these views ranged from positive to negative. Most of the students, however, were positive about their lecturers' proficiency and thought them to be proficient enough to teach in English. Furthermore, seven indicated that of some lecturers the proficiency was good enough and of others it was not. The students who made a comment indicated that they did not really find it important whether their lecturers' proficiency is near-native or somewhat lacking behind. Finally, other students mentioned that the proficiency of their lecturers is not good enough. These students indicated that there are lecturers who literally translate Dutch expressions into English, do not (know how to) translate words, or speak Dunglish (Dutch-English). Consequently, the students suggested to give English courses to lecturers or to give lecturers the opportunity of improving their English.

Thirdly, students discussed lecturers' pronunciation and accent. Most were very negative and argued that bad or wrong pronunciation and thick accents distract and make it harder to pay attention in classes. Others simply remarked that the pronunciation is bad or that lecturers should work on their pronunciation. Few are neutral towards lecturers' bad

pronunciation and one even indicated that *some of them [i.e. lecturers] have quite a bit of an accent, but that is not necessarily a bad thing*, because one can get used to it and then it is not a distraction anymore.

Fourthly, students also discussed their own proficiency in English. The majority indicated that their proficiency, or that of fellow students, is actually of a lower level than is expected at university. They declared that their low English proficiency limits them in their learning process either in class or at home. They also stated that this low proficiency limits classroom interaction. Students are less willing to give an answer to questions and to participate in discussions. On a positive note, students also argue that their English proficiency improved much due to EMI.

Finally, students made some general comments as well. They felt that EMI is either worse or better than Dutch-medium instruction. In addition, they expressed their preference for either EMI or Dutch-medium instructions. The comments were also directed at the improvement of lectures. One student mentioned that it would be better if lecturers elaborated more on English chapters and papers, because these are harder to understand. Two students talked about the advantages of EMI. They indicated that it is very important that students are taught in English and that they have the opportunity to improve their English in this globalising world. Finally, students also commented on the questionnaire. They missed the possibility to rate lecturers' EMI better than their Dutch-medium instruction. Another remarked that the questionnaire was too generalising as he had had various experiences which were incomparable.

Overall, students made quite some comments regarding their own or lecturers' English proficiency. Most of them were negative about either students' or lecturers' proficiency. Furthermore, students felt that lecturers' pronunciation leaves much to be desired. Finally,

students thought it was hard to compare their lecturers, because the differences were quite large.

### **4.3 Observational Study**

This section presents the results of the observational study. The observational study was done in three ways. The first coded different types of teaching behaviour, the second rated teaching behaviour, and the third focussed on lecturers' word count in English and Dutch.

It should be noted that not all lecturers have been observed in both EMI and Dutch-medium instruction for reasons stated in chapter 3. Undoubtedly, the lack of lecturers that agreed to be observed and the lack of lecturers that were observed in both languages are flaws in the study which could not have been solved. Consequently, the results should be treated carefully, as they do not give a complete view of the situation at Radboud University. Furthermore, the percentages have been rounded off, through which they are not always equal to 100 percent. Thirdly, the observational study deals with raw numbers and has not been tested for significance.

#### ***4.3.1 Coded teaching behaviour categories in Dutch and English***

The required data shows the relative frequencies of the occurrence of individual behaviour categories and behaviour dimensions. The relative frequency is explained by Vinke (1995) as "the frequency of occurrence expressed as a percentage of the total number of times a lecturer's behaviour is coded in a lecture session" (p. 102). Furthermore, these relative frequencies of the separate lecturers have been gathered in two tables which show the mean of the Dutch and English individual teaching behaviour categories and behaviour dimensions respectively. Table 9 presents the mean percentages for behaviour dimensions in English and Dutch for the whole sample.

**Table 9: Mean Percentages of the Teaching Behaviour Dimensions in Dutch and English for the entire sample**

Teaching behaviour dimensions	Proportion in %	
	Dutch	English
Presentation of information (1)	37.6	42.6
Structuring (2)	1.9	1.6
Redundancy (3, 4)	28.3	19.7
Asides (5)	2.4	0.4
Interaction (6 – 11)	17.8	25.7
Compensation (12, 13)	1.7	2.6
Use of silence (14, 15, 16)	5.4	3.6
Other behaviour (17)	4.9	3.9
Total:	100.00	100.1

The teaching behaviour dimensions show some striking results, which are discussed below.

Firstly, presentation, of new information makes up the largest part of the lectures in both languages. In Dutch it accounts for 37.6% of the coded items and in English for 42.6%, implying that in English lecturers present more new information. Secondly, a great difference between English and Dutch can be spotted in the dimension of redundancy. In Dutch, lecturers are more redundant (28.3%) than in English (19.7%). Thirdly, lecturers tend to use more asides when teaching in Dutch than in English (2.4% and 0.4% respectively). Fourthly, interaction differs greatly as well. In English 25.7% of the coded items belonged to interaction, while this is much lower in Dutch, i.e. 17.8%. Fifthly, when lecturers teach in English they tend to use more compensation strategies (2.6%) than when they teach in Dutch (1.7%). Sixthly, in Dutch-medium instruction there are more silences than in EMI, i.e. 5.4% and 3.6% respectively. Finally, lecturers in Dutch-medium instruction display more other behaviour than lecturers in EMI (4.9% and 3.9% respectively).

The second table, Table 10 below, shows the individual behaviour categories in Dutch and English for the whole sample (see Appendix I, Table I.1 for the range of proportions for each individual behaviour category).



**Table 10: Mean Percentages of the Individual Teaching Behaviour Categories in Dutch and English for the entire sample**

Teaching behaviour categories	Proportion in %	
	Dutch	English
1. Presents for the first time	37.6	42.6
2. Structures	1.9	1.6
3. Summarises	2.6	4.0
4. Explains again	25.7	15.7
5. Uses aside	2.4	0.4
6. Solicits	3.7	1.6
7. Prompts	2.7	1.4
8. Elicits	0.3	0.3
9. Student talks	5.1	19.0
10. Student reacts	0.1	0.4
11. Reacts	5.9	3.0
12. Postpones or delegates reaction	0.0	0.3
13. Reads aloud	1.7	2.3
14. Administrative or strategic silence	2.6	2.6
15. Silence due to student activity	2.1	1.0
16. Empty silence	0.7	0.0
17. Other	4.9	3.9
Total:	100.00	100.1

What is striking about this table is that looking at the dimension of redundancy (category 3 and 4), lecturers summarise more in English than in Dutch, while in Dutch, lecturers more often explain their subject matter again. Furthermore, lecturers ask more questions (solicits) and rephrase their questions (prompts) more often when teaching in Dutch. In EMI lectures, however, students almost talk 4 times as much than in Dutch, i.e. 19.0% and 5.1% respectively. Nevertheless, lecturers react more often to students' questions, answers, or comments in Dutch. Reading aloud is done somewhat more in English than in Dutch. Finally, there are more silences due to student activity in Dutch-medium classes, but there are also more empty silences in Dutch-medium instruction than in EMI.

Overall, on the one hand the lecturers of the entire sample tend to use more interaction and compensation teaching behaviour in EMI than in Dutch-medium instruction. They also present more information for the first time in English. On the other hand, lecturers are more

redundant, use more asides, use more silences, and display more other teaching behaviour when teaching in Dutch than in English.

As not all lecturers were observed both in an EMI setting and a Dutch-medium instruction setting, no strong claims can be made by means of the results presented above. Therefore, the data of three lecturers that have been observed in both settings are gathered in one table. Table 11 represents the behaviour dimensions of the three lecturers.

**Table 11: Mean Percentages of the Teaching Behaviour Dimensions in Dutch and English for the Three Lecturers observed both in English and in Dutch**

Teaching behaviour dimensions	Proportion in %	
	Dutch	English
Presentation of information (1)	35.0	29.7
Structuring (2)	2.0	0.7
Redundancy (3, 4)	20.0	13.0
Asides (5)	5.7	1.0
Interaction (6 – 11)	25.3	43.0
Compensation (12, 13)	0.7	5.0
Use of silence (14, 15, 16)	7.6	2.7
Other behaviour (17)	3.7	5.0
Total:	100.0	100.1

Some dimensions show striking differences with the results from the entire sample. Contrary to the overall results, these three lecturers present more information in Dutch-medium instruction than in EMI. Furthermore, the difference in structuring has become larger. Finally, other behaviour in English is more frequent (5.0%) than in Dutch (3.7%). The other results are similar to the entire sample, although the differences have become larger.

Table 12 shows the individual behaviour categories of English and Dutch of the three lecturers (see Appendix I, Table I.2 for the range of proportions for each individual behaviour category). In this table the dimensions are split in order to give a complete overview.

**Table 12: Mean Percentages of the Individual Teaching Behaviour Categories in Dutch and English for the Three Lecturers observed both in English and in Dutch**

Teaching behaviour categories	Proportion in %	
	Dutch	English
1. Presents for the first time	35.0	29.7
2. Structures	2.0	0.7
3. Summarises	1.0	2.3
4. Explains again	19.0	10.7
5. Uses aside	5.7	1.0
6. Solicits	6.0	2.0
7. Prompts	3.7	2.0
8. Elicits	0.0	0.0
9. Student talks	7.0	36.0
10. Student reacts	0.3	0.3
11. Reacts	8.3	2.7
12. Postpones or delegates reaction	0.0	0.7
13. Reads aloud	0.7	4.3
14. Administrative or strategic silence	4.0	1.7
15. Silence due to student activity	3.3	1.0
16. Empty silence	0.3	0.0
17. Other	3.7	5.0
Total:	100.0	100.1

The results of the individual behaviour categories of the three lecturers do not differ much from the results of the entire sample, i.e. they mostly only portray larger differences between teaching in English and teaching in Dutch. Nevertheless, reading aloud has changed considerably, i.e. it now occurs six times as much in English. However, there are some categories for which the results changed. Students reacted more in EMI in the entire sample, but in the lectures of the three lecturers, the reactions in both languages were the same. Furthermore, in the entire sample, administrative or strategic silences were present to the same extent in EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. Contrary, in the present sample, administrative or strategic silences occur much more in Dutch.

#### ***4.3.2 Rated teaching behaviour categories in Dutch and English***

In addition to the coded teaching behaviour, lecturers have been rated on teaching behaviour as well. Because the behaviour categories were rated via a 4-point Likert scale, the median of

the ratings for the sample as a whole have been taken (Appendix L, Table L.1 shows the frequency of occurrence of the individual behaviour categories). Table 13 presents the median rating of the 20 individual teaching behaviour categories for Dutch-medium instruction and for EMI. A remark should be made about this table; next to the 4-point Likert scale a fifth option was provided, i.e. not applicable. These scores have not been taken into consideration when determining the median rates for the behaviour categories as it implies that the lecturers do not use these behaviour categories.

**Table 13: Median Ratings of the Individual Teaching Behaviour Categories in Dutch and English for the Entire Sample**

Behaviour dimensions	Teaching behaviour categories	Median Ratings	
		Dutch	English
Compensation	1. Consultation of notes	2	2
	2. Visual support	4	4
Expressiveness	3. Use of gestures	4	4
	4. Body movement	4	3
	5. Variation in speed of delivery	3	3
	6. Variation in intonation	4	3
Clarity	7. Verbal fluency	3	4
	8. Fluency	3	3
	9. Vagueness terms	1	2
Presentation	10. Explains in different ways	3	2
	11. Clearly and accurately	4	3
	12. Enthusiasm	3	3
	13. Confidence	4	4
Interaction	14. Lecturer's questions	3	3
	15. Students' questions	3.5	3
	16. Rephrasing of questions	3	2
	17. Airy atmosphere	3	3
General Teaching Skills	18. Summarise	2	2
	19. Structure	3	3
	20. Development	3	3

Most of the results presented in Table 13 do not show a difference between the median ratings of EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. What is striking is that lecturers tend to be equally confident in both EMI and Dutch-medium instruction. Furthermore, there are categories that show differences between teaching in English and in Dutch. All but two of the behaviour categories that show differences are displayed to a greater extent in Dutch-medium

instruction, i.e. body movement, variation in intonation, explains in different ways, clearly and accurately, students' questions, and rephrasing of questions. When teaching in Dutch, lecturers use less vagueness terms. Finally, verbal fluency is displayed more in EMI, which implies that lecturers formulate, come up with sentences, find words etc. more easily in EMI than in Dutch.

So lecturers are equally confident when teaching in English and in Dutch. Furthermore, most categories are displayed more in Dutch. However, lecturers show a higher verbal fluency in English than in Dutch.

As the sample does not provide ratings on all individual lecturers in English and in Dutch, no strong claims can be made. Therefore, the data of the three lecturers that have been observed in both English and Dutch have been collected in Table 14 (a frequency table of the occurrence of the individual behaviour categories is presented in Appendix L, Table L.2). Table 14 presents median ratings for the 20 individual teaching behaviour categories as well.

Most of the results were the same as the results of the entire sample presented above, e.g. lecturers were equally confident in both languages. However, contrary to the entire sample, the three lecturers moved around much more when they are teaching in Dutch compared to teaching in English. Furthermore, verbal fluency, explaining in different ways, and answering to students' questions were displayed to the same extent in both languages. Consultation of notes, visual support, fluency, enthusiasm, and lecturers' questions were displayed more in Dutch than in English by the three lecturers, whereas they were displayed equally much by the entire sample. Finally, in contrast with the entire sample, the three lecturers rephrased their questions more in English than in Dutch.

The results of the three lecturers are thus largely similar to the results acquired by the entire sample. However, the most obvious differences are that the three lecturers move around

much more and turn to their notes more in Dutch. In addition lecturers rephrase their questions more in English than in Dutch.

**Table 14: Median Ratings of the Individual Teaching Behaviour Categories in Dutch and English for the Three Lecturers observed both in English and in Dutch**

Behaviour dimensions	Teaching behaviour categories	Median Ratings	
		Dutch	English
Compensation	1. Consultation of notes	2	1
	2. Visual support	4	3
Expressiveness	3. Use of gestures	4	4
	4. Body movement	4	2
	5. Variation in speed of delivery	3	3
	6. Variation in intonation	4	3
Clarity	7. Verbal fluency	3	3
	8. Fluency	3	2
	9. Vagueness terms	1	2
Presentation	10. Explains in different ways	3	3
	11. Clearly and accurately	4	3
	12. Enthusiasm	4	3
	13. Confidence	4	4
Interaction	14. Lecturer's questions	4	3
	15. Students' questions	3	3
	16. Rephrasing of questions	1	2
	17. Airy atmosphere	3	3
General Teaching Skills	18. Summarise	2	2
	19. Structure	3	3
	20. Development	2	2

#### 4.3.3 Word count

The last method used is that of word counts. The transcriptions of the three-minute samples can be found in Appendix M. The lecturers used quite some hesitations in both English and Dutch (erm/er and ehm/eh respectively). These have been calculated and subtracted from the number of words per minutes. Then, the percentages of the hesitations have been calculated by dividing the number of hesitations per minute by the words per minute.

Before showing the results, two remark should be made. The present study only looked at the number of hesitations in the word counts. No attention was paid to other disfluencies such as false starts, grammatical incorrectness, or unfinished sentences. Furthermore, it is useless to compare the word counts of the eight lecturers that have been

observed in an English or a Dutch setting only. Therefore, only the results of the three lecturers that have been observed both in English and in Dutch are presented here. These results are presented in Table 15 below.

**Table 15: Word counts**

Lecturer	Number of words per minute		Number of hesitations		Number of words per minute without hesitations		Percentage of hesitations	
	Dutch	English	Dutch	English	Dutch	English	Dutch	English
1	141.7	149.3	7	10	134.7	139.3	4.9	6.7
2	162.7	143	3.3	3.7	159.4	139.3	2.0	2.6
3	134.3	149	2.3	10.7	132	138.3	1.7	7.2
<b>Average:</b>	146.2	147.1	4.2	8.1	142.0	139.0	2.9	5.5

*Note.* Numbers are in rounded off for the word counts. Numbers in the row of Average are in percentages.

There are a number of striking results. First of all, lecturers 1 and 3 both use more words per minute in English than in Dutch which is still the case when hesitations have been taken into account. However, these lecturers display rather huge differences between the number of hesitations in English and Dutch. Both have more hesitations when lecturing in English (for the third lecturer the difference is much higher, 1.7 in Dutch vs. 7.2 in English). Lecturer 2 has a similar amount of hesitations in both languages. However, this lecturer read aloud most of the lecture in English which explains the fewer hesitations. Secondly, lecturer 2 uses fewer words in English than in Dutch. Thirdly, the number of words per minute (including hesitations) is reduced by 12.1% for lecturer 2. However, the number of words is increased by 5.4% and 10.9% for lecturer 1 and 3 respectively. Finally, on average, lecturers use more words per minute in English. However, they also have more hesitations per minute in English. Consequently, the overall number of words per minute (so minus hesitations) is larger in Dutch than in English (142.0 and 139.0 respectively).

## 5. Discussion

The previous chapter presented the analysis of the results found by the lectures' and students' questionnaire and the observational study. This chapter describes if and how lecturers' way of teaching in English differs from their way of teaching in Dutch. The following sections (5.1 – 5.3) discuss the findings of the various methods in perspective of previous literature, but also in light of each other. Finally, section 5.4 summarises what has been found in sections 5.1 up to and including 5.3 and provides a general discussion.

### 5.1 Lecturers' Views on their Way of Teaching in English compared to Dutch

#### *5.1.1 Findings of the questionnaire related to previous literature*

The lecturers' questionnaire was linked to the first sub-question: What are lecturers' views on their way of teaching in English compared to Dutch? It became clear from the analysis that lecturers, in general, hold quite positive views on EMI and do not experience many differences between teaching in English and in Dutch. This is in line with studies such as Bolton and Kuteeva (2012), Tatzl (2011), Vinke (1995), and Wilkinson (2005). However, when the results are viewed in more detail, not all aspects of EMI were perceived positively by the lecturers.

Most of the findings of the lecturers' questionnaire were in line with previous studies and the most important findings are discussed below. Firstly, lecturers were quite experienced and overall assessed their English proficiency as sufficient, which is in line with Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2010), Lehtonen et al. (1999), and Vinke (1995). All found that the lecturers in general were quite experienced and proficient.

Secondly, lecturers felt that their vocabulary was much less adequate when they taught in English. They also felt they lacked vocabulary that was needed and they felt it was harder to find the right words to express their ideas. This is in line with studies such as Airey (2011),



Jensen et al. (2011), Kling (2015), Lehtonen et al. (2003), Tange (2010), and Vinke (1995).

All found that lecturers were restricted in their vocabulary when they taught in English.

Thirdly, it can be concluded that lecturers at Radboud University do not differentiate between preparing for EMI or Dutch-medium instruction, because the preparation techniques are applied to the same extent in both languages. This is in line with Vinke (1995). However, lecturers needed more time when they prepared for EMI, both when they prepared for the first time and when they had already lectured a course before. This in line with Airey (2011) and Vinke (1995). Vinke (1995) does not give an explanation, but Airey (2011) states that lecturers' extra preparation time is due to "looking up terms and phrases and planning in greater depth than they would in L1" (p. 44). Similarly, the data in questions 21 through 29 in the present study show that some lecturers indicated they used several techniques more in preparing for EMI than for Dutch-medium instruction, which increases the preparation time.

Fourthly, language-related teaching skills were assessed least positive in general, especially the ability to express oneself clearly and accurately. This is in line with previous studies such as Klaassen (2003), Kling (2015), Tange (2010), Vinke (1995), and Wilkinson (2005). All studies found that language-related teaching skills were present to a lesser degree in EMI. Both Kling (2015) and Tange (2010) found that lecturers felt restricted in communicating knowledge to students, because fewer nuances could be made in their statements.

Fifthly, lecturers of the present study were struggling with their improvising teaching skills. It turned out that encouraging or getting a discussion going is hardest, followed by making a humorous remark and telling anecdotes. These results are also found in Klaassen (2003), Kling (2015), Tange (2010), Vinke (1995), and Wilkinson (2005).

Sixthly, respondents of the current study experienced their other teaching skills quite positively. In general, 60.3% of the lecturers felt there were no differences between teaching

in English and in Dutch, which is in line with Hellekjær (2007). However, similar to Vinke (1995), respondents of the current study felt that teaching in English is more demanding and that the quality of their lectures is lower. They also indicated that their academic level was lower in English, which was found in Jensen and Thøgersen (2011) as well.

Finally, several lecturers commented that they found it difficult to teach in EMI because of the varying or insufficient proficiencies of students. This is also found in Gürtler and Kronewald (2015), Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2010), Kling (2015), and Tatzl (2011).

Despite the various resemblances between the present study and previous studies, the findings of the current study are also in contrast with other studies. Firstly, one third of the lecturers in the present study indicated they were less confident speaking English. This is in contrast with findings by Kling (2015) and Lehtonen et al. (2003), who found that lecturers were very comfortable and confident teaching in EMI settings. Furthermore, lecturers of the present study felt that their grammatical correctness was sufficient in English, whereas Kling (2015) found lecturers' grammatical correctness was insufficient. Jensen et al. (2011) found that the lecturers thought themselves to be linguistically well equipped, but most of the respondents of the present study pointed out to have some problems.

Secondly, half of the respondents spends more time writing their lecture notes in English, which is 70% in Vinke (1995). This difference could be due to the fact that in the last 20 years English has been used more in higher education and that more literature is in English. One lecturer mentioned that the amount of available literature in English made it easier to prepare English lectures.

Thirdly, there were also discrepancies between findings on teaching skills of the present study and of previous studies. Tatzl (2011) found that lecturers thought it was hard to motivate students. However, this was not the case in the present study since all lecturers felt

they were able to motivate students in EMI settings. Kling (2015), Lehtonen et al. (2003), Thøgersen and Airey (2011), and Wilkinson (2005) found that their respondents had problems maintaining their speed of speech. However, lecturers in the current study felt they were able to deliver the information in English at the same speed as in Dutch. Furthermore, Tange (2010) and Thøgersen and Airey (2011) found that lecturers were more formal in English. However, this is not represented in the current study. Vinke (1995) found that lecturers perceived teaching skills to be of more importance in EMI, but the lecturers of the current study did not feel a difference. Finally, Airey (2011) found that lecturers used less gestures and had more false starts in EMI, but no difference was perceived by the respondents of the present study.

The results of the questionnaire also found some results that were in line and in contrast with previous studies. Firstly, some preparation techniques were not used at all by some of the respondents. Similar to Vinke (1995), writing down opening sentences and rehearsing parts of the subject matter were two techniques that were not applied by many lecturers. However, more than half of the lecturers in the present study did apply these techniques in their preparation and therefore the results were not excluded as was the case in Vinke (1995).

Secondly, lecturers of the present study felt they hesitated more in English. This is in line with lecturers in Airey (2011) who used more hesitations. Nevertheless, lecturers in Jensen et al. (2011) felt they would have had as much hesitations in EMI as in teaching in their L1. As both the present study and that of Jensen et al. (2011) rely on lecturers' self-perceptions, objective data from the observational study should reveal whether lecturers had more or less hesitations.

Thirdly, Klaassen (2003) and Tatzl (2011) found that lecturers go into subject matter in less depth, whereas Airey (2011) and Thøgersen and Airey (2011) found the opposite. The

respondents in the current study felt they were able to go into as much depth in both languages, which is thus in agreement with Airey (2011) and Thøgersen and Airey (2011).

Finally, lecturers felt that students were less able to comprehend them. This question was based on Lehtonen et al. (1999), but they did not discuss the results. Therefore, it cannot be concluded whether this finding is in line with previous studies.

### ***5.1.2 Conclusion***

In answer to the sub-question it can be concluded that lecturers at Radboud University are quite positive towards teaching in English and do not perceive grave differences between teaching in English and Dutch. Nevertheless, some lecturers indicated they needed more time for preparation, they had difficulties with language-related teaching skills, and the quality of their lectures was lower in EMI.

## **5.2 Students' Views on their Lecturers' Way of Teaching in English compared to Dutch**

### ***5.2.1 Findings of the questionnaire related to previous literature***

The students' questionnaire dealt with the second sub-question: What are students' views on lecturers' way of teaching in English compared to Dutch? In agreement with the results of the lecturers' questionnaire, the general view of students was positive. However, the results of the students' questionnaire, too, found some problems when viewed in more detail. Since this questionnaire adds a new dimension to the field of research, it was hard to discuss differences and similarities in light of previous literature. Therefore, students' views on lecturers' proficiency are discussed first. Then, the last part of this section discusses students' views on lecturers' teaching skills.

Most of the findings of students' views on lecturers' proficiency were in line with previous research. Firstly, students were somewhat more critical about their own proficiency

in English than lecturers since most of the students felt they were adequate or good. However, they rated their understanding of English as excellent, which is in line with Klaassen (2003) and Lehtonen et al. (2003) who stated that students had no problems in understanding lecturers.

Secondly, in the comments, students stated that their own proficiency or that of fellow students was too low which made it harder to engage in lectures and to fully understand subject matter. This is in line with Zonneveld's (1991) prediction that students' proficiency would not be adequate. Similarly, Lehtonen et al. (1999) found that students were positive about their proficiency, but that they had difficulties with free speech and improvisation. This confirms the findings from the present research in which students are positive about their proficiency, but make comments about hindrances such as not being proficient or confident enough to speak up.

Thirdly, the majority of the students in the current study felt their lecturers were either adequate or good in English. This is in line with Lehtonen et al. (1999) who also found that students were positive about lecturers' English proficiency. However, lecturers' pronunciation was perceived rather negatively. In the comments, too, students mentioned that it distracted them from understanding lectures and subject matter. This is in agreement with Airey and Linder (2006, 2007), Hellekjær (2010), Klaassen (2003), and Lehtonen et al. (2003) who found that students felt lecturers' pronunciation to be a limiting factor. The study conducted by Hendriks et al. (2016) found that lecturers with a moderate accent are evaluated as less comprehensible and regarded less positively (p. 9 – 10). Furthermore, Jensen et al. (2013) state it is hard to know how students assess lecturers, but “repeated errors, such as consistently mispronouncing terms or expressions for key concepts in a lecture or stigmatised L1 features can ‘erode teacher credibility’ and lead to students paying more attention to linguistic errors than to the message of the lecture” (p. 88). This means that pronunciation is

definitely a key factor for students in understanding subject matter and should therefore be taken seriously. What is more, lecturers' bad pronunciation lead to bad students' attitudes towards "lecturers' general lecturing competence" (Jensen et al., 2013, p. 103). So, pronunciation also influences students' attitudes of their lecturers.

As a contrast to the lecturers' questionnaire, students' perceptions of their lecturers' proficiency are more negative than lecturers' perceptions of their own proficiency. This is in contrast with Lehtonen et al. (1999) who found the opposite, in which the students rated lecturers' proficiency higher than lecturers' own rating (p. 14).

Finally, quite some students stated that it was difficult to compare lecturers that teach in English, because there are huge differences between lecturers. Therefore, students took the average of lecturers' abilities. Consequently, the results of this questionnaire might not represent the situation at Radboud University in a proper way. In contrast this has not been a problem in previous literature (e.g. Hellekjær, 2010; Lehtonen et al., 1999), because those studies asked students to assess one lecturer.

The remainder of this section discusses the findings on students' views of lecturers' way of teaching in English compared to Dutch. The findings of the students' questionnaire on language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills are in agreement with the findings of the lecturers' questionnaire and hence also with previous studies. Both students and lecturers felt that lecturers are least able to perform language-related teaching skills. However, lecturers felt they were worst in expressing themselves clearly and accurately, whereas students thought lecturers were worst in explaining something in different ways. Furthermore, both students and lecturers agree that improvising teaching skills take the intermediate position. Both lecturers and students think lecturers are less able to encourage or get a discussion going in EMI compared to Dutch-medium instruction. They also feel that lecturers are much less able to make a humorous remark in EMI. Finally, students felt that lecturers

were less able to retain their interest and to engage them in lectures. However, lecturers felt the opposite.

As none of the previous studies have been looking into students' perceptions of lecturers' ability to teach in English in such detail, it is nearly impossible to compare and discuss the findings in light of previous literature. However, there are some similarities between the findings of the students' questionnaire and previous studies. Hellekjær (2010) found that students were slightly less able to follow lecturers' train of thought in English since the mean rating was 3.1. The results of the present study showed a similar finding, but was somewhat more negative, i.e. it had a mean rating of 2.8. Furthermore, Lehtonen et al. (2003) stated that students had difficulties with lecturers' speed of speech and their monotonous tone of voice. Similarly, in the present research both are rated with a mean score of 2.7, indicating that lecturers are less able to speak at the same speed or maintain a lively argument.

Students also felt quite positive about lecturers' other teaching skills. However, they gave these other teaching skills a lower rating than lecturers did. This is reflected in the mean ratings, i.e. 3.1 for students and 3.4 for lecturers. Students especially felt that lecturers hesitated more in English, which is in line with lecturers' perceptions, as they, too, felt they hesitated more in English. Furthermore, students felt lecturers were less capable of holding their interest while teaching in English. This is in contrast with lecturers' perceptions, as they did not find it more difficult to hold students' interest. Students also felt that the quality of lectures and lecturers' academic level were equally good in both languages. Lecturers, however, felt these to be lower in English than in Dutch. Despite lecturers' view that students do not comprehend them equally well in English, students felt they were perfectly able to understand their lecturers when they taught in English.

The results of these language skills cannot be compared to previous literature as well, because Jensen et al. (2013) and Klaassen (2001), who included aspects of students' views on

lecturers' teaching skills, did not analyse teaching skills separately. Other studies did not include students' views on lecturers' teaching skills at all. Consequently, it cannot be concluded whether the findings are in line with other studies. Therefore, in order to draw conclusions more research should be done in this particular field.

### **5.2.2 Conclusion**

The findings of the current study show that students have similar perceptions of their own and lecturers' proficiency in English as has been found in previous studies. Students' perceptions of their lecturers' teaching skills could not be compared to previous studies, since none have looked at this in detail. However, an answer to the sub-question can be formulated. Students at Radboud University are in general quite positive about lecturers' way of teaching in English and about lecturers' proficiency as well. Nonetheless, there were some critical notes. Students were rather positive about lecturers' proficiency, however, lecturers' pronunciation was perceived negatively and students indicated it distracted them from learning and understanding subject matter. Furthermore, language-related teaching skills were also assessed negatively just like some skills of improvising teaching skills. Students also felt lecturers hesitate more in English and they have more difficulty holding students' interest.

### **5.3 Observational Study**

The observational study was done to give an answer to the third sub-question: Do lecturers exhibit differences between teaching in English and Dutch? Three methods have been used that are discussed separately below.



### ***5.3.1 Coding instrument***

The results of the coding instrument can be viewed in light of previous literature. The data showed a clear contrast with other studies. The results show that lecturers present new information in both languages quite extensively. What is more, lecturers present more new information in English than in Dutch. This is in contrast with the findings by Vinke (1995), and Wilkinson (2005) who found that lecturers tend to present less new information when teaching in English.

There were two behaviour dimensions that showed similarities with previous studies. Firstly, lecturers in the present study are less redundant in English than in Dutch. Lecturers explain their subject matter various times in Dutch which accounts for the fact that less new material can be covered in Dutch-medium instructional settings. The result that lecturers are less redundant when teaching in English is backed up by Vinke (1995) and Wilkinson (2005). Vinke (1995) found that lecturers have a higher percentage of explaining subject matter again in Dutch than in English. Wilkinson (2005) concluded that lecturers were less able to make digressions in English than in Dutch (p. 3).

Similar to Vinke (1995), the lecturers in the present research use more compensation techniques in English. However, this could be due to one lecturer who read aloud much of her lecture. There are also more silences in Dutch than in English, both in Vinke (1995) and in the present research. However, this can be accounted for by the fact that lecturers ask more questions in Dutch and therefore more silences due to student activity are present. Furthermore, another explanation could be that lecturers were “more afraid of silence when teaching in English, so they talk[ed] more” (Airey, 2011, p. 46).

Furthermore, there were some findings that were both in contrast and in line with previous findings. Firstly, lecturers of the current study use more asides in Dutch than in English, which also reduces the chance of presenting new information. This finding deviates

from Vinke's (1995) observational study which found that lecturers used asides to the same extent in English and Dutch. Nevertheless, it is equal to findings by Klaassen (2003), Tange (2010), Vinke's (1995) questionnaire, and Wilkinson (2005) who stated that lecturers found it harder to make jokes and tell anecdotes in English.

Secondly, the percentage of interaction is higher in EMI than in Dutch-medium instruction. Students talk much more in EMI than in Dutch-medium instruction settings, which can be due to the fact that three of the observed lectures in English were graduate degree courses in which both the lecturer and the students were talking and discussing the subject matter. Nonetheless, the findings can be related to other studies. First of all, the findings are in conformation with Vinke (1995) and Wilkinson (2005) who found that there was more interaction in EMI. However, the findings differ from Gütler and Kronewald (2015), Hellekjær (2007), Shohamy (2013), and lecturers' and students' comments from the present study. All concluded that there was less interaction in EMI due to students' language proficiency. However, the category student talks does not distinguish whether students ask questions, or whether they talk for a different reason. This restrains the possibility to draw a conclusion on whether interaction is due to lecturers' effort of asking questions, or whether it is due to students' questions.

However, as explained in Chapter 3, no strong claims can be made by means of the previous findings, since not all lecturers were observed in both languages. Accordingly, the three lecturers that were observed in both languages were analysed separately. These findings are largely similar to the findings of the entire sample. Therefore, only two aspects are discussed. Firstly, the three lecturers present more new information in Dutch which can be explained by the courses being undergraduate degree courses in Dutch which only require the lecturer to speak. The courses observed in EMI were all graduate courses in which students are also required to talk. Secondly, students talk more in EMI lectures of the three lecturers.

However, this, too, can be explained by the level of the lecture, i.e. graduate degree, in which both lecturers and students talk.

### ***5.3.2 Rating Instrument***

The results of the rating instrument did not show great differences between English and Dutch and most of it was in line with previous studies. For example, lecturers made more use of body movements and variation in intonation in Dutch than in English. This is in line with Lehtonen et al. (2003) and Vinke (1995). The former found that lecturers had difficulties using the classroom (Lehtonen et al., 2003, p. 114), because they did not move around. They also found that students had difficulties with lecturers' monotonous tone of voice in EMI, i.e. lack of variation in intonation. Furthermore, Klaassen (2001) stated that clarity is the most important factor when assessing lecturers' performance in English. This behaviour dimension is rated very positively in the present research.

A contrastive to previous studies is the fact that the present study did not find differences between structuring and summarising in English and Dutch. However, Vinke (1995) found that lecturers structured more and summarised less in English.

Furthermore, there were some findings that were in contrast and in line with previous studies. Firstly, verbal fluency is rated higher in EMI than in Dutch-medium instruction. This is in contrast with Vinke (1995) and earlier findings from the present study. Vinke (1995) found that lecturers were more fluent in Dutch than in English. Furthermore, the lecturers in the present research indicated they found words less quickly in English than in Dutch.

Lecturers' better verbal fluency in English can be explained by the fact that a large amount of the literature is in English these days. One lecturer mentioned that he found it easier to teach in English, because the jargon is in English (personal communication, November 9, 2016). In addition, Airey (2011) stated that "fluency problems reduce with time, suggesting that

teaching in English gets easier” (p. 46). It could be the case that the lecturers in the present research have had quite some experience in teaching in English which makes their verbal fluency better.

Secondly, lecturers’ confidence is given a rating of 4 both in English and in Dutch. This is in line with Kling (2015) and Lehtonen et al. (2003). However, it is both in line and in contrast with what has been found in the questionnaires. One third of the lecturers felt less confident while speaking English, whereas only one fourth of the students agreed with this. An explanation could be that lecturers come across quite confident, even when most of them experience it differently.

The data of the rating instrument were also analysed for the three lecturers that have been observed in both languages. However, not many differences occur. The three lecturers consult their notes more in English than in Dutch, which is in line with Vinke (1995). However, in the present study it is due to one lecturer who relied greatly on her notes in English (rated with a 4) and in Dutch (rated with a 3), whereas the other two hardly relied on their notes in English (both rated with a 1) or Dutch (rated with a 1 and a 2). Because the median is calculated for the presentation of these results, it gives a distorted view. Furthermore, the three lecturers rephrase their questions more in English than in Dutch. This, too, should be explained via personal rating again. In English all lecturers have been given a rating of 2. In Dutch there is more diversity as two lecturers have been rated with a 1 and the other with a 4. Once again, because the median ratings have been calculated the results are skewed. This cannot be compared to previous literature, because it has only been included in Klaassen (2001) who only provides average scores.

### **5.3.3 Word count**

The overall results show that lecturers use more words per minute in Dutch-medium instruction when hesitations have not been taken into account. However, it is not a large difference. Nonetheless, the overall findings are in agreement with studies carried out by Vinke (1995) and Thøgersen and Airey (2011). Both found that lecturers use fewer words per minute in EMI. Despite the fact that the overall findings show that lecturers use more words in Dutch than in English, two of the three lecturers show that they use more words per minute in English. Why this is the case cannot be explained.

Lecturers also use more hesitations per minute in English. This is in line with findings from the lecturers' questionnaire of the present study in which lecturers indicated that they hesitate more in English. Furthermore it is in agreement with the students' questionnaire of the current study and Airey (2011).

Due to limitations in the data gathering not more than three lecturers were analysed for the word counts. As this is not enough to represent all lecturers at Radboud University, no clear conclusions can be drawn from these findings. Therefore, the conclusion is that more research should be done to see whether lecturers indeed use more words per minute in EMI nowadays and whether there are factors that can explain this finding.

### **5.3.4 Conclusion**

After the discussion of the findings, it can be concluded that lecturers exhibit differences between teaching in English and in Dutch. Overall, the findings show that EMI has a moderate effect on lecturers. In English, lecturers present more new information, but they are less redundant, use fewer asides, and read more aloud. Furthermore, there is more interaction in English, but this is mainly due to students' talking. Lecturers also speak in a monotonous

tone and move around less when teaching in English. Finally, the lecturers are more fluent in English than in Dutch, but in general use fewer words per minutes.

#### **5.4 General discussion**

Based on the findings of the three methods, it can be concluded that lecturers' way of teaching in English and in Dutch differs. What is more, it was found that lecturers' way of teaching in English differs from their teaching in Dutch in a somewhat negative way. The questionnaires show that, in general, lecturers and students feel that lecturers' way of teaching in English is similar to their teaching in Dutch. However, some aspects of teaching were perceived negatively. It was concluded that lecturers felt they needed more time to prepare EMI lectures, had difficulties with language-related teaching skills, and felt that the quality of their lectures was lower. Furthermore, students were greatly distracted by lecturers' pronunciation. They also rated lecturers' language-related teaching skills most negatively and they felt that lecturers hesitated more and had more difficulty holding students' interest in EMI. Finally, the observational study found that lecturers were less redundant in English, used fewer asides, read more aloud, moved around less, and spoke in a monotonous tone.

The three methods complement each other, but they also show some discrepancies. What lecturers found to be harder in English, was sometimes not noticed by the students and what lecturers found to be the same in both settings, was perceived as different by the students. Furthermore, it was shown that lecturers' and students' perceptions differ to what is observed by an outsider. It was therefore useful to use three methods and incorporate the observational study which objectified and nuanced the results.

In comparison with previous literature, the findings are not surprising since they replicate results that have been found in other studies. As the research was a replication of Vinke (1995), it is most interesting whether the findings are also replicated. It is concluded

that most of the findings are indeed similar to Vinke (1995). She found that changing the language of instruction had a moderate effect on lecturers, which is replicated in the present study. However, there were some differences, such as the fact that lecturers verbal fluency is better in English, which can be attributed to the fact that English has become the language of higher education.

## 6. Conclusion

This study was conducted with a view to providing more information relevant to the discussion about English-medium instruction. Another goal was to provide information on whether lecturers' way of teaching in English differs from their way of teaching in Dutch. Furthermore, it looked at lecturers' and students' views on lecturers' way of teaching in English compared to Dutch. The research question that was posed was: Is lecturers' way of teaching in English different from their way of teaching in Dutch? The question was answered in three different way, i.e. a lecturers' questionnaire, a students' questionnaire, and an observational study. The lecturers' questionnaire focused on lecturers' views on their teaching abilities in EMI settings. The students' questionnaire asked students to assess their lecturers' way of teaching in English compared to the way of teaching in Dutch. The observational study focused on lecturers' actual teaching behaviour in Dutch and English lectures. It showed what teaching behaviour was displayed either throughout the lecture or at certain time intervals.

The overall results suggest that there are no differences between teaching in English and in Dutch. However, when questions were analysed separately it became apparent that lecturers and students felt teaching in English had a moderate, negative effect on lecturers' teaching skills. Lecturers and students noted that lecturers had difficulties especially with language-related teaching skills. Furthermore, the quality of the lectures was lower. Lecturers indicated they needed more time for preparation. Students noted they were distracted by lecturers' pronunciation. The observational study revealed that lecturers were less redundant, used fewer asides, read more aloud, moved around less, and spoke in a monotonous tone. In conclusion, the findings succeeded in answering the research question. Lecturers' way of teaching in English indeed differs from their way of teaching in Dutch. Furthermore, the hypothesis that lecturers' way of teaching is influenced negatively by EMI is also supported.



The findings were in line with previous research and did not show any striking differences. Most of all, the results were in line with Vinke (1995), who's study has been replicated here. It shows that not much has changed in 20 years. Even though the world and higher education have become subject to globalisation and internationalisation, more and more research is published in English, and education is more and more focussed on English, the findings are not much different from the findings by Vinke (1995). Nevertheless, overall, the current findings were somewhat more positive.

The current study contributed in various ways to the field of EMI research, especially to studies done on lecturers' performance. First of all, this study adds a new dimension to the research on EMI. It has looked into students' perceptions of their lecturers' teaching skills in detail. Previous studies only examined students' attitudes towards their own or lecturers' English proficiency or towards EMI. However, the current study has shed some light on how students perceived their lecturers when teaching in English was compared to teaching in Dutch. Secondly, it contributed to the research on EMI in the Netherlands and especially at Radboud University. It showed that, even though EMI is implemented to a great extent at Radboud University, lecturers and students report some problems. In order to optimise EMI at this university, the university should bear in mind that problems do arise and that lecturers and students experience difficulties and are sceptical about EMI when they take a closer look at it. Thirdly, the study contributes to the field of EMI research, because it focused on a general university instead of a university of engineering, technology, or agriculture. It shows that there are minor differences between general and technological universities. However, the results cannot be generalised for all general universities since only four faculties participated in the study, of which two, i.e. Nijmegen School of Management and the Faculty of Law, are faculties that have been examined in other studies. Therefore, this study was not significantly different from previous studies, since other faculties, such as the Faculty of Art and the

Faculty of Philosophy, Theology, and Religious Studies, have not been examined. Fourthly, the study provides more detailed information that can be used in the ongoing debate on EMI in the Netherlands. It shows that lecturers have poorer teaching skills when they teach in English. Sceptics have been pointing this out for quite some time and consequently, this should be taken into consideration when universities switch to EMI.

This has been an exploratory study of EMI at Radboud University. Therefore, to make strong claims about the results, the present study requires some additions to the method. First of all, the goal was to look at a general university. However, as explained above, due to the faculties that participated, the study was not much different from other studies. Unfortunately, the study was subject to the willingness and ability of faculties to cooperate. Further research might look at all faculties of a general university to see whether there are differences between universities and faculties.

What is more, due to the limited time and space it was not possible to do statistics. Additionally, the number of participants was unknown at the start of the study and therefore it was impossible to judge whether the study would be representative or not. Consequently, no statistics have been done. Furthermore, the current study included various aspects of participants' background. The results could not be tested for correlations between background variables and e.g. lecturers' perceived proficiency or experience of teaching skills, or between background variables and e.g. students' perceived proficiency, either of themselves or their lecturers. Previous research, e.g. Vinke (1995) and Jensen et al. (2011), have looked into correlations. Vinke (1995) found that lecturers who perceived their level of proficiency higher, also felt it was easier "to perform teaching duties in English" (p. 64). Further analysis could look into this and see whether there are correlations between the background variables and other parts of the questionnaire.

Furthermore, both questionnaires were deemed biased by lecturers and students. Both groups indicated that the questionnaires did not provide the option that teaching in English could be easier than Dutch. As explained, this had not been taken into account since previous studies did not lead up to answer this. However, this should be included in future studies. Students also commented that their questionnaire was hard to fill in since it focused on their general perception of lecturers who teach both in English and in Dutch. This was thought to be nearly impossible by some of the students since lecturers' proficiency differed to a great extent. Future studies should consider this and use an approach such as Hellekjær (2010) for example, who handed out questionnaires in lectures in which the students were asked to assess the lecturer who was present.

In addition, the study produced a large amount of subjective data. The questionnaires relied on lecturers' and students' views and self-assessments. In Chapter 3 it has already been stated that self-assessment questionnaires have flaws (cf. Jensen et al., 2011). However, Hellekjær (2010) and Jensen et al. (2011) state that some studies found that self-assessment questionnaires can be reliable. Nevertheless, the current study tried to account for the subjectivity of lecturers' and students' views on lecturers' teaching skill by using an observational study. Future studies should also include objective methods for establishing lecturers' and students' English proficiency, e.g. the CEFR and TOEFL test. These methods would objectify lecturers' and students' proficiencies.

The current study should also be expanded. In the observational study for example, very few lecturers were observed. What is more, only 3 lecturers were observed in both languages, which meant that it was impossible to generalise the findings. In order to get a general view of lecturers' actual teaching skills, a future observational study should include more lecturers. Furthermore, the lectures were observed by one observer only. In order to avoid any possible bias more observers would have been desirable.

The results of this study also give rise to a number of further research questions. First of all, none of the previous studies discussed in Chapter 2 conducted research on students' perceptions of lecturers' teaching skills in EMI. This is, however, a very important aspect of EMI. Klaassen (2001) showed that lecturers' teaching skills are deemed more important by students than the language of instruction. If lecturers' teaching skills are poor in English, this will have an effect on students' results. More research should be done on this topic to find out whether this is the case and how this can be solved.

The findings of the current study were that in general lecturers and students felt quite positive about EMI. However, some problems occurred when detailed questions were asked. It was concluded that lecturers needed to improve certain aspects of teaching, such as language-related teaching skills or the ability to improvise, in order to reach the same level in EMI as in Dutch-medium instruction. It is therefore interesting to see where the positive attitude towards EMI comes from and why lecturers and students fail to notice problems when they give an overall view.

Finally, as stated in the discussion, the findings of the present study are similar to those of previous studies. However, there are no studies that have been dedicated to presenting solutions to the problems of EMI. As the implementation of EMI is an ongoing process, it would be desirable to solve the problems that are encountered. Further research could look into these problems and could try to find solutions.

## References

- Airey, J. (2011). Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. *Ibérica* 22, 35-54. Retrieved from [http://www.aelfe.org/documents/02\\_22\\_Airey.pdf](http://www.aelfe.org/documents/02_22_Airey.pdf)
- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2015). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries. Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, online first article, 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2
- Airey, J., & Linder, C. (2006). Language and the experience of learning university physics in Sweden. *European Journal of Physics*, 27(3), 553–560. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0143-0807/27/3/009>
- Airey, J., & Linder, C. (2007). Disciplinary learning in a second language: A case study from university physics. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Integrating content and language: Researching content and language integration in higher education* (pp. 161–171). Maastricht: Maastricht University Language Centre.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290–305. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303542
- Ammon, U., & McConnell, G. (2002). *English as an academic language in Europe: A survey of its use in teaching* (Duisburg papers on research in language and culture, vol. 48). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Bolton, K., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). English as an academic language at a Swedish university: Parallel language use and the 'threat' of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(5), 429–447. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2012.670241

- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39(1), 1–14. doi:10.1017/S026144480600320X
- Coleman, J. A. (2013). Foreword. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. xiii–xv). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cornips, L. M. E. A. (2013, March 16). ‘English, unless...’. *De Limburger/Limburs Dagblad*. Retrieved from [https://pure.knaw.nl/portal/en/publications/english-unless\(da9fd129-abbc-49ae-9caf-12a1ce6fb33e\).html](https://pure.knaw.nl/portal/en/publications/english-unless(da9fd129-abbc-49ae-9caf-12a1ce6fb33e).html)
- Crystal, D. (2004). The past, present, and future of world English. In A. Gardt & B. R. Hüppauf (Eds.), *Globalization and the future of German: With a select bibliography* (pp. 27–45). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Dimova, S., Hultgren A. K., & Jensen, C. (2015). English-medium instruction in European higher education: Review and future research. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 317–323). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). Introduction. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. xvii–xxii). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Drees, W. B. (2016, August 23). Engels in de humanities is helemaal niet zo gek. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/opinie/engels-in-de-humanities-is-helemaal-niet-zo-gek~a4362488/>
- Engels invoeren als voertaal op universiteiten ondoordacht. (2016, September 3). *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/opinie/-engels-invoeren-als-voertaal-op-universiteiten-ondoordacht~a4369469/>

- European Commission. (n.d.). *The Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area*. Retrieved November 23, 2016 from [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process_en)
- European Higher Education Area (EHEA). (1999, June 19). *The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999*. Retrieved November 23, 2016 from [http://media.ehea.info/file/Ministerial\\_conferences/02/8/1999\\_Bologna\\_Declaration\\_English\\_553028.pdf](http://media.ehea.info/file/Ministerial_conferences/02/8/1999_Bologna_Declaration_English_553028.pdf)
- European Higher Education Area (EHEA). (2016, October 26). *Ministerial Declarations and Communiqués: Ministerial Conference Bologna 1999*. Retrieved November 23, 2016 from <http://www.ehea.info/cid100210/ministerial-conference-bologna-1999.html>
- European Higher Education Area (EHEA). (n.d.). *History*. Retrieved November 23, 2016 from <http://www.ehea.info/pid34248/history.html>
- Gardt, A., & Hüppauf, B. R. (2004). Preface. In A. Gardt & B. R. Hüppauf (Eds.), *Globalization and the future of German: With a select bibliography* (pp. ix–xii). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Gürtler, K., & Kronewald, E. (2015). Internationalization and English-medium instruction in German higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 89–114). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Hellekjær, G. O. (2007). The implementation of undergraduate level English-medium programs in Norway: An explorative case study. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Integrating content and language: Researching content and language integration in higher education* (pp. 68–81). Maastricht: Maastricht University Language Centre.

Hellekjær, G. O. (2010). Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education.

*Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 45, 11–34.

<http://download2.hermes.asb.dk/archive/2010/Hermes45.html>

Hellekjær, G. O., & Westergaard, M. R. (2003). An exploratory survey of content learning through English at Nordic universities. In C. van Leeuwen & R. Wilkinson (Eds.),

*Multilingual Approaches in University Education: Challenges and Practices* (pp. 65–80). Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Valkhof Pers.

Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., Hogervorst, N. (2016). Effects of degree of accentedness in

lecturers' Dutch-English pronunciation on Dutch students' attitudes and perceptions of comprehensibility. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 1–17. doi:

10.1075/dujal.5.1.01hen

Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education and language policy: Questions of quality and equity. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20(1), 1–18.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/hemp-v20-art6-en>

Hultgren, A. K., Jensen, C., & Dimova, S. (2015). English-medium instruction in European higher education: From the north to the south. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C.

Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 1–15). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Hüppauf, B. R. (2004). Globalization – Threats and opportunities. In A. Gardt & B. R.

Hüppauf (Eds.), *Globalization and the future of German: With a select bibliography* (pp. 3–24). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Huskens, J. (2015, June 22). I have there no words for... *UT Nieuws*. Retrieved from

[http://www.utnieuws.nl/opinie/61658/I\\_have\\_there\\_no\\_words\\_for](http://www.utnieuws.nl/opinie/61658/I_have_there_no_words_for)



- Huygen, M. (2016, March 9). De professor is niet so good to follow. *NRC*. Retrieved from <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/03/09/de-professor-is-niet-so-good-to-follow-1596265-a973769>
- Ingvarsdóttir, H., & Arnbjörnsdóttir, B. (2010). Coping with English at tertiary level: Instructors' views. In *Netla – Menntakvika 2010*. Menntavísindasvið Háskóla Íslands. [Journal of the School of Education, University of Iceland]. Retrieved from <http://netla.hi.is/menntakvika2010/010.pdf>
- Jensen, C., Denver, L., Mees, I. M., & Werther, C. (2011). Students' and teachers' self-assessment of English language proficiency in English-medium higher education in Denmark: A questionnaire study. In B. Preisler, I. Klitgård & A. H. Fabricius (Eds.), *Language and Learning in the International University: From English Uniformity to Diversity and Hybridity* (pp. 19–38). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jensen, C., Denver, L., Mees, I. M., & Werther, C. (2013). Students' attitudes to lecturers' English in English-medium higher education in Denmark. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 13(1), 87–112. Retrieved from <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/issue/view/301>
- Jensen, C., & Thøgersen, J. (2011). Danish university lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Ibérica*, 22(22), 13–34. Retrieved from <http://www.aelfe.org/?s=revista&veure=22>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). Internationalization or Englishization: Medium of instruction in today's universities. Hong Kong: Centre for Governance and Citizenship, The Hong Kong Institute of Education. Retrieved from [http://repository.lib.ied.edu.hk/pubdata/ir/link/pub/AK%20CGC%20occasional%20paper%20final\\_final\\_----%20Prof%20%20Kirkpatrick.pdf](http://repository.lib.ied.edu.hk/pubdata/ir/link/pub/AK%20CGC%20occasional%20paper%20final_final_----%20Prof%20%20Kirkpatrick.pdf)

- Klaassen, R. G. (2001). *The international university curriculum: Challenges in English-medium Engineering Education*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Klaassen, R. G. (2003). English-medium degree programmes in higher education: From implementation to quality assurance. In C. van Leeuwen & R. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Multilingual Approaches in University Education: Challenges and Practices* (pp. 119–143). Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Valkhof Pers.
- Klaassen, R. G., & Bos M. (2010). English language screening for scientific staff at Delft University of Technology. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 45, 61–75. Retrieved from <http://download2.hermes.asb.dk/archive/2010/Hermes45.html>
- Klaassen, R. G., & De Graaff, E. (2001). Facing innovation: Preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction in a non-native context. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(1), 281–289. doi: 10.1080/03043790110054409
- Kleis, R., & Sikkema, A. (2016, September 8). Engelse bachelor goed idee? *Resource*. Retrieved from <https://resource.wur.nl/nl/show/Engelse-bachelor-goed-idee.htm>
- Kling, J. (2015). “You try with a little humor and you just get on with it”: Danish lecturers’ reflections on English-medium instruction. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 201–222). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2–3. Retrieved from <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/7391/6588>
- Kuiper, R. (2016, August 26). ‘Docenten moeten alle hoeken en gaten van het Engels kennen’ – Meer dan de helft van de studies volledig in het Engels. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from

<http://www.volkskrant.nl/binnenland/-docenten-moeten-alle-hoeken-en-gaten-van-het-engels-kennen~a4364572/>

Lehtonen, T., Lönnfors, P., & Virkkunen-Fullenwider, A. (1999). English or not English: that is the question! Teaching through English at the University of Helsinki. Helsingin yliopiston Opintoasiaintoimiston julkaisuja 18/1999. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.  
Retrieved from <http://h27.it.helsinki.fi/TTE/search.htm>

Lehtonen, T., Lönnfors, P., & Virkkunen-Fullenwider, A. (2003). Teaching through English: A university case study. In C. van Leeuwen & R. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Multilingual Approaches in University Education: Challenges and Practices* (pp. 103–118). Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Valkhof Pers.

Linn, A. (2015). Series Preface. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. vii–viii). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Maiworm, F., & Wächter, B. (2002). *English-language-taught degree programmes in European higher education*. Bonn: Lemmens. Retrieved from <http://www.aca-secretariat.be/index.php?id=392>

Margić, B. D., & Vodopija-Krstanović, I. (2015). Introducing EMI at a Croatian university: Can we bridge the gap between global emerging trends and local challenges? In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 43–63). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Montgomery, S. (2004). Of towers, walls, and fields: Perspectives on language in science. *Science*, 303(5662), 1333–1335. doi: 10.1126/science.1095204

Phillipson, R. (2015). English as threat or opportunity in European higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 19–42). Boston: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

- Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1999). Englishisation: One dimension of globalisation. In D. Graddol & U. H. Meinhof (Eds.), *English in a changing world – The AILA Review 13* (pp. 19–36). Guildford: Biddles Ltd.
- Radboud Universiteit (2015). *De Radboud Universiteit op weg naar 2020: An invitation to change perspective*. Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit.
- Radboud University Nijmegen (RU). (2016a). *Feiten en Cijfers*. Retrieved December 20, 2016 from <http://www.ru.nl/over-ons/overradboud/feitencijfers/>
- Radboud University Nijmegen (RU). (2016b, December 12). *Percentage vrouwelijke hoogleraren Radboud Universiteit opnieuw gestegen*. Retrieved from <http://www.ru.nl/nieuws-agenda/nieuws/vm/2016/december/monitor-vrouwelijke-hoogleraren-2016/>
- Radboud University Nijmegen (RU). (2016c, September 29). *Radboud, once again, best general university*. Retrieved from <http://www.ru.nl/english/news-agenda/news/vm/2016/elsevier-beste-studies-2016/>
- Radboud University Nijmegen (RU). (2016d, October 4). *Radboud Universiteit steeds internationaler*. Retrieved from <http://www.ru.nl/nieuws-agenda/nieuws/vm/2016/oktober/oktobercijfers-2016/>
- Ritzen, J. (2004). Across the bridge: Towards an international university. In R. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenges of a multilingual higher education* (pp. 28–40). Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht.
- Sercu, L. (2004). The introduction of English-medium instruction in universities. A comparison of Flemish lecturers' and students' language skills, perceptions and attitudes. In R. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenges of a multilingual higher education* (pp. 547–555). Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht.

- Shohamy, E. (2013). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196–210). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. *AILA Review*, 25(1), 1–12. doi: 10.1075/aila.25.01smi
- Sommer, M. (2016, August 27). Nee tegen stone coal English (2). *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/binnenland/nee-tegen-stone-coal-english-2~a4365217/>
- Tamtam, A. G., Gallagher, F., Olabi, A. G., & Naher, S. (2012). A comparative study of the implementation of EMI in Europe, Asia and Africa. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1417–1425. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.836
- Tange, H. (2010). Caught in the tower of Babel: University lecturers' experiences with internationalisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10(2), 137–149. doi: 10.1080/14708470903342138
- Tatzl, D. (2011). English-medium masters' programmes at an Austrian university of applied sciences: Attitudes, experiences and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10, 252–270. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2011.08.003
- Thøgersen, J. & Airey, J. (2011). Lecturing undergraduate science in Danish and in English: A comparison of speaking rate and rhetorical style. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30, 209–221. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2011.01.002
- Van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the OECD countries: Challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 274–289. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303543

- Vinke, A. A. (1995). *English as the medium of instruction in Dutch engineering education*. Delft: Delft University Press.
- Vinke, A. A., Snippe, J., & Jochems, W. (1998). English-medium content courses in non-English higher education: A study of lecturer experiences and teaching behaviours. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 3(3), 383–394. doi: 10.1080/1356215980030307
- Wächter, B. (2008). Internationalisation and the European Higher Education Area. Academic Cooperation Association (ACA). Retrieved from [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/BolognaSeminars/documents/Ghent/Ghent\\_May08\\_Bernd\\_Waechter.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/BolognaSeminars/documents/Ghent/Ghent_May08_Bernd_Waechter.pdf)
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education. The picture in 2007*. Bonn: Lemmens. Retrieved from <http://www.aca-secretariat.be/index.php?id=384>
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2015). *English-taught programmes in European higher education. The state of play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens. Retrieved from <http://www.aca-secretariat.be/index.php?id=792>
- Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek [act on higher education and scientific research] (WHW)*. (1992, October 8). Retrieved December 20, 2016 from [http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0005682/2016-10-01#search\\_highlight0](http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0005682/2016-10-01#search_highlight0)
- Wilkinson, R. (2005). The impact of language on teaching content: Views from the content teacher. Paper at the “Bi- and Multilingual Universities – challenges and future prospects” conference in Helsinki 1 – 3 September 2005. Retrieved from: <http://www.palmenia.helsinki.fi/congress/bilingual2005/presentations/wilkinson.pdf>
- Wilkinson, R. (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium*

*instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 3–24). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Zonneveld, M. (1991). *Studeren en doceren in Engelstalige, multiculturele situaties: Een exploratieve studie naar mogelijke effecten van integratie van MSc- en regulier onderwijs aan de Landbouwniversiteit*. (Wageningen University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Agricultural Educational Theory). Wageningen: Wageningen Universiteit.

## Appendix A:

### Lecturers' Questionnaire

#### **Lecturers' questionnaire**

Dear lecturer,

This anonymous questionnaire is part of a research project investigating teaching quality of lecturers that teach both in English and in Dutch. Your answers will help to learn more about a possible change in teaching of lecturers that teach both in English and in Dutch. Furthermore, the results will help Radboud University to improve English-medium instruction.

In order to get the most out of this questionnaire, I would like to ask you the following:

- Answer the questions as correctly as possible, and to the best of your ability even though you might not be quite certain that you remember correctly.
- If you teach more courses in both English and Dutch, answer the questions on the basis of your general impression of these courses.
- If you do not teach courses in English/Dutch this semester, use your experience from previous semesters to answer.

Thank you for your assistance!

Senne van Amerongen

(based on Hallekjær, 2010)

#### **Background information**

In this section you are asked to provide information on your background.

1. Gender

☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Age

☐ 25 – 35      ☐ 36 – 45      ☐ 46 – 55      ☐ 56 – 65      ☐ older than 65

3. In which faculty do you teach? (Lehtonen et al., 1999) (If you teach in more than one faculty, check the faculty you work in most).

- ☐ Faculty of Arts
- ☐ Faculty of Law
- ☐ Faculty of Medical Sciences
- ☐ Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies
- ☐ Faculty of Science
- ☐ Faculty of Social Sciences
- ☐ Nijmegen School of Management



4. What academic subject do you teach? (e.g. political science, sociology, European Law School)

5. For how many years have you been a university lecturer? (Vinke, 1995)  
☐ Less than 2 years    ☐ 2 – 5 years    ☐ More than 5 years

6. For how many years have you been teaching in English? (based on Jensen et al., 2013)  
☐ Less than 2 years    ☐ 2 – 5 years    ☐ More than 5 years

---

### Practise and use of English

7. How often do you teach in an English-medium instructional setting? (Vinke, 1995)  
☐ Occasionally    ☐ 1 – 2 courses a year    ☐ 2 – 5 courses a year  
☐ More than 5 courses a year

8. Have you taken any additional English course(s) after you finished secondary school? (Vinke, 1995)  
☐ Yes    ☐ No

9. Have you ever stayed in an English-speaking country for 2 months or longer? (Vinke, 1995)  
☐ Yes    ☐ No

10. How often do you speak English in the exercise of your profession? (Vinke, 1995)  
☐ Never    ☐ Occasionally    ☐ Regularly    ☐ Always

11. Do you give lectures at English-medium conferences? (Vinke, 1995)  
☐ No    ☐ Yes, less than once per year    ☐ Yes, 1 or 2 time(s) a year    ☐ Yes, 3 times or more a year

---

### Proficiency in English

12. How would you characterise your overall proficiency in English (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening)? (based on Vinke, 1995; see also Jensen et al., 2011)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)

13. How would you characterise your pronunciation of English? (Vinke, 1995; based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)

14. How would you characterise your ability to speak English? (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)

15. How would you characterise the grammatical correctness of your oral English performance? (Vinke, 1995)

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)

16. How would you characterise your overall oral English proficiency? (Vinke, 1995)

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)

17. How would you characterise your understanding of spoken English? (based on Jensen et al., 2011)

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Barely sufficient, 4 = Excellent)

18. Compared to speaking in Dutch, how confident are you when speaking in English? (Vinke, 1995)

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Much less confident, 4 = Equally confident)

19. How adequate is your vocabulary when speaking in English, compared to speaking Dutch? (based on Jensen et al., 2013; Klaassen, 2001; Vinke, 1995)

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Much less adequate, 4 = Equally adequate)

20. Considering teaching in an English-medium instructional setting, would you like to improve your oral English proficiency by taking an English language course? (Vinke, 1995)

☐ Yes ☐ No

---

## Comparison of English-medium and Dutch-medium instructional courses/settings.

In the following sections you will be asked to compare your teaching in English with your teaching in Dutch.

### Preparing

The following questions (21 - 29) are all statements introduced by the same phrase. Indicate in what way it applies to your teaching.

On a scale of 1 to 4

1 = Applies to English-medium instruction only

2 = Applies to a greater extent when compared to Dutch-medium instruction

3 = Applies to the same extent when compared to Dutch-medium instruction

4 = Applies to Dutch-medium instruction only

5 = Not applicable (i.e. that in general you do not include the aspect involved in your preparation) (Vinke, 1995)

### *When I prepare for English-medium instruction/lectures, I:*

21. go through the relevant subject matter

22. elaborate links or connections between various subject matter units in writing

23. clarify theories, formulas, operations and the like in writing

24. think up or think about appropriate and/or clarifying examples
25. elaborate potential difficulties about which students might ask questions
26. work out problems or sums and write down the appropriate way(s) of solving them
27. prepare (instructional) materials: handouts, PowerPoint presentations, outlines for use of BlackBoard etc.
28. write down “opening sentences” for the various subject matter components
29. “rehearse” parts of the subject matter that I find difficult or tricky

(All based on Vinke, 1995)

30. How often do you need to look up technical terminology when preparing for English-medium instruction? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Nearly always, 4 = Never)
31. How often do you need to look up terminology not related to subject matter content when preparing for English-medium instruction (e.g. words to paraphrase or explain concepts)? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Nearly always, 4 = Never)

The time spent on preparation can be expressed in proportion to teaching time, e.g. the ratio of preparation to teaching time is 2 to 1, if it takes 2 hours to prepare for 1 hour of teaching. (Vinke, 1995)

Questions 32 and 33 deal with this.

32. What was this ratio when you prepared for an English-medium course for the first time, compared to the first time in Dutch? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Much higher, 4 = The same)
33. What is this ratio when you prepare for an English-medium course that you have taught several times before, compared to the same situation in Dutch? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Much higher, 4 = The same)
34. Compared to Dutch, writing lecture notes in English takes up (1 = Much more time, 4 = A similar amount of time) (Vinke, 1995)
35. Compared to Dutch, my English lecture notes are of (1 = Much lower quality, 4 = The same quality) (Vinke, 1995)
36. Compared to Dutch, constructing a written exam in English takes up (1 = Much more time, 4 = A similar amount of time) (Vinke, 1995)
37. Compared to Dutch, I experience grading a written exam in English as being (1 = Much more complicated, 4 = Complicated to the same extent) (Vinke, 1995)

---

## Language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills

Questions 38 up to and including 64 concern the extent to which you can make use of certain teaching skills in an English-medium instructional setting, compared to a Dutch-medium instructional setting. The questions are all statements introduced by the same phrase:

***Compared to a Dutch-medium instructional setting, in an English-medium instructional setting I am able to***

(Vinke, 1995)

- 1 = To a much lesser degree
- 2 = To a lesser degree
- 3 = To a similar extent
- 4 = To the same extent

### Language-related teaching skills

- 38. express myself clearly and accurately (Vinke, 1995)
- 39. get across my train of thought (based on Hellekjær, 2010)
- 40. explain something in different ways (Vinke, 1995)
- 41. differentiate or qualify statements (Vinke, 1995)

---

### General teaching skills

- 42. provide students with background information on theories or concepts that I discuss (Vinke, 1995)
- 43. discuss recent developments in my field of study (Vinke, 1995)
- 44. air views different from my own (Vinke, 1995)
- 45. present subject matter clearly and coherently (Vinke, 1995)
- 46. summarise subject matter which has been covered so far (Vinke, 1995)
- 47. ask questions on the subject matter (based on Vinke, 1995)
- 48. retain students' attention (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)
- 49. engage students in my lecture (based on Klaassen, 2001)
- 50. motivate students (based on Tatzl, 2011)
- 51. prepare students for their academic future (based on Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011)

52. deliver the information at the same speed (based on Hellekjær, 2010; Thøgersen & Airey, 2011)
  53. maintain a lively argument (i.e. high and low sounds vary, melodious intonation and differences in speech rate) (Klaassen 2001; based on Klaassen & De Graaff, 2001)
  54. structure the lectures (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013; Vinke, 1995)
  55. manage the lectures (based on Tatzl, 2011)
- 

#### Improvising teaching skills

56. encourage or get a discussion going (Vinke, 1995)
57. give appropriate and/or clarifying examples unprepared (Vinke, 1995)
58. alternate or illustrate theory with personal experience (Vinke, 1995)
59. give a clear and complete answer to student questions unprepared (Vinke, 1995)
60. respond to current affairs (e.g. newspapers, television) (Vinke, 1995)
61. rephrase questions if not understood (based on Klaassen, 2001)
62. make a humorous remark (Vinke, 1995)
63. tell anecdotes (based on Wilkinson, 2005)
64. adjust my teaching strategy to the situation in a somewhat flexible way (Vinke, 1995)

---

#### Experiencing teaching skills

In question 65 up to and including 82 a Dutch-medium instructional setting is used as a reference as well.

65. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do you rely on your notes when teaching in English? (1 = To a much greater extent, 4 = To the same extent) (Vinke, 1995)
66. Compared to Dutch, how many PowerPoint slides do you use when teaching in English? (1 = A much larger number, 4 = A similar number) (based on Vinke, 1995)
67. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do you go into subject matter in depth when teaching in English? (1 = To a much lesser degree, 4 = To the same extent) (Vinke, 1995; see also Airey, 2011; Klaassen, 2003)
68. Compared to Dutch, what amount of subject matter do you cover when teaching in English? (1 = A much smaller amount, 4 = A similar amount) (Vinke, 1995)

69. Compared to Dutch, how hard is it for you in an English-medium instructional setting to find words that express your ideas adequately? (1 = Much harder, 4 = Not harder at all) (Vinke, 1995)
70. Compared to Dutch, to what extent are false starts present in your presentations? (1 = To a much bigger extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Airey, 2011)
71. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do you hesitate while speaking? (1 = To a much bigger extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Airey, 2011; Jensen et al., 2011)
72. Compared to Dutch, the level of formality of my lectures in English is (1 = Much higher, 4 = The same) (based on Thøgersen & Airey, 2011)
73. Compared to Dutch, of what importance are your teaching skills when teaching in English? (1 = Of much more importance, 4 = Of similar importance) (Vinke, 1995)
74. Compared to Dutch, the quality of my presentation skills is (1 = Much lower, 4 = The same) (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)
75. Compared to Dutch, the quality of my pedagogical skills is (1 = Much lower, 4 = The same) (based on Jensen et al., 2011; Klaassen, 2001)
76. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do you use gestures? (1 = To a much lesser degree, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Airey, 2011; Klaassen, 2001; Vinke, 1995)
77. Compared to Dutch, how hard is it for you to hold students' interest when teaching in English? (1 = Much harder, 4 = Not harder at all) (Vinke, 1995; based on Jensen et al., 2011)
78. Compared to Dutch, to what extent can you get your enthusiasm across when teaching in English? (1 = To a much lesser degree, 4 = To the same extent) (Vinke, 1995; see also Klaassen, 2001)
79. Compared to Dutch, to what extent is teaching in English demanding for you? (1 = To a much greater extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Vinke, 1995)
80. Compared to Dutch, what do you think of the quality of your English-medium instruction? (1 = It is much lower, 4 = It is as high) (Vinke, 1995)
81. Compared to Dutch, my academic level in English is (1 = Much lower, 4 = As high) (based on Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011)
82. Compared to Dutch, how well do your students comprehend you? (1 = Far less well, 4 = Equally well) (based on Lehtonen et al., 1999)

---

## General Comments

Please feel free to offer any other opinions or comments regarding the teaching of courses in English and Dutch. You can answer either in English or in Dutch. (based on Lehtonen et al., 1999)

.....  
.....  
.....

Thank you very much for your help in filling out this questionnaire. Your answers have been saved. (based on Lehtonen et al., 1999)

## Appendix B

## Frequency Table Lecturers

**Table B.1: Frequency table for all multiple choice questions of the lecturers' questionnaire**

Question number	n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
1	42	81.0 (34)	19.0 (8)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	42	28.6 (12)	23.8 (10)	21.4 (9)	26.2 (11)	0 (0)	-	-	-
3	42	0 (0)	16.7 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.4 (1)	31.0 (13)	50.0 (21)	-
5	41	7.3 (3)	12.2 (5)	80.5 (33)	-	-	-	-	-
6	42	14.3 (6)	28.6 (12)	57.1 (24)	-	-	-	-	-
7	42	11.9 (5)	45.2 (19)	40.5 (17)	2.4 (1)	-	-	-	-
8	41	53.7 (22)	46.3 (19)	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	42	50.0 (21)	50.0 (21)	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	42	0 (0)	9.5 (4)	88.1 (37)	2.4 (1)	-	-	-	-
11	42	9.5 (4)	11.9 (5)	45.2 (19)	33.3 (14)	-	-	-	-
12	42	2.4 (1)	14.3 (6)	47.6 (20)	35.7 (15)	-	-	-	3.2
13	42	4.8 (2)	23.8 (10)	38.1 (16)	33.3 (14)	-	-	-	3.0
14	42	2.4 (1)	21.4 (9)	38.1 (16)	38.1 (16)	-	-	-	3.1
15	41	7.3 (3)	19.5 (8)	48.8 (20)	24.4 (10)	-	-	-	2.9
16	40	7.5 (3)	17.5 (7)	47.5 (19)	27.5 (11)	-	-	-	3.0
17	42	0 (0)	0 (0)	28.6 (12)	71.4 (30)	-	-	-	3.7
18	42	11.9 (5)	21.4 (9)	40.5 (17)	26.2 (11)	-	-	-	2.8
19	42	16.7 (7)	21.4 (9)	33.3 (14)	28.6 (12)	-	-	-	2.7
20	42	42.9 (18)	57.1 (24)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	42	0 (0)	7.1 (3)	92.9 (39)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	-	-



22	42	0 (0)	4.8 (2)	83.3 (35)	2.4 (1)	9.5 (4)	-	-	-
23	42	0 (0)	9.5 (4)	85.7 (36)	0 (0)	4.8 (2)	-	-	-
24	42	0 (0)	14.3 (6)	85.7 (36)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	-	-
25	42	2.4 (1)	7.1 (3)	83.3 (35)	0 (0)	7.1 (3)	-	-	-
26	42	2.4 (1)	2.4 (1)	76.2 (32)	0 (0)	19 (8)	-	-	-
27	41	0 (0)	4.9 (2)	95.1 (39)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	-	-
28	42	0 (0)	21.4 (9)	52.4 (22)	0 (0)	26.2 (11)	-	-	-
29	42	7.1 (3)	14.3 (6)	64.3 (27)	0 (0)	14.3 (6)	-	-	-
30	42	9.5 (4)	7.1 (3)	61.9 (26)	21.4 (9)	-	-	-	3.0
31	42	7.1 (3)	16.7 (7)	54.8 (23)	21.4 (9)	-	-	-	2.9
32	42	19.0 (8)	21.4 (9)	23.8 (10)	35.7 (15)	-	-	-	2.8
33	42	2.4 (1)	7.1 (3)	16.7 (7)	73.8 (31)	-	-	-	3.6
34	42	7.1 (3)	11.9 (5)	31.0 (13)	50.0 (21)	-	-	-	3.2
35	42	0 (0)	7.1 (3)	23.8 (10)	69.0 (29)	-	-	-	3.6
36	42	4.8 (2)	26.2 (11)	23.8 (10)	45.2 (19)	-	-	-	3.1
37	42	7.1 (3)	7.1 (3)	19.0 (8)	66.7 (28)	-	-	-	3.5
38	42	2.4 (1)	40.5 (17)	33.3 (14)	23.8 (10)	-	-	-	2.8
39	42	2.4 (1)	23.8 (10)	47.6 (20)	26.2 (11)	-	-	-	3.0
40	42	0 (0)	33.3 (14)	35.7 (15)	31.0 (13)	-	-	-	3.0
41	42	2.4 (1)	35.7 (15)	35.7 (15)	26.2 (11)	-	-	-	2.9
42	42	0 (0)	19.0 (8)	38.1 (16)	42.9 (18)	-	-	-	3.2
43	42	0 (0)	19.0 (8)	33.3 (14)	47.6 (20)	-	-	-	3.3
44	41	0 (0)	17.1 (7)	34.1 (14)	48.8 (20)	-	-	-	3.3
45	42	2.4 (1)	14.3 (6)	35.7 (15)	47.6 (20)	-	-	-	3.3
46	42	0	9.5	42.9	47.6	-	-	-	3.4

		(0)	(4)	(18)	(20)				
47	42	0 (0)	7.1 (3)	45.2 (19)	47.6 (20)	-	-	-	3.4
48	42	2.4 (1)	16.7 (7)	40.5 (17)	40.5 (17)	-	-	-	3.2
49	42	2.4 (1)	26.2 (11)	33.3 (14)	38.1 (16)	-	-	-	3.1
50	42	0 (0)	14.3 (6)	52.4 (22)	33.3 (14)	-	-	-	3.2
51	41	2.4 (1)	9.8 (4)	43.9 (18)	43.9 (18)	-	-	-	3.3
52	42	2.4 (1)	26.2 (11)	35.7 (15)	35.7 (15)	-	-	-	3.0
53	42	0 (0)	21.4 (9)	33.3 (14)	45.2 (19)	-	-	-	3.2
54	42	0 (0)	2.4 (1)	35.7 (15)	61.9 (26)	-	-	-	3.6
55	42	0 (0)	2.4 (1)	42.9 (18)	54.8 (23)	-	-	-	3.5
56	42	4.8 (2)	38.1 (16)	33.3 (14)	23.8 (10)	-	-	-	2.8
57	42	0 (0)	23.8 (10)	35.7 (15)	40.5 (17)	-	-	-	3.2
58	42	0 (0)	16.7 (7)	35.7 (15)	47.6 (20)	-	-	-	3.3
59	42	2.4 (1)	16.7 (7)	35.7 (15)	45.2 (19)	-	-	-	3.2
60	42	0 (0)	16.7 (7)	35.7 (15)	47.6 (20)	-	-	-	3.3
61	42	2.4 (1)	16.7 (7)	40.5 (17)	40.5 (17)	-	-	-	3.2
62	42	9.5 (4)	31.0 (13)	26.2 (11)	33.3 (14)	-	-	-	2.8
63	42	7.1 (3)	14.3 (6)	42.9 (18)	35.7 (15)	-	-	-	3.1
64	42	2.4 (1)	26.2 (11)	28.6 (12)	42.9 (18)	-	-	-	3.1
65	42	2.4 (1)	4.8 (2)	19.0 (8)	73.8 (31)	-	-	-	3.6
66	42	2.4 (1)	0 (0)	2.4 (1)	95.2 (40)	-	-	-	3.9
67	42	4.8 (2)	7.1 (3)	9.5 (4)	78.6 (33)	-	-	-	3.6
68	42	0 (0)	4.8 (2)	11.9 (5)	83.3 (35)	-	-	-	3.8
69	42	4.8 (2)	31.0 (13)	33.3 (14)	31.0 (13)	-	-	-	2.9
70	42	2.4 (1)	7.1 (3)	16.7 (7)	73.8 (31)	-	-	-	3.6

71	42	2.4 (1)	23.8 (10)	33.3 (14)	40.5 (17)	-	-	-	3.1
72	42	7.1 (3)	14.3 (6)	21.4 (9)	57.1 (24)	-	-	-	3.1
73	42	4.8 (2)	9.5 (4)	14.3 (6)	71.4 (30)	-	-	-	3.5
74	42	0 (0)	11.9 (5)	33.3 (14)	54.8 (23)	-	-	-	3.4
75	42	0 (0)	14.3 (6)	21.4 (9)	64.3 (27)	-	-	-	3.5
76	41	0 (0)	0 (0)	7.3 (3)	92.7 (38)	-	-	-	3.9
77	42	0 (0)	16.7 (7)	21.4 (9)	61.9 (26)	-	-	-	3.5
78	42	2.4 (1)	7.1 (3)	38.1 (16)	52.4 (22)	-	-	-	3.4
79	41	12.2 (5)	19.5 (8)	31.7 (13)	36.6 (15)	-	-	-	2.9
80	42	9.5 (4)	9.5 (4)	35.7 (15)	45.2 (19)	-	-	-	3.2
81	41	7.3 (3)	14.6 (6)	31.7 (13)	46.3 (19)	-	-	-	3.2
82	42	4.8 (2)	11.9 (5)	45.2 (19)	38.1 (16)	-	-	-	3.2

*Note.* The column under ‘n’ shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 7 refer to the answering possibilities (in most cases this is rating 1 through 4).

Cells filled with a ‘-’ mean this answering option does not apply for the questions.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages and the number of lecturers that chose an answering option in brackets.

## Appendix C

## Recoded Tables Lecturers

**Table C.1: Recoded frequency table for questions 21 – 29**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
21	26	0	3.8	96.2	0
22	26	0	7.7	88.5	3.8
23	26	0	3.8	96.2	0
24	26	0	15.4	84.6	0
25	26	3.8	7.7	88.5	0
26	26	3.8	3.8	92.3	0
27	26	0	7.7	92.3	0
28	26	0	23.1	76.9	0
29	26	7.7	15.4	76.9	0

The column under 'n' shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 4 refer to the answering possibilities.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages.

**Table C.2: Recoded frequency table for questions 42 – 55**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Mean</b>
42	40	0	17.5	40.0	42.5	3.3
43	40	0	17.5	35.0	47.5	3.3
44	40	0	17.5	35.0	47.5	3.3
45	40	2.5	15.0	37.5	45.0	3.3
46	40	0	10.0	45.0	45.0	3.4
47	40	0	7.5	47.5	45.0	3.4
48	40	2.5	17.5	40.0	40.0	3.2
49	40	2.5	27.5	35.0	35.0	3.0
50	40	0	15.0	52.5	32.5	3.2
51	40	2.5	10.0	45.0	42.5	3.3
52	40	2.5	27.5	37.5	32.5	3.0
53	40	0	22.5	32.5	45.0	3.2
54	40	0	2.5	35.0	62.5	3.6
55	40	0	2.5	42.5	55.0	3.5
Average	40	0.9	15.0	40.0	44.1	3.3

The column under 'n' shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 4 refer to the answering possibilities.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages.

**Table C.3: Recoded frequency table for questions 65 – 82**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Mean</b>
65	39	2.6	5.1	17.9	74.4	3.6
66	39	2.6	0	2.6	94.9	3.9
67	39	5.1	7.7	10.3	76.9	3.6
68	39	0	5.1	12.8	82.1	3.8
69	39	5.1	33.3	33.3	28.2	2.8
70	39	2.6	7.7	17.9	71.8	3.6
71	39	2.6	25.6	30.8	41.0	3.1
72	39	7.7	12.8	23.1	56.4	3.3
73	39	5.1	10.3	12.8	71.8	3.5
74	39	0	12.8	35.9	51.3	3.4
75	39	0	15.4	20.5	64.1	3.5
76	39	0	0	7.7	92.3	3.9
77	39	0	17.9	20.5	61.5	3.4
78	39	2.6	7.7	35.9	53.8	3.4
79	39	12.8	20.5	28.2	38.5	2.9
80	39	10.3	10.3	35.9	43.6	3.1
81	39	7.7	15.4	30.8	46.2	3.2
82	39	5.1	12.8	46.2	35.9	3.1
Average	39	4.0	12.2	23.5	60.3	3.4

The column under ‘n’ shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 4 refer to the answering possibilities.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages.

## Appendix D

### Students' Questionnaire

#### **Students' questionnaire**

Dear student,

This anonymous questionnaire is part of a research project investigating teaching quality of lecturers that teach both in English and in Dutch. Your answers will help to learn more about a possible change in teaching of lecturers that teach both in English and in Dutch. Furthermore, the results will help Radboud University to improve English-medium instruction.

In order to get the most out of this questionnaire, I would like to ask you the following:

- Answer the questions as correctly as possible, and to the best of your ability even though you might not be quite certain that you remember correctly.
- If you attend more courses in both English and Dutch, answer the questions on the basis of your general impression of these courses.
- If you do not have courses in English/Dutch this semester, use your experience from previous semesters to answer.
- The questionnaire asks for your opinion on your lecturers, however, if you only have one lecturer that teaches/taught in English, fill in the questionnaire with that lecturer in mind.

Thank you for your assistance!

Senne van Amerongen

(based on Hallekjær, 2010)

#### **Background information**

In this section you are asked to provide information on your background.

1. Gender

☐ male ☐ female

2. Age

☐ 15 – 20      ☐ 21 – 25      ☐ 26 – 30      ☐ older than 30

3. In which faculty do you study? (Lehtonen et al., 1999)

- ☐ Faculty of Arts
- ☐ Faculty of Law
- ☐ Faculty of Medical Sciences
- ☐ Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies
- ☐ Faculty of Science
- ☐ Faculty of Social Sciences
- ☐ Nijmegen School of Management

4. What academic subject do you study? (e.g. political science, sociology, European Law School)

5. In what year of your study are you? (based on Hellekjær, 2010)

☐ Year 1      ☐ Year 2      ☐ Year 3      ☐ Year 4 or higher

---

### Practise and use of English

6. Estimate what percentage of classes of your entire study is taught in English (i.e. classes from year 1 – year 3). (based on Hellekjær, 2010)

☐ 0 - 10      ☐ 11 - 20      ☐ 21 - 30      ☐ 31 - 40      ☐ More than 40

7. From what year onwards have you been taught in English (next to Dutch) at the university?

☐ Year 1      ☐ Year 2      ☐ Year 3

8. Have you ever stayed in an English-speaking country for 2 months or longer? (Vinke, 1995; see also Hellekjær, 2010)

☐ Yes    ☐ No

---

### Your own proficiency in English

9. How would you characterise your overall proficiency in English (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening)? (based on Vinke, 1995; see also Jensen et al., 2011)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = moderate, 4 = near-native)

10. How would you characterise your pronunciation of English? (Vinke, 1995; based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = moderate, 4 = near-native)

11. How would you characterise your ability to speak English? (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = moderate, 4 = near-native)

12. How would you characterise the grammatical correctness of your oral English performance? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = moderate, 4 = near-native)

13. How would you characterise your overall oral English proficiency? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = moderate, 4 = near-native)

14. How would you characterise your understanding of spoken English? (based on Jensen et al., 2011)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = barely sufficient, 4 = excellent)

15. Compared to speaking in Dutch, how confident are you when speaking in English? (Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = much less confident, 4 = equally confident)
16. How adequate is your vocabulary when speaking in English, compared to speaking Dutch? (based on Jensen et al., 2013; Klaassen, 2001; Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = much less adequate, 4 = equally adequate)
- 

## **Comparison of English-medium and Dutch-medium instructional courses.**

In the following sections you will be asked to compare your lecturers' ability to teach in English and Dutch.

### **Lecturers' proficiency in English**

17. How would you characterise your lecturers' overall proficiency in English (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening)? (based on Vinke, 1995; see also Jensen et al., 2011)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)
18. How would you characterise your lecturers' pronunciation of English? (based on Vinke, 1995; see also Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)
19. How would you characterise your lecturers' ability to speak English? (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)
20. How would you characterise the grammatical correctness of your lecturers' oral English performance? (based on Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)
21. How would you characterise your lecturers' overall oral English proficiency? (based on Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Moderate, 4 = Near-native)
22. Compared to speaking in Dutch, how confident are your lecturers when speaking in English? (based on Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Much less confident, 4 = Equally confident)
23. How often do your lecturers search for technical terminology in an English-taught class? (based on Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Nearly always, 4 = Never)
24. How often do your lecturers search for terminology not related to subject matter content (e.g. words to paraphrase or explain concepts)? (based on Vinke, 1995)  
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = Nearly always, 4 = Never)
-



## Language-related, general, and improvising teaching skills

Questions 25 up to and including 50 concern the extent to which your lecturers can make use of certain teaching skills in an English-medium instructional setting, compared to a Dutch-medium instructional setting. The questions are all statements introduced by the same phrase:

***Compared to a Dutch-medium instructional setting, in an English-medium instructional setting my lecturers are able to***

(Vinke, 1995)

1 = To a much lesser degree

2 = To a lesser degree

3 = To a similar extent

4 = To the same extent

### Language-related teaching skills

25. express themselves clearly and accurately (based on Vinke, 1995)

26. get across their train of thought (based on Hellekjær, 2010)

27. explain something in different ways (Vinke, 1995)

28. differentiate or qualify statements (Vinke, 1995)

-----

### General teaching skills

29. provide background information on theories or concepts that they discuss (based on Vinke, 1995)

30. discuss recent developments in the field of study (Vinke, 1995)

31. air views different from their own (based on Vinke, 1995)

32. present subject matter clearly and coherently (Vinke, 1995)

33. summarise subject matter which has been covered so far (Vinke, 1995)

34. ask questions on the subject matter (based on Vinke, 1995)

35. retain students' attention (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)

36. engage students in their lecture (based on Klaassen, 2001)

37. motivate students (based on Tatzl, 2011)

38. deliver the information at the same speed (based on Hellekjær, 2010; Thøgersen & Airey, 2011)

39. maintain a lively argument (i.e. high and low sounds vary, melodious intonation and differences in speech rate) (Klaassen 2001; based on Klaassen & De Graaff, 2001)
40. structure the lectures (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013; Vinke, 1995)
41. manage the lectures (based on Tatzl, 2011)

---

#### Improvising teaching skills

42. encourage or get a discussion going (Vinke, 1995)
43. give appropriate and/or clarifying examples unprepared (Vinke, 1995)
44. alternate or illustrate theory with personal experience (Vinke, 1995)
45. give a clear and complete answer to student questions unprepared (Vinke, 1995)
46. respond to current affairs (e.g. newspapers, television) (Vinke, 1995)
47. rephrase questions if not understood (based on Klaassen, 2001)
48. make a humorous remark (Vinke, 1995)
49. tell anecdotes (based on Wilkinson, 2005)
50. adjust their teaching strategy to the situation in a somewhat flexible way (Vinke, 1995)

---

#### Experiencing teaching skills

In question 51 up to and including 64 a Dutch-medium instructional setting is used as a reference as well.

51. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do your lecturers rely on their notes when teaching in English? (1 = To a much greater extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Vinke, 1995)
52. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do your lecturers go into subject matter in depth when teaching in English? (1 = To a much lesser degree, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Vinke, 1995; see also Airey, 2011; Klaassen, 2003)
53. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do your lecturers provide handouts, PowerPoint presentations, outlines etc.? (1 = To a much greater extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Vinke, 1995)
54. Compared to Dutch, to what extent are false starts present in your lecturers' presentations? (1 = To a much bigger extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Airey, 2011)

55. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do your lecturers hesitate while speaking? (1 = To a much bigger extent, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Airey, 2011; Jensen et al., 2011)
56. Compared to Dutch, the level of formality of your lectures in English is (1 = Much higher, 4 = The same) (based on Thøgersen & Airey, 2011)
57. Compared to Dutch, the quality of your lecturers' presentation skills is (1 = Much lower, 4 = The same) (based on Jensen et al., 2011, 2013)
58. Compared to Dutch, the quality of your lecturers' pedagogical skills is (1 = Much lower, 4 = The same) (based on Jensen et al., 2011; Klaassen, 2001)
59. Compared to Dutch, to what extent do your lecturers use gestures? (1 = To a much lesser degree, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Airey, 2011; Klaassen, 2001; Vinke, 1995)
60. Compared to Dutch, how hard is it for your lecturers to hold students' interest when teaching in English? (1 = Much harder, 4 = Not harder at all) (based on Vinke, 1995; Jensen et al., 2011)
61. Compared to Dutch, to what extent can your lecturers get their enthusiasm across when teaching in English? (1 = To a much lesser degree, 4 = To the same extent) (based on Vinke, 1995; see also Klaassen, 2001)
62. Compared to Dutch, what do you think of the quality of your lecturers' English-taught classes? (1 = It is much lower, 4 = It is as high) (based on Vinke, 1995)
63. Compared to Dutch, your lecturers' academic level in English is (1 = Much lower, 4 = As high) (based on Jensen & Thøgersen, 2011)
64. Compared to Dutch, how well do you understand your lecturers? (1 = Far less well, 4 = Equally well) (based on Lehtonen et al., 1999)

---

## General Comments

Please feel free to offer any other opinions or comments regarding the teaching of courses in English and Dutch. You can answer either in English or in Dutch. (Lehtonen et al., 1999)

.....

.....

.....

**Do you want to stand a chance of winning a gift voucher of your choice to the value of €15,-? Fill in your email address below (email addresses will only be used to get in contact with the winner).**

Email address

.....

.....

.....

Thank you very much for your help in filling out this questionnaire. Your answers have been saved. (based on Lehtonen et al., 1999)

## Appendix E

## Frequency Table Students

**Table E.1: Frequency table for all multiple choice questions of the students' questionnaire**

Question number	n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
1	268	38.8 (104)	61.2 (164)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	268	42.2 (113)	54.1 (145)	3.4 (9)	0.4 (1)	-	-	-	-
3	268	0.4 (1)	17.2 (46)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34.7 (93)	47.8 (128)	-
5	267	13.5 (36)	23.2 (62)	31.1 (83)	32.2 (86)	-	-	-	-
6	266	10.9 (29)	17.7 (47)	25.2 (67)	25.9 (69)	20.3 (54)	-	-	-
7	266	53.0 (141)	44.0 (117)	3.0 (8)	-	-	-	-	-
8	267	23.2 (62)	76.8 (205)	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	267	2.2 (6)	25.5 (68)	42.3 (113)	30.0 (80)	-	-	-	3.0
10	268	8.6 (23)	32.5 (87)	38.8 (104)	20.1 (54)	-	-	-	2.7
11	268	5.6 (15)	22.0 (59)	44.8 (120)	27.6 (74)	-	-	-	2.9
12	267	9.0 (24)	31.5 (84)	39.3 (105)	20.2 (54)	-	-	-	2.7
13	268	4.1 (11)	28.0 (75)	45.5 (122)	22.4 (60)	-	-	-	2.9
14	268	0.4 (1)	4.9 (13)	40.3 (108)	54.5 (146)	-	-	-	3.5
15	268	10.4 (28)	26.1 (70)	41.8 (112)	21.6 (58)	-	-	-	2.7
16	267	9.4 (25)	31.8 (85)	41.9 (112)	16.9 (45)	-	-	-	2.7
17	267	4.5 (12)	24.7 (66)	59.9 (160)	10.9 (29)	-	-	-	2.8
18	268	15.7 (42)	39.6 (106)	38.8 (104)	6.0 (16)	-	-	-	2.4
19	268	5.6 (15)	24.6 (66)	54.9 (147)	14.9 (40)	-	-	-	2.8
20	268	3.7 (10)	25.0 (67)	56.0 (150)	15.3 (41)	-	-	-	2.8
21	268	4.9	29.9	52.6	12.7	-	-	-	2.7

		(13)	(80)	(141)	(34)				
22	268	7.1 (19)	18.7 (50)	48.9 (131)	25.4 (68)	-	-	-	2.9
23	268	3.7 (10)	19.0 (51)	50.0 (134)	27.2 (73)	-	-	-	3.0
24	268	4.1 (11)	25.4 (68)	51.1 (137)	19.4 (52)	-	-	-	2.9
25	268	3.4 (9)	30.6 (82)	48.1 (129)	17.9 (48)	-	-	-	2.8
26	268	3.7 (10)	27.6 (74)	48.9 (131)	19.8 (53)	-	-	-	2.8
27	268	7.8 (21)	33.2 (89)	44.4 (119)	14.6 (39)	-	-	-	2.7
28	268	3.7 (10)	27.2 (73)	49.3 (132)	19.8 (53)	-	-	-	2.9
29	268	1.5 (4)	15.7 (42)	54.5 (146)	28.4 (76)	-	-	-	3.1
30	267	1.1 (3)	9.0 (24)	58.1 (155)	31.8 (85)	-	-	-	3.2
31	267	1.5 (4)	16.5 (44)	55.4 (148)	26.6 (71)	-	-	-	3.1
32	266	3.8 (10)	28.6 (76)	44.0 (117)	23.7 (63)	-	-	-	2.9
33	268	3.4 (9)	21.3 (57)	45.5 (122)	29.9 (80)	-	-	-	3.0
34	268	4.1 (11)	10.4 (28)	55.2 (148)	30.2 (81)	-	-	-	3.1
35	268	13.1 (35)	36.6 (98)	32.1 (86)	18.3 (49)	-	-	-	2.6
36	267	10.9 (29)	34.5 (92)	36.0 (96)	18.7 (50)	-	-	-	2.6
37	268	8.6 (23)	32.5 (87)	39.9 (107)	19.0 (51)	-	-	-	2.7
38	268	6.7 (18)	31.0 (83)	44.4 (119)	17.9 (48)	-	-	-	2.7
39	267	7.9 (21)	32.6 (87)	37.5 (100)	22.1 (59)	-	-	-	2.7
40	267	3.4 (9)	14.6 (39)	44.2 (118)	37.8 (101)	-	-	-	3.2
41	265	3.0 (8)	14.3 (38)	46.8 (124)	35.8 (95)	-	-	-	3.2
42	268	11.2 (30)	35.4 (95)	41.0 (110)	12.3 (33)	-	-	-	2.5
43	268	6.0 (16)	29.1 (78)	47.0 (126)	17.9 (48)	-	-	-	2.8
44	268	3.7 (10)	15.7 (42)	57.1 (153)	23.5 (63)	-	-	-	3.0

45	268	4.9 (13)	28.0 (75)	45.1 (121)	22.0 (59)	-	-	-	2.8
46	268	3.4 (9)	14.2 (38)	50.4 (135)	32.1 (86)	-	-	-	3.1
47	268	5.6 (15)	24.6 (66)	44.4 (119)	25.4 (68)	-	-	-	2.9
48	268	10.1 (27)	35.1 (94)	36.9 (99)	17.9 (48)	-	-	-	2.6
49	267	5.6 (15)	27.7 (74)	44.2 (118)	22.5 (60)	-	-	-	2.8
50	268	5.2 (14)	29.5 (79)	45.1 (121)	20.1 (54)	-	-	-	2.8
51	266	1.9 (5)	12.4 (33)	41.7 (111)	44.0 (117)	-	-	-	3.3
52	267	1.5 (4)	15.0 (40)	41.9 (112)	41.6 (111)	-	-	-	3.2
53	267	1.5 (4)	6.7 (18)	20.2 (54)	71.5 (191)	-	-	-	3.6
54	268	1.1 (3)	14.2 (38)	39.9 (107)	44.8 (120)	-	-	-	3.3
55	268	4.9 (13)	28.0 (75)	42.9 (115)	24.3 (65)	-	-	-	2.9
56	265	4.2 (11)	18.1 (48)	31.3 (83)	46.4 (123)	-	-	-	3.2
57	266	4.5 (12)	22.9 (61)	39.5 (105)	33.1 (88)	-	-	-	3.0
58	267	3.4 (9)	22.1 (59)	36.0 (96)	38.6 (103)	-	-	-	3.1
59	268	1.1 (3)	7.8 (21)	36.9 (99)	54.1 (145)	-	-	-	3.4
60	267	12.7 (34)	34.8 (93)	27.7 (74)	24.7 (66)	-	-	-	2.6
61	267	7.1 (19)	28.1 (75)	32.2 (86)	32.6 (87)	-	-	-	2.9
62	268	6.0 (16)	22.0 (59)	42.9 (115)	29.1 (78)	-	-	-	3.0
63	268	5.6 (15)	17.9 (48)	45.1 (121)	31.3 (84)	-	-	-	3.0
64	267	2.6 (7)	21.0 (56)	42.3 (113)	34.1 (91)	-	-	-	3.1

The column under 'n' shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 7 refer to the answering possibilities (in most cases this is rating 1 through 4). Cells filled with a '-' mean this answering option does not apply for the questions.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages and the number of lecturers that chose an answering option in brackets.

## Appendix F

## Recoded Tables Students

**Table F.1: Recoded frequency table for questions 29 – 41**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Mean</b>
29	259	1.5	15.4	54.1	29.0	3.1
30	259	1.2	8.9	57.9	32.0	3.2
31	259	1.5	16.6	54.8	27.0	3.1
32	259	3.9	28.2	44.0	23.9	2.9
33	259	3.5	21.2	45.6	29.7	3.0
34	259	4.2	10.0	55.6	30.1	3.1
35	259	13.1	37.1	31.7	18.1	2.5
36	259	11.2	34.7	35.1	18.9	2.6
37	259	8.5	32.0	40.2	19.3	2.7
38	259	6.9	30.5	44.4	18.1	2.7
39	259	8.1	32.0	37.5	22.4	2.7
40	259	3.5	14.3	44.4	37.8	3.2
41	259	3.1	14.7	46.7	35.5	3.1
Average	259	5.4	22.7	45.5	26.3	2.9

The column under 'n' shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 4 refer to the answering possibilities.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages.

**Table F.2: Recoded frequency table for questions 42 – 50**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Mean</b>
42	259	10.8	36.3	40.2	12.7	2.5
43	259	6.2	28.6	47.1	18.1	2.8
44	259	3.9	15.4	57.1	23.6	3.0
45	259	5.0	27.4	45.9	21.6	2.8
46	259	3.1	14.3	50.2	32.4	3.1
47	259	5.8	24.7	44.4	25.1	2.9
48	259	10.0	34.7	37.1	18.1	2.6
49	259	5.8	26.6	44.4	23.2	2.8
50	259	5.4	30.1	43.6	20.8	2.8
Average	259	6.2	26.5	45.6	21.7	2.8

The column under 'n' shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 4 refer to the answering possibilities.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages.



**Table F.3: Recoded frequency table for questions 51 – 64**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Mean</b>
51	257	1.6	12.8	40.5	45.1	3.3
52	257	1.2	15.2	42.4	41.2	3.2
53	257	1.6	7.0	20.2	71.2	3.6
54	257	0.8	14.4	39.7	45.1	3.3
55	257	4.7	28.8	42.4	24.1	2.9
56	257	3.9	17.9	31.5	46.7	3.2
57	257	4.7	23.0	40.1	32.3	3.0
58	257	2.7	23.0	35.8	38.5	3.1
59	257	1.2	8.2	37.0	53.7	3.4
60	257	12.5	35.0	28.4	24.1	2.6
61	257	7.0	27.6	32.7	32.7	2.9
62	257	5.8	23.0	42.0	29.2	2.9
63	257	5.4	17.5	45.9	31.1	3.0
64	257	2.7	20.2	42.4	34.6	3.1
Average	257	4.0	19.7	37.2	38.6	3.1

The column under 'n' shows the sample size of the questions. Columns under 1 up to and including 4 refer to the answering possibilities.

Columns under 1 through 4 show rounded percentages.

## Appendix G

## Coding Instrument Definitions

<b>Behaviour dimensions</b>	<b>Individual behaviour categories with category number in brackets</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Presentation of information</b> (lecturing behaviour; “establish degree of redundancy and structuring” (Vinke, 1995, p. 89))	Presents for the first time (1) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer gives an extended explanation or other information on a (sub)topic which has not been covered yet in the current lecture session” (Vinke, 1995, p. 89). “The lecturer provides additional surplus material to extend breadth of coverage” (Vinke, 1995, p. 91) (background information, giving different points of view, responding to current affairs, discussing recent developments in the field) (Vinke, 1995).
	Structures (2) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer explicitly indicates the structure of subject matter to be dealt with” (Vinke, 1995, p. 90). Giving instructional cues, metastatements, organizational markers, discourse markers, or structuring moves (Vinke, 1995).
	Summarises (3) (Vinke, 1995)	Restating or reformulating in brief form the key points of subject matter which has previously been presented, either within the current lecture session [...] or in previous sessions (Vinke, 1995, p. 90–91).
	Explains again (4) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer renders a preceding statement, concept, explanation or definition more intelligible either by repeating, restating, paraphrasing, qualifying or y using synonyms” (Vinke, 1995, p. 91). “The lecturer renders a preceding statement, concept, explanation or definition more intelligible by means of an appropriate example, illustration, analogy, or personal experience” (Vinke, 1995, p. 91).
	Uses aside (5) (Vinke, 1995)	“Lecturer communications that do not focus on the assigned subject matter of the lecture” (“jokes, irrelevant examples or anecdotes, incidental or parenthetical comments”) (Vinke, 1995, p. 91).
<b>Interaction</b> (“Lecturer-student interaction”,	Solicits (6) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer asks a question about content with the intent that a student answers” (Vinke, 1995, p. 91).

Vinke, 1995, p. 91)	Prompts (7) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer provides additional information which helps students to answer the solicitation” (“repeating, rephrasing, or redirecting a question, providing additional information, asking supplementary questions”) (Vinke, 1995, p. 91).
	Elicits (8) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer invites students to ask questions about or give comment on subject matter which has been dealt with so far” (Vinke, 1995, p. 91).
	Student talks (9) (Vinke, 1995)	“Student asks a question, answers a question, or gives comment” (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
	Student reacts (10)	Students react to jokes, anecdotes etc.
	Reacts (11) (Vinke, 1995)	“Any verbal response the lecturer gives to a student question, student answer or student comment” (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
<b>Compensation</b> (“Behaviour[...] that lecturers display to possibly overcome limitations in their oral English proficiency”, Vinke, 1995, p. 92)	Postpones or delegates reaction (12) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer does not answer a student question or does not comment on student response; instead he either explicitly postpones reaction, or he delegates reaction to someone else (e.g. another student)” (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
	Reads aloud (13) (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer reads verbatim from notes, textbook, handouts, [slides], or other material prepared in writing” (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
<b>Silence</b> (“Behaviour which is characterised by an absence of other signs”, Vinke, 1995, p. 92)	Administrative or strategic silence (14) (Vinke, 1995)	Administrative: “a silence of at least a few seconds, which is related to lecturer performance of an on-task activity” (writing on whiteboard, looking up a problem) (Vinke, 1995, p. 92). Strategic: “a silence of at least a few seconds related to a certain rhetorical or dramatic effect the lecturer wants to produce” (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
	Silence due to student activity (15) (Vinke, 1995)	“Lasts at least a few seconds and is related to student performance of an on-task activity” (“working on a problem or reflecting upon lecturer question – ‘wait-time’”) (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
	Empty silence (16) (Vinke, 1995)	“A silence of at least a few seconds which does not function in conjunction with the workings of the classroom” (Vinke, 1995, p. 92).
<b>Other</b>	Lecturer behaviour other than 1 through 16 (17) (Vinke, 1995)	

## Appendix H

## Coding Instrument

**Coding instrument**

Name: .....

Faculty: .....

Course: .....

Language: .....

Date and Time: .....

Observation nr.: .....

Observation time: .....

<b>Behaviour dimensions</b>	<b>Individual behaviour categories with category number in brackets</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Percentage:</b>
Presentation of information (lecturing behaviour. Establish degree of redundancy and structuring)	Presents for the first time (1)			
	Structures (2)			
	Summarises (3)			
	Explains again (4)			
	Uses aside (5)			
Interaction	Solicits (6)			
	Prompts (7)			
	Elicits (8)			
	Student talks (9)			
	Student reacts (10)			
	Reacts (11)			
Compensation	Postpones or delegates reaction (12)			
	Reads aloud (13)			
Silence	Administrative or strategic silence (14)			
	Silence due to student activity (15)			
	Empty silence (16)			
Other	Lecturer behaviour other than 1 through 16 (17)			
<b>Total:</b>				

## Appendix I

## Tables Coding instrument

**Table I.1: Proportion range of individual teaching behaviour categories**

Teaching behaviour categories	Proportion in %		Range of proportions in %	
	Dutch	English	Dutch	English
1. Presents for the first time	37.57	42.57	23 – 49	16 – 57
2. Structures	1.86	1.57	0 – 5	0 – 3
3. Summarises	2.57	4.00	1 – 7	1 – 7
4. Explains again	25.71	15.71	15 – 41	4 – 29
5. Uses aside	2.43	0.43	0 – 13	0 – 2
6. Solicits	3.71	1.57	0 – 10	0 – 3
7. Prompts	2.71	1.43	0 – 7	0 – 3
8. Elicits	0.29	0.29	0 – 2	0 – 1
9. Student talks	5.14	19.00	1 – 10	0 – 59
10. Student reacts	0.14	0.43	0 – 1	0 – 2
11. Reacts	5.86	3.00	1 – 13	0 – 7
12. Postpones or delegates reaction	0.00	0.29	0	0 – 2
13. Reads aloud	1.71	2.29	0 – 8	0 – 13
14. Administrative or strategic silence	2.57	2.57	0 – 7	0 – 5
15. Silence due to student activity	2.14	1.00	0 – 7	0 – 3
16. Empty silence	0.71	0.00	0 – 3	0
17. Other	4.86	3.86	1 – 13	1 – 11
Total:	99.98	100.01	0 – 100	0 – 100

**Table I.2: Proportion range of individual teaching behaviour categories – three lecturers**

Teaching behaviour categories	Proportion in %		Range of proportions in %	
	Dutch	English	Dutch	English
18. Presents for the first time	35.00	29.67	28 – 43	16 – 42
19. Structures	2.00	0.67	0 – 4	0 – 2
20. Summarises	1.00	2.33	1	1 – 3
21. Explains again	19.00	10.67	15 – 24	4 – 24
22. Uses aside	5.67	1.00	1 – 13	0 – 2
23. Solicits	6.00	2.00	0 – 10	1 – 3
24. Prompts	3.67	2.00	0 – 7	1 – 3
25. Elicits	0.00	0.00	0	0
26. Student talks	7.00	36.00	2 – 10	0 – 59
27. Student reacts	0.33	0.33	0 – 1	0 – 1
28. Reacts	8.33	2.67	2 – 13	0 – 4
29. Postpones or delegates reaction	0.00	0.67	0	0 – 2
30. Reads aloud	0.67	4.33	0 – 1	0 – 13
31. Administrative or strategic silence	4.00	1.67	1 – 7	0 – 4
32. Silence due to student activity	3.33	1.00	0 – 7	0 – 3
33. Empty silence	0.33	0.00	0 – 1	0
34. Other	3.67	5.00	2 – 6	1 – 11
Total:	100.00	100.01	0 – 100	0 – 100

## Appendix J

## Rating Instrument Definitions

Behaviour dimensions	Individual behaviour categories with category number in brackets	Definition
Compensation (Vinke, 1995)	1. Consultation of notes (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer briefly consults lecture notes or other material prepared in writing” (Vinke, 1995, p. 97).
	2. Visual support (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer supports his lecture by explicit use of visual aids such as [...] slides, maps, and [whiteboard]” (Vinke, 1995, p. 97).
Expressiveness (Vinke, 1995)	3. Use of gestures (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer intentionally uses hands, arms, head, or shoulders either to convey meaning, or to complement, reinforce or support his verbal message” (Vinke, 1995, p. 97).
	4. Body movement (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer changes his posture or the position of his body [...] (sitting down, getting up, moving about, or leaning on a desk)” (Vinke, 1995, p. 97).
	5. Variation in speed of delivery (based on Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer varies speed of delivery” (Vinke, 1995, p. 97).
	6. Variation in intonation (based on Vinke, 1995)	The lecturer varies vocal inflection (intonation) (Vinke, 1995).
Clarity (Vinke, 1995)	7. Verbal fluency (Vinke, 1995)	“The ease with which the lecturer formulates” (Vinke, 1995, p. 98), comes up with sentences, finds words etc..
	8. Fluency (based on Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer speaks without hesitations, stumbles, errors, false starts and ‘empty’ silences” (Vinke, 1995, p. 98).
	9. Vagueness terms (Vinke, 1995)	“The lecturer uses words or phrases that indicate approximation, unclarity or indeterminate quantification, words or phrases that have an ambiguous designation, and other statements of impreciseness” (Vinke, 1995, p. 98).
Presentation (Klaassen, 2001)	10. Explains in different ways (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	“The lecturer explains main points and difficult issues in various ways” (Klaassen, 2001, p. 197).
	11. Clearly and accurately (Vinke, 1995)	The lecturer is able to express him-/herself clearly and accurately (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001).

	12. Enthusiasm (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	“The lecturer shows enthusiasm (as if it is enjoyed to present this matter)” (Klaassen, 2001, p. 197.
	13. Confidence (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	The lecturer appears confident (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001).
Interaction (Klaassen, 2001)	14. Lecturer’s questions (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	The lecturer asks questions (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001).
	15. Students’ questions (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	The lecturer confidentially, clearly, and accurately answers to student questions unprepared (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001).
	16. Rephrasing of questions (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	“The lecturer rephrases his questions if [...] not understood” (Klaassen, 2001, p. 195).
	17. Airy atmosphere (based on Vinke, 1995)	The lecturer makes a humorous remark or tells an anecdote.
General Teaching Skills (based on Vinke, 1995)	18. Summarise (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	“The lecturer summarises subject matter which has been covered” (Vinke, 1995, p. 182).
	19. Structure (Vinke, 1995; Klaassen, 2001)	The lecturer structures the lectures.
	20. Development (Vinke, 1995)	The lecturer discusses recent developments in the field of study.



## Appendix K

## Rating Instrument

**Rating instrument**

Name: .....

Faculty: .....

Course: .....

Language: .....

Date and Time: .....

Observation nr.: .....

<b>Behaviour dimensions</b>	<b>Individual behaviour categories with category number in brackets</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>n.a.</b>
Compensation	1. Consultation of notes					
	2. Visual support					
Expressiveness	3. Use of gestures					
	4. Body movement					
	5. Variation in speed of delivery					
	6. Variation in intonation					
Clarity	7. Verbal fluency					
	8. Fluency					
	9. Vagueness terms					
Presentation	10. Explains in different ways					
	11. Clearly and accurately					
	12. Enthusiasm					
	13. Confidence					
Interaction	14. Lecturer's questions					
	15. Students' questions					
	16. Rephrasing of questions					
	17. Airy atmosphere					
General Teaching Skills	18. Summarise					
	19. Structure					
	20. Development					

1 = the observed lecturer hardly displays the teacher behaviour

4 = the observed lecturer displays the behaviour concerned to a very large extent

## Appendix L

## Tables Rating Instrument

**Table L.1: Individual behaviour categories – frequencies of occurrence**

Teaching behaviour categories		Averaged Ratings				
		1	2	3	4	n.a.
1. Consultation of notes	D	2	3	1	1	-
	E	3	1	1	2	-
2. Visual support	D	-	-	2	5	-
	E	-	1	1	4	1
3. Use of gestures	D	-	-	1	6	-
	E	-	1	1	5	-
4. Body movement	D	1	1	1	4	-
	E	-	3	1	3	-
5. Variation in speed of delivery	D	-	-	6	1	-
	E	-	1	6	-	-
6. Variation in intonation	D	-	-	2	5	-
	E	-	-	4	3	-
7. Verbal fluency	D	-	-	4	3	-
	E	-	1	2	4	-
8. Fluency	D	-	-	6	1	-
	E	-	2	2	3	-
9. Vagueness terms	D	7	-	-	-	-
	E	3	2	2	-	-
10. Explains in different ways	D	-	2	5	-	-
	E	-	4	2	1	-
11. Clearly and accurately	D	-	-	1	6	-
	E	-	1	4	2	-
12. Enthusiasm	D	-	-	4	3	-
	E	-	-	5	2	-
13. Confidence	D	-	-	-	7	-
	E	-	1	-	6	-
14. Lecturer's questions	D	1	2	1	3	-
	E	-	3	3	1	-
15. Students' questions	D	-	1	1	2	3
	E	-	1	3	1	2
16. Rephrasing of questions	D	2	-	2	1	2
	E	1	3	3	-	-
17. Airy atmosphere	D	-	3	3	1	-
	E	-	1	5	1	-
18. Summarise	D	2	3	2	-	-
	E	2	2	2	1	-
19. Structure	D	1	-	5	1	-
	E	1	-	4	2	-
20. Development	D	-	3	3	1	-
	E	1	2	2	2	-

**Table L.2: Individual behaviour categories – frequencies of occurrence – three lecturers**

Teaching behaviour categories		Averaged Ratings				
		1	2	3	4	n.a.
1. Consultation of notes	D	1	1	1	-	-
	E	2	-	-	1	-
2. Visual support	D	-	-	1	2	-
	E	-	1	-	1	1
3. Use of gestures	D	-	-	1	2	-
	E	-	-	1	2	-
4. Body movement	D	-	1	-	2	-
	E	-	3	-	-	-
5. Variation in speed of delivery	D	-	-	2	1	-
	E	-	1	2	-	-
6. Variation in intonation	D	-	-	1	2	-
	E	-	-	2	1	-
7. Verbal fluency	D	-	-	2	1	-
	E	-	1	1	1	-
8. Fluency	D	-	-	2	1	-
	E	-	2	-	1	-
9. Vagueness terms	D	3	-	-	-	-
	E	1	1	1	-	-
10. Explains in different ways	D	-	1	2	-	-
	E	-	1	1	1	-
11. Clearly and accurately	D	-	-	1	2	-
	E	-	1	2	-	-
12. Enthusiasm	D	-	-	1	2	-
	E	-	-	3	-	-
13. Confidence	D	-	-	-	3	-
	E	-	1	-	2	-
14. Lecturer's questions	D	-	1	-	2	-
	E	-	-	2	1	-
15. Students' questions	D	-	1	-	1	1
	E	-	-	2	-	1
16. Rephrasing of questions	D	2	-	-	1	-
	E	-	3	-	-	-
17. Airy atmosphere	D	-	1	1	1	-
	E	-	1	1	1	-
18. Summarise	D	1	2	-	-	-
	E	1	1	1	-	-
19. Structure	D	-	-	3	-	-
	E	-	-	2	1	-
20. Development	D	-	2	1	-	-
	E	1	1	-	1	-

## Appendix M

## Verbatim Transcripts

**Lecturer 1:****Dutch**

Goed, dat is causaal mechanisme. Ik, dit, je hoeft niet zo'n leuke diagram te tekenen met plaatjes in je, in je document, maar het mag. Eh, het mag, ehm, want ik vind dat het vaak iets veel concreter kan maken. Goed, ik heb hier een causaal mechanisme van mijn proefschrift die ik er uiteindelijk helemaal niet heb in gedaan, maar dit is eentje eh toen ik mijn eh ja toen ik nog mijn onderzoeksdesign aan het ontwerpen was, ehm, lang geleden. 2012 denk ik dat het was. Ehm, nou daar zullen jullie je nog herinneren mijn onderzoek ging of Eurosceptische partijen mainstream partijen beïnvloeden en of ze dan hun posities veranderen. Ja? Eh, dus de afhankelijke variabele, dv, voor dependent variable, is mainstream party policy reaction on EU issue, hè dus eh, reactie van mainstream partijen, ehm, op het EU, EU tip. Nou, waarom? Wat gebeurt er? Nou er zijn een aantal dingen die kunnen gebeuren. Ehm, de aantal stemmen die de Eurosceptische challenger partij, dus de Eurosceptische radicaal links of radicaal rechtse partij krijgt in de verkiezingen. Eh, of eh, of tijdens de, na de verkiezingen. Een andere was, hoeveel stemmen krijgen ze tijdens eh, in opiniepeilingen. Eh, hoe belangrijk is het EU thema in de media. En eh, is het thema, voor de radicaal links en radicaal rechtse partij een belangrijk thema? Zijn zij, praten zij inderdaad heel veel over Europese migratie? Nou, dan zal ik aan deze kant, heb ik gezegd, nou dat kunnen wel een aantal dingen, een aantal karakteristieken van de gevestigde partijen kunnen dat wel beïnvloeden, bijvoorbeeld, eh, is de partij in de regering of niet, ehm, reageren ze ook op andere partijen, zijn ze, ehm, ehm, eigenlijk binnen de partij redelijk homogeen met hun reactie of niet. Zijn natuurlijk allemaal aspecten die, die invloed hier kunnen beïnvloeden of kunnen veranderen. Goed, niet al deze aspecten hebben het uiteindelijk in mijn onderzoeksdesign gehaald, sommige heb ik ook op een andere plek gezet, maar ik laat dit zien omdat voor mij was het heel erg nuttig om om deze manier te gaan nadenken. En als je dit presenteert, als je bijvoorbeeld je, een een paper schrijft, of een presentatie doet, zegt nou ik heb een idee en als je het op deze manier presenteert wordt het al veel duidelijker wat je precies wil zeggen. Dus ik kan het alleen maar eh aanmoedigen. Goed, hypothese dus. Een hypothese is een eh, veronderstelling over een bepaald verschijnsel die nog niet bewezen is, ja? Een hypothese is altijd afgeleid van een theorie.

**English**

And I think that also played a big big role, right? Erm, in the, there were, erm, Virginia, Virginia is also a contested state er, went to Trump and OK one of the reasons was that ok what's about coalminers, right. Er, and coalminers they er, er they really believed, OK well Hilary will not change anything. For us. Yeah? And I think, this also has to do with a, erm, larger trend, and this again, this is my personal view, of where we have an increasingly market liberal er, erm, yeah, ideology or a way of doing politics, with governance that is almost uncontested. Erm, which produces losers and then er, also has, erm, yeah negative side effects and erm, produces also a conflict between erm, when if people are in or feel at least they are in financial distress this creates tension and friction around society. You do not have to share, who sh, OK, who disagrees with me or be interesting to say. I mean you do not have to share this opinion with me. Erm, OK fair enough. But I think, I mean I think this is important, right? I think this economic question can predict, the larger economic question

were we have Hilary Clinton as a candidate that had traditionally quite strong links with Wall Street. She was, within the democratic party, she was, er, she had a strong opponent in Bernie Sanders, er, and I think it was a produce for Bernie Sanders, did not like what they er, er, saw in Hilary. Erm, I think in erm, the UK in with er, you have a similar thing where after new labour third way democracy where market liberal aspects were incorporated into er, social democracy. I think it's credible to say that it's not er, plausible that these, this left wing party will actually do something to change my economic fate. Erm, and erm, well in the Netherlands, I think we also have an example of er, social democratic party that er, is very left wing in its ideology, its ideals and campaigning time but when it's in government you do not necessarily see that, right and maybe that is natural, it's a compromise, I'm, I'm not blaming anyone, I'm also not saying per se that is the, it is better to spend more money, have expensive social policies, but I think, it is important that, and I think this is also what Finn meant slightly that you have a convergence of economic issue, although er, the policy position that's been adopted produces clear winners and losers and, but they cannot contest that in within the competitive sphere, right? But, erm, yeah.

## Lecturer 2:

### Dutch

Dat is inderdaad de Westelijke Sahara, ofwel de Sahrawi democratic republic zoals het heet voor degene die daar wonen. Sorry? Ja. En ehm dat deel van de Sahara is inderdaad door eh, wordt door Marokko bezet gehouden en eh daar geldt daar daar worden überhaupt geen verkiezingen gehouden, maar mochten ze gehouden worden dan zouden alleen mannen stemmen. Goed. We zien dus dat in de loop van de afgelopen, van de vorige eeuw, geleidelijk aan in vrijwel alle landen van de wereld ehm, vrouwenkiesrecht is ingevoerd. Overigens, Spanje is wel een hele bijzondere, want in de jaren twintig hadden die wel even kiesrecht, hè? In de tijd dat daar een eh, socialistische regering was en vervolgens vestigden zich een dictatuur, hè, de Spaanse burgeroorlog en toen was het afgelopen met het vrouwenkiesrecht. Dit om je eraan te herinneren dat verworvenheden in zijn algemeenheid altijd ook weer kunnen worden teruggedraaid. Goed, so far so good. Na, ehm, vrouwen en kiesrecht, OK. En wat doen ze daar dan mee, hè? Is het zo dat er een gender gap is, dat vragen Inglehart en Norris zich af en hoe kunnen we die dan verklaren en natuurlijk lijkt er een hè op basis van hun gegevens lijkt er een verschuiving te zijn ontstaan en is er een nieuw soort gender gap en hoe kun je dan ook die verschuiving verklaren. OK, op zich heel helder. Ehm, even, even voor de duidelijkheid, het gaat dus alleen maar over kiesgedrag, het gaat niet over alle andere aspecten van politieke representatie hè, bijvoorbeeld van het aantal vrouwen in het parlement, of je vrouwelijke regeringsleiders hebt of eh, of het er toe doet hoeveel, daar gaan we het nog over hebben, dat is vandaag niet aan de orde en daar gaat dit onderzoek ook niet over, hè. Het is echt heel beperkt wat dat betreft. Nu moet je weten dat Inglehart en Norris zijn echt hele grote namen. Hoofdletter, hoofdletter. Pippa Norris is heel erg bekend vanwege haar onderzoek naar eh, gender en representatie en Inglehart, Ronald Inglehart, hebben jullie, heeft iemand van jullie naar de biografie van deze auteurs gekeken helemaal achteraan? Niemand? Dan had je namelijk kunnen zien dat een van de functies, dat is soms wel interessante informatie, een van de functies van Ronald Inglehart is, hij is programme director tududum, and chair of the steering commity of the world values study. Ja? Dus hij is de voorzitter van het comité dat de world values study uitvoert en die data beheert. Waarom begin ik daarover? Ja Sylvie? [...].

Ze kennen er heel veel invloed aan toe hè? Dus soms is het nuttig, ik zeg niet dat dat dus, dat daar een enorm corrupt eh, verhaal achter zit, maar het is wel, altijd wel slim om even te

kijken van goh, zou het kunnen zijn dat hier belangen een rol spelen en is er netjes mee omgegaan hè? Dus moet je extra alert maken. OK.

### **English**

So it is really playing into shame, feeling ashamed, feeling not er, a real man should go to war. So there was no room whatsoever about well perhaps erm, doing something in a different way. No, to go to war was the only option and also women really actively cooperated, not all of them, but many cooperated with them and organised campaigns, putting white feathers on the sleeves of men when when they walked down the street and they they saw other men walking there, they would put white feathers on them saying well you are not, you're not in the army yet? How come you're not? So there was really. Also the women of England's active service league, another organisation er erm enrolled in this, engaged in this I will never be seen in public with an able-bodied man not serving in the military. And British, recruiting, recruiting posters told men that if they were not wearing khaki erm, women would reject them. So there was really, the, this, this very strong social pressure. Which meant that the war in fact reduced for men the options they had to shape their life. Hè, they had to go to military serve, there was no excuse. And interestingly for women, the war increased the number, the number of options they had, as you indicated already, they were able then to go and do paid work. And now, you could wonder perhaps how nice this work was and how good the conditions were, well they were not good at all, but for many women this was really, perhaps not the first time, but this was a big opportunity to get out of the homes, to get out of the boredom, especially for elite women, and to do finally something. So, the most well-known, I think, gender issue linked to the First World War is that men in industry were replaced by women and also men in agriculture. And this was in, in huge numbers. In the UK there was over one and a half million of women joining the workforce during the First World War. And they would be working in government departments, public transport, erm the post office, erm, as land workers and in factories. And those are the best known images, I think, erm, women putting together er, munition. And there, in those munition factories there were really something like one million lower class women working there. The work was very dangerous. I mean, the munition could explode, but also because of the stuff in it, erm, there, erm [...].

### **Lecturer 3:**

#### **Dutch**

En in die bibliotheek, zou een boek liggen, de enig overlevende tekst van Aristoteles over humor. En dat eh, de de hele roman draait om de zoektocht naar dat boek. En om de interpretatie van ehm, de betekenis van dat boek over humor. Kunnen we, kunnen we dit wel hebben. Aristoteles speelde in de middeleeuwen een fantastisch belangrijke rol in het omverwerpen van het klassieke denken. Christelijk klassieke denken op dat ogenblik. Ik kom daar nog eventjes op terug zo meteen. Politiek, staat er als laatste woordje, heb ik kom ik ook nog op terug. Ontzettend belangrijk. He wat grappig. Daar hoefde die helemaal niet heen te gaan. Er wordt van alles over Aristoteles verteld, gezegd, in termen van overlevering. Ehm, Aristoteles heeft vermoedelijk geen letter zelf geschreven. Net als Plato trouwens en Socrates. Ik weet niet of Bart dat heeft uitgelegd hoe dat ging? Hier heb ik het over lopend. Eh, daar, daarna is zijn school de peripathetische school genoemd, de lopende school. Eh, al wandelend, onder zuilengangen, ongeveer zoals ik heen en weer loop hier, maar Aristoteles zou dan gewoon met een kudde van die goedbetalende studenten om hem heen, zou die rondlopen en denken en en aan het praten zijn en aan het vertellen zijn en denken zijn, discussiëren zijn etcetera. Zo werd college gegeven. En daar achteraan huppelden slaven. Met

boekrolletjes, met wasbordjes etcetera. Om als een gek aantekeningen te maken. Die aantekeningen, daar zit iemand die die rol voorbeeldig op zich heeft genomen. Daar ook iemand. Slaven die de aantekeningen maakten, die daarna bijeenkwamen, dat bewerkten tot een soort verslag en in een aantal gevallen werd het voorgelegd aan Aristoteles en in een aantal gevallen werd het ook gewoon direct uitgewerkt en daar komen de werken van Aristoteles vandaan. Zo werden die dingen gemaakt. Als je ze wilde hebben, als je die colleges ooit wilde hebben, dan moest je een kopie bestellen, kopen. Eh, wie ging studeren deed dat om later in de wereld in de politiek actief te zijn, in het openbaar bestuur actief te zijn. En zoals iedereen van Nederlandse politici weet, als ze ooit een boek hebben gelezen dan zijn ze dat allang vergeten. Ook in deze tijd, veel intellectuelen waren heel voorzichtig bij het aanschaffen van boeken en boekrollen etcetera etcetera. Dus dat gebeurde niet veel. Er werd niet veel gekopieerd. Kopiëren was goed in die tijd hè, kopiëren nu dat is eh, ja?

### English

Can I take up another point perhaps, well, and OK. One, one more in this context. Erm, erm, er, sort of food for thought. For the, for the future. There is a, erm, a tv series. It's now probably on Youtube as well. So erm, available for everyone, free for all. Er, it's called Europe after the War. Er, it's about what happened in Europe after May 1945. Erm, er, er, it's a very grim documentary and a series of documentaries, four, five documentaries. Erm, about revenge taken after the war. Erm, by ordinary citizens against other ordinary citizens. Erm, by everybody in Europe against the Germans. If you know, the Germans lived all over Europe, erm, in, up to 1945. And since 1946, they only live in Germany. Erm, they they there been a couple of million people killed after the war. Not, not people, Germans killed after the war, simply for being German. Chased out of Poland, chased out of Russia, chased out of Romania, Hungary, and so on and so forth. Erm, it is a very interesting documentary, er, basically, with, with by the way, pictures. Actually. People took pictures of, were proud to take pictures of the executions of er, er, war traitors and collaborators and and so on and so forth. Erm, very very gruesome pictures. It's a, worthwhile looking at. Er, it's interesting because erm, when you look up Europe now, sixty, seventy years after the war, we all seem to be at peace etcetera and we don't talk about the war anymore. Right? Except in Monty Python er, and even in Monty Python the phrase is 'don't mention the war'. Basically, we don't talk about the war anymore, we're all friends, we're all at good people etcetera. Nobody talks about what happens after the war. Nobody talks about revenge. What is missing, I think in in Gouvier, is the erm, is the function that revenge had. Erm, it may that. It certainly isn't retributed justice, it absolutely isn't reconciliation. It is probably, utterly, fucking immoral, but it probably also worked. Purgulars, persecution, revenge. Probably also worked. It's, it's disheartening to know, but anyway. I'm given given this with you for your nightmares tonight. Er, if you, yeah?

[...]

Well that would be my point! Did anything like that happen after the war. Er, er, Germany still has its er, unions of heimatmatkontrivere, people who were chased out of their heimat er, er, but they're living and sleeping as sisbons and even even in the 1950s and sixties when the heimatkontrivere [?] were basically anouncely a unions etcetera even then there was no real plan to take back everything erm, or, feelings [...]