

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY**  
**SAKARYA UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**INVESTIGATING THE LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES  
EMI STUDENTS USE TO OVERCOME LANGUAGE BARRIERS  
AND CHALLENGES THEY FACE**

**A MASTER'S THESIS**

**BETUL OZKARA**

**SUPERVISOR**

**PROF. DR. FIRDEVS KARAHAN**

**JUNE 2019**



**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY**  
**SAKARYA UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**INVESTIGATING THE LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES**  
**EMI STUDENTS USE TO OVERCOME LANGUAGE BARRIERS**  
**AND CHALLENGES THEY FACE**

**A MASTER'S THESIS**

**BETUL OZKARA**

**SUPERVISOR**

**PROF. DR. FIRDEVS KARAHAN**

**JUNE 2019**

## DECLARATION

I declare that this master's thesis has been composed by me in respect to the academic honesty, and it has not been presented or published in anywhere before.



Signature

Betul OZKARA

## JÜRİ ÜYELERİNİN İMZA SAYFASI

Investigating the Language Learning Strategies EMI Students Use to Overcome Language Barriers and Challenges They Face başlıklı bu yüksek lisans tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalında hazırlanmış ve jürimiz tarafından kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan Prof. Dr Firdevs Karahan

(İmza)



Üye Doç. Dr. Doğan Yüksel

(İmza)



Üye Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Orhan Kocaman

(İmza)



Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

16.07/2019

(İmza)



Prof.Dr. Ömer Faruk TUTKUN

Enstitü Müdürü

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

This thesis could not have been possible without the support of several people whom I would like to express my gratitude. First, I would like to express my debt of gratitude to my mentor Prof. Dr. Firdevs Karahan for her guidance, insightful feedback, and patience during my thesis work. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Barış Horzum for his support, particularly for his help with the statistical data analysis. My thanks also go to Assist. Prof. Dr. Orhan Kocaman for his instructive feedback. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Doğan Yüksel for his review of my work and helpful feedback. Also, this thesis draws on data collected from survey participants from several universities in Turkey. I would like to thank those respondents who took the time to answer my questionnaires and share their experiences, without their help this thesis wouldn't have been possible.

Finally I would like to thank to my parents and husband who gave their support to me generously during my dissertation work.

## **DEDICATION**

This thesis is dedicated to my dear husband for his love, endless support and encouragement and to all members of my family, especially to my mother, sisters, and brother for their sincere love and being the source of motivation.

## **ABSTRACT**

# **INVESTIGATING THE LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES EMI STUDENTS USE TO OVERCOME LANGUAGE BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES THEY FACE**

Özkara, Betül

Master Thesis, English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Firdevs KARAHAN

June, 2019. xv+86Pages.

The aim of this study is to investigate which language learning strategies English medium instruction (EMI) students' use, gender difference, if any, on language learning strategy use, challenges they face and their way of dealing with their challenges in EMI educational context. The data were gathered from 255 Turkish EMI students through demographic questionnaire and Turkish version of Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) (Cesur & Seval, 2007) adapted from SILL, version 7.0, developed by Oxford (1990). The data were analyzed through descriptive statistics and Independent Sample T-test. The qualitative data were also gathered through an open-ended questionnaire and additional comment section. The data were analyzed through thematic coding. The results indicated that Turkish EMI students used a medium range of language learning strategy. Among the six categories of language learning strategy, while the metacognitive strategy was the most frequently used strategy, the affective strategy was the least frequently used strategy. The study also showed that gender does not have any significant effect on overall language learning strategy use. In addition, qualitative data indicated that EMI students in the study were concerned with understanding lessons, lecturer's English accent, making communication, understanding exam questions and therefore feeling anxious. According to the qualitative findings, while some of the students (N=56) argued that they do not know how to deal with challenges, (N=69) others endeavored through using a dictionary, asking help from friends and lecturers, using Turkish materials, taking notes and memorizing vocabulary. All these findings will be discussed and suggestions will be made for the relevant EMI education context.



**Keywords:** English Medium Instruction, Language Learning Strategy, Gender

## ÖZET

# ÜNİVERSİTELERDE YABANCI DİLDE EĞİTİM ALAN ÖĞRENCİLERİN DİL BARIYERİNİ AŞABİLMEK İÇİN KULLANDIKLARI DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ VE KARŞILAŞTIKLARI ZORLUKLARIN İNCELENMESİ

Özkara, Betül

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Firdevs Karahan

Haziran, 2019. xv+86 Sayfa.

Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizceyi eğitim dili olarak kullanan (English Medium Instruction – EMI) üniversitedeki öğrencilerin hangi dil öğrenim stratejilerini kullandıklarını, dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımında cinsiyet farkını, hangi zorluklarla karşılaştıklarını ve bu zorluklarla nasıl baş edebildiklerini araştırmaktır. Çalışmada 255 Türk üniversite öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımına ilişkin veriler demografik anket ve 7.0 sürümüyle Oxford (1990) tarafından geliştirilen Dil Öğrenme Strateji Envanteri'nin (DÖSE) Türkçe versiyonu (Cesur ve Seval, 2007) ile toplanmıştır. Veriler, tanımlayıcı istatistikler, Bağımsız Örneklem T-Testi ile analiz edilmiştir. Nitel veriler açık uçlu anket ve ek yorum bölümü aracılığıyla toplandı. Veriler tematik analiz yoluyla analiz edildi. Sonuçlar, İngilizcenin eğitim dili olarak kullanıldığı üniversitedeki öğrencilerinin orta düzeyde dil öğrenme stratejisi kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Altı dil öğrenme stratejisi kategorisinde ise metabilşsel strateji en sık kullanılan strateji iken, duygusal strateji en az kullanılan stratejidir. Bu çalışma, cinsiyetin genel dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımı üzerinde önemli bir etkisinin olmadığını bulmuştur. Ayrıca çalışma, öğrencilerin dersleri anlama, öğretim görevlilerinin İngilizce aksanı, iletişim problemi, sınav sorularını anlama ve bu sebeplerden dolayı endişeli hissetme gibi zorluklarla karşılaştıklarını göstermiştir. Bu çalışmada öğrencilerin bir kısmı zorluklarla başa çıkamazken (S = 56), bazıları (S = 69) sözlük kullanarak, arkadaşlarından ve öğretim üyelerinden yardım isteyerek, Türkçe materyalleri kullanarak, not alarak ve kelimeleri ezberleyerek bu zorluklarla baş etmeye çalıştıkları bulunmuştur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İngilizcenin Eğitim Dili Olarak Kullanımı, Cinsiyet, Dil Öğrenme Stratejisi

# Contents

Declaration .....	iv
Acknowledgment .....	vi
Dedication .....	vii
Abstract .....	viii
List of Tables.....	xv
Chapter i.....	1
Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Statement of The Problem .....	1
1.1.1 Using English As Medium of Instruction .....	1
1.1.3 Language Learning Strategies.....	4
1.2 Aim of The Study.....	5
1.3 Research Questions .....	6
1.4 Significance of The Study.....	6
1.5 Limitations .....	7
1.6 The List of The Study Abbreviations.....	8
Chapter ii.....	9
Literature Review.....	9
2.1 Previous Studies on EMI.....	9
2.1.1 A Closer Look At EMI in European Countries.....	9
2.1.2 A Closer Look At EMI in Asian And Middle Eastern Countries .....	10
2.1.3 A Closer Look At EMI in Turkey .....	12
2.2 Previous Studies on Language Learning Strategies .....	14
2.2.1 Clarifications on Language Learning Strategy .....	14
2.2.2 Research on Good Language Learner .....	15
2.2.3 Classification of Language Learning Strategies .....	16
2.2.4 Individual Factors in Language Learning Strategies .....	17
2.2.4.1 Proficiency .....	17
2.2.4.2 Gender.....	18
2.3 Previous Studies on Language Learning Strategies of EMI Students .....	18
Chapter iii.....	20
Methodology .....	20

3.1 Research Design.....	20
3.2 Setting .....	21
3.3 Participants.....	21
3.4 Data Collection Procedure .....	22
3.5 Data Collection Instruments.....	23
3.5.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL).....	23
3.5.2 Open Ended Questionnaire .....	24
3.6 Data Analysis .....	24
Chapter iv .....	26
Results .....	26
4.1 Quantitative Results .....	26
4.1.1 Use of Language Learning Strategies with Mean Ratings.....	26
4.1.1.2 Use of compensation strategies with mean ratings .....	29
4.1.1.3 Use of cognitive strategies with mean ratings.....	30
4.1.1.4 Use of social strategies with mean ratings .....	32
4.1.1.5 Use of memory strategies with mean ratings .....	33
4.1.1.6 Use of affective strategies with mean ratings .....	35
4.1.1.7 Overall of use of strategy items with mean ratings.....	36
4.1.2 Gender Difference on Language Learning Strategy Use .....	37
4.2 Qualitative Results .....	41
4.2.1 Challenges that EMI Students Faced .....	42
4.2.1.1 Lack of understanding the lesson.....	42
4.2.1.2 Lecturers' English accent.....	42
4.2.1.3 Communication.....	43
4.2.1.5 Understanding exam questions .....	43
4.2.2 Dealing with challenges .....	45
4.2.3.1 Use of dictionary.....	46
4.2.3.2 Asking for help from friends.....	46
4.2.3.3 Asking help from lecturers.....	46
4.2.3.4 Using turkish materials .....	47
4.2.3.5 Note taking .....	47
4.2.3.6 Memorizing .....	48

4.2.3.7 Using no strategies at all .....	49
4.2.3.1 Turkish medium instruction .....	50
4.2.3.3 More speaking opportunities.....	51
Chapter V .....	53
Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestion .....	53
5.1 Discussion .....	53
5.1.1 Overall And Categories of Strategy Use by Turkish EMI Students .....	53
5.1.2 Language Learning Strategy According to Gender .....	57
5.1.3 Challenges that EMI Students Face in The Lesson.....	58
5.1.3 Dealing with Challenges that EMI Students Face in The Lesson.....	61
5.2 Conclusion .....	64
5.3 Suggestions .....	67
5.3.2 Suggestions for Future Research.....	68
References .....	70
Appendices.....	82
Appendix-1.....	82
Appendix-2.....	83
Appendix -3.....	85
Curriculum Vitae and Contact Details .....	86

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The departments the participants Majored.....	21
Table 2. Overall Language Learning Strategy Use .....	27
Table 3. Six Categories of Language Learning Strategy Use .....	27
Table 4. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Metacognitive Items	28
Table 5. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Compensation items	30
Table 6. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Cognitive Items .....	31
Table 7. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Social Strategy Items .....	33
Table 8. Frequencies (%), Means, And Standard Deviations of Memory Strategy Items.....	34
Table 9. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Affective Strategy Items.....	35
Table 10. Three Most Used and Three Least Used Strategies with Mean Ratings....	37
Table 11. Gender Difference in Overall Strategy Use .....	37
Table 12. Gender Difference in Six Categories of Language Learning Strategy Use	39
Table 13. The Most Used Category of Strategy for Males and Females .....	40
Table 14. The Least Used Category of Language Learning Strategy .....	40
Table 15. The most and least Preferred Language Learning Strategies.....	41
Table 16. Content Analyses of EMI Students Open-ended Questionnaire Responses .....	45
Table 17. Content Analyses of EMI Students Open-ended Questionnaire Responses	49
Table 18. Content Analyses of EMI Students Open-ended Questionnaire Responses .....	52

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### 1.1.1 Using English as Medium of Instruction

Language teaching has undergone many changes and these changes do not happen all of a sudden. The creation of a method or approach is not something like pulling a rabbit out of a hat, it happens progressively by seeing the pros and cons of previous experiences. Richards (2006) divided the last 50 years of language teaching into three periods including traditional approach (up to the late 1960s), classic communicative language teaching (1970s to 1990s) and current communicative language teaching (late 1990s to the present). In the first period, we came across structure-based language teaching, put it differently, we focused on formative aspects of language teaching. At this period, the main focus was the grammar, as Prabhu (1987) and Krashen (1989) argued the approach lacked communicative skills. Moreover, the traditional method did not answer the demands of the globalized world. The second period emerged as a reaction to the previous method and focused on Audio-lingual method in which theoretical basis of the time was created by prominent scholars such as Austin (1962), Hymes (1972) and Halliday (1973). In Austin's (1962) speech act theory, in Hymes' (1972) Communicative competence, and in Halliday's (1973) functional perspectives the main focus was on developing communicative competence, as a reaction to the traditional approach. The third period is the current communicative language teaching. Kumaravadivelu (2006) divided this period into two, including the period before the 1990s as "*period of awareness*", and after 1990s, as "*period of awakening*" (p.59). He mentioned this change as a process "*from communicative language teaching to task-based language teaching*" (p. 60). He criticized communicative language teaching (CLT) by mentioning three fallacy of communicative teaching. The first one is "*adaptability*" which conveys the meaning



of challenges in implementing CLT in different settings. Bax (2003) also implied CLT's lack of contextual approach with the idea of adaptation in every context. The second is "*acceptability*" which means CLT is not a radical change and it included the previous method's traces. The third is "*authenticity*" which refers to the creation of an authentic environment in the classroom, in other words, creating an authentic atmosphere. All these concepts, "*acceptability*", "*authenticity*" and "*adaptability*" (p. 62) and other criticisms set the ground for the emergence of various other approaches such as task-based language teaching (TBLT), Content-Based language teaching (CBI), Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI). In all these approaches, the main focus was to complete the shortcomings of CLT. In task-based language teaching, language teaching is processed through meaningful tasks to create a more authentic and communicative classroom. Content-based Instruction is "*an instructional and curricular approach specifically designed to embed language instruction in the context of content that is meaningful to learners*" (Cammarata, Tedick, & Osborn 2016, p. 12). CBI learners both develop their knowledge of content and linguistic ability. This approach that involves both content and language is described as "*a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language*" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 1). In all approaches, the common points are student-centered approaches and the creation of real-life classroom situations.

I now turn to the brief discussion of EMI which is defined as "*the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English*" (Dearden, 2015, p. 4). Referring to Dearden (2015), Brown and Bradford (2017) defined EMI as follows: "*EMI entails the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English. It may or may not include the implicit aim of increasing students' English language abilities*". In this definition, Bradford and Brown implied the development of language skills and also emphasized the improvement as a possibility, not an outcome.

EMI is often confused with other labels such as CBI and CLIL since both have the content instruction. However, EMI is different from CBI, because CBI is language

focused and commonly applied at secondary and primary levels. Furthermore, as different from EMI, CBI was originated in North America. As Bradford and Brown (2017) stated, while in EMI the main aim is content, in CBI the main aim is both content and language. Regarding CLIL from the European perspective, the learning outcome could be both language and content. While EMI is used in universities namely in higher education and the aim is not to teach English, CLIL is originated in Europe and one of the concerns is language teaching through giving authentic, communicative, meaningful content.

Put simply, in EMI's definition, teaching academic content was dominant, while in CLIL's definition meaningful engagement with content and language was equally important.

### **1.1.2 EMI's Spread at Tertiary Level**

As different from other approaches, EMI is spreading fast all over the world. In 1999 countries in Europe issued the Bologna Declaration which is one of the important components of this growing global expansion. This educational program aimed to appeal to international students as well as to form a multilingual European society in which European universities began to standardize their courses providing courses in another language other than their mother tongue. This has happened to be, more often than not, English. One outstanding example of this growing phenomenon mostly at the tertiary level is the "*EMI Research Center*" established at the University of Oxford in 2014. The impetus of the center is to investigate the EMI issue at universities all around the world and to suggest solutions and conclusions to the problems faced by both students and teachers. Another institution is the British Council, which investigates the EMI issue in order to give implications and suggestions to schools or universities or even governments all over the world. Moreover, the other policy support of EMI is the Foundation of the South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) involving nations such as Thailand, Brunei, Indonesia, Myanmar, Laos, Malaysia, Cambodia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Vietnam, Secretary-General Le Luong Minh statement, naming English as "*indispensable tool to bring our community closer together*" (ASEAN, 2013). Although criticized by his division,

Kachru's (1982) pioneering model split the speakers of English into "*three-concentric-circles*", in which inner circle consisted of native speakers of English, the outer circle in which English is their second language and the expanding circle in which English is their foreign language. EMI is growing fast not just in outer circle countries, but also in the expanding circle such as Turkey, Italy, Poland, etc. Compared to the past, most of the universities, especially private universities have been using EMI programs. However, all these developments done in the field are not welcomed positively by some scholars. For example, Coleman (2006) called these vivid growing phenomena as the "*Microsoft effect*"(p.4). Swales (1997) in his article defined "English as Tyrannosaurus rex" calling usage of English in an academic setting as "*a powerful carnivore gobbling up the other denizens of the academic linguistic grazing grounds*" (p. 374). Growing of English as an academic language even decreased the attraction of English speakers to learn another language (Brumfit, 2004). To make a long story short, one of the main reasons of the application of EMI is to increase the prestige of institutions, to attract international students and staffs and to help local students to be competent in the international market (Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2011). For institutions where the English is not the mother tongue, the sole remedy to compete with other institutions is to apply English medium instruction (Civan & Coskun, 2016).

### **1.1.3 Language Learning Strategies**

Trends and changes in language learning strategies have happened over time. One of the important changes is the transition from teacher-centered approach to learner centered language approach, which gives a more active role to learners and to teachers as a counselor and also a creator of a more favorable learning environment. All these changes influenced scholar's studies in that they tended to focus on learners' success and the associated elements that would have an impact on their success in language learning.

It is important to state that following the period from the 1970s to date the term language learning strategy has growth into one of the controversial topics in the field. It started with the investigation of scholars such as Stern (1975), Rubin (1975), and

Fillmore (1979) which focused on understanding what makes a language learner successful in the target language. Many of the early studies' suggestions and implications devoted on the clarification of language learning strategies (Rubin, 1975; Chamot, 2004, 2005 Griffiths, 2008;) and categorization of language learning strategies (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Rubin, 1981; Oxford, 1990). Moreover, these studies also focused on the individual differences that affect the language learning strategies such as age, gender, proficiency level, motivation, and socio-cultural background and personal traits, etc. it is important that the sample of these studies mainly consisted of participants who were ESL or EFL learners. EMI students were not included in their samples. Even though as Philipson (2015) stated "*English in higher education has become a global commodity, which inevitably affects the nature and goals of universities*" (p. 22-23), there are only a few studies which focused on EMI.

Given that addressing students' specific challenges in EMI journey is not examined adequately in current research, have the current study aimed to fill this gap by investigating EMI students' language learning strategies.

## **1.2 AIM OF THE STUDY**

This study aims to investigate the challenges EMI students face in tertiary education. Moreover, it also addresses EMI students' language learning strategies and gender difference on the use of language learning strategy. Although extensive research on language learning strategies of EFL and ESL learners, few studies have been carried out in EMI learning context. Therefore, the main object of this study is to fill this gap and increase teachers' awareness about Turkish EMI students' language learning strategies. In this study, EMI students were focused because they are the main characters of EMI programs and we need to hear their voices and investigate how they deal with the problems they face. In addition, the study's findings might help curriculum planners to provide a more effective learning environment.

### **1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What language learning strategies do EMI students utilize in their lessons?
2. Does language learning strategy use change according to gender?
3. What challenges do EMI students face in the lesson?
4. How do EMI students deal with their challenges in the lesson?

### **1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The current study has important contributions to the research in this area for three main reasons. Firstly, it provides awareness to students on language learning strategies use and clarification on their language learning strategies. Secondly, it helps lecturers to get insight into the strategies of EMI students and helps them to review their curriculum by studying their students' language learning strategies. Thirdly, it provides pedagogical implications for students and teachers.

## **1.5 LIMITATIONS**

The sample of this study is limited to Turkish EMI students (N = 255) therefore, the findings should not be generalized to other EMI contexts. Another limitation was other parties such as lecturers, parents and administrators' views could be involved; however, because of the time limit, involving them would not be possible.

## **1.6 THE LIST OF THE STUDY ABBREVIATIONS**

ASEAN: “Association of South East Asian Nations”

EAP: “English for Academic Purposes”

EMI: “English as a Medium of Instruction”

CBI: “Content-Based Instruction”

CLIL: “Content Language Integrated Learning”

CLT: “Communicative Language Teaching”

LLS: “Language Learning Strategy”

SILL: “Strategy Inventory for Language Learning”

TBLT: “Task-Based Language Teaching”

TMI: “Turkish Medium Instruction”

SPSS: “Statistical Package for the Social Sciences”

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON EMI**

As EMI seems to be spreading all over the world, recent studies have mainly focused on teachers and students' attitudes towards it. In this section, the study presents what challenges EMI students and lecturers face on different continents. Then the study presents the previous studies on language learning strategies of EFL, ESL, and EMI students.

##### **2.1.1 A Closer Look at EMI in European Countries**

In European countries, Dearden and Macaro (2016) examined the attitude of university teachers who taught their academic subjects through the medium of English in the context of Austria, Italy, and Poland. According to the results of their study, even though both lecturers and students had some concerns, EMI had been gradually increasing and becoming a trend in ELT literature. In Austria, Tatzl (2011) found that both students and teachers had positive attitudes towards EMI. For instance, in Macedonia, South East European University was able to host all ethnic diversity of the country thanks to their use of three different medium of instruction: Albanian, Macedonian and English language. Again, Lochi (2015) investigated 30 lecturers' views from the English Department (ED) and Language Centre (LC) with an open-ended questionnaire included eight questions. Findings revealed that while LC teachers were more focused on "*communicative use of English*", ED teachers' main aim was "*reaching the standard English ideology*" (p. 345), more importantly, these teachers thought that students could understand academic content in English. In a Ukrainian University, Goodman (2014) found that both students and lecturers had



positive attitudes towards EMI, even though they acknowledged some challenges of EMI.

However, in Denmark, Danish university lecturers showed a different attitude. They believe that even though the English language is a remarkable element for internalization, they had concern that it is a threat to their native language (Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011). Moreover, Jensen and Thøgersen explained this situation as lecturers wish to have “*proverbial cake*” (p.30) Barrios, López-Gutiérrez and Lechuga (2016) found that one of the main challenges of EMI for students and instructors was language proficiency. Importantly, Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2012) argued about future challenges of EMI students, one of these challenges was that the motivation to apply EMI programs would be economic interests and the second future challenge was difficulty of combining both content and language successfully. Similarly, Coleman (2006) also investigated on predictable problems in the medium of instruction and listed the followings ‘cultural identity’ (p. 6) and a “*threat to the native language*”, “*organizational problems*” and so on (p. 7). Barrios et al. (2016) created several innovative programs in response to these challenges which were ‘*cooperative interdisciplinary training*’, ‘*language support*’ and ‘*evaluation of the experiment*’ (p. 212, 213).

### **2.1.2 A Closer Look at EMI in Asian and Middle Eastern Countries**

In Asian countries, EMI has been discussed extensively as well, although the research presents mixed findings. One of the earliest studies in Hong Kong, Tung, Lam, and Tsang (1997) investigated more than 5,000 students, 700 lectures and 4,600 parents’ opinions on EMI through three different questionnaires. In accordance with the study results, in Chinese context teachers endorsed mother tongue for a more satisfying academic and language outcome and for a more even view of language education. In Malaysia, Othman and Saat’s (2009) study with pre-service science teachers indicated that pre-service teachers were unsure about how to combine subject matter with language. However, Brown and Bradford (2017) stated that even though EMI courses demand near-native speaker profession with “*swim or sink approach*” (p.330), EMI also supported the development in language skills. Chuo

(2018) called EMI as a doubtful subject because of the issue of patriotism, better learning at native language and combination of learning content in another language. He also argued that EMI could affect the lower class' right to education in a negative way. Huang (2018) investigated the reasons for the students' 'resistance' (p.436) to EMI in Taiwan. He found that the main focus of this avoidance was 'sociocultural' reasons such as incompatible curriculum and teacher-centered lecture. Moreover, Joe and Lee (2013) found that even though EMI did not influence lecture comprehension; medical students had negative feelings and concern about English medium lectures.

As opposed to these studies, which reported negative approaches to EMI, there are also studies presenting positive results in regard to attitudes to EMI. For example, Yeh (2014) found that students had a favorable attitude towards EMI; moreover, he found that developing language skills were the main reason for choosing EMI courses. In addition, in a study in Hong Kong, Tsui and Ngo (2017) examined the students' opinion about EMI in a Chinese University of Hong Kong. The study revealed that students endorsed using English as a medium of instruction by virtue of three instrumental impetuses; "*employability at local and global levels*", appreciation of "*culture*" and "*international exchange*" (p. 13). In Korea, Kym and Kym (2014) found that irrespective of their language proficiency levels, students had a positive attitude towards EMI. Interestingly, they found that students' contentment was also bound up with background knowledge and nationality of instructors. For example, students were more content with the lecture more easily when the instructor was a native speaker. Moreover, the findings of the study of He and Chiang (2016) was similar. In accordance with the results of this study, from point of view of international students, in China one of the EMI program's main challenge was instructors' language proficiency and lecture style. In India, Sultan, Borland, and Eckersley (2012) found that the EMI students' performance was better than students in non-EMI programs and they displayed a more favorable attitude towards target language.

In Middle Eastern context even though EMI received positive attitudes, some of the studies revealed that students were more sided with bilingual education. For example, in a study in Saudi Arabia, Ryhan (2014) found that even though students

initially avoid using English, after a certain period of time they gradually showed a willingness to learn and became more confident in the target language. In Arabian/Persian Gulf, Belhiah & Elhami (2015) found that most of the students and teachers were in favor of using Arabic and English together, even though they were aware of English as lingua franca. In another study, in Kuwait, students also thought that using both English and Arabic made instruction more understandable (Alenezi 2010). Ahmed, Peeran, and Ahmed (2015) also reached similar results; medical and dental students of Sebha University thought that using both Arabic and English would make the lecture more comprehensible and would improve their English language skills. Moreover, they did not think English as a threat to their local language. As it is inferred from these studies, Middle Eastern students such as the Persian Gulf, Libya, and Kuwait students were sided with bilingual education. Moreover, in this context, bilingual education is also considered as a response to the concerns that EMI may intimidate the place of local languages. For example, Kirkpatrick (2011) suggested that bilingual education at the tertiary level is a solution to EMI's risk of being a killer language.

### **2.1.3 A Closer look at EMI in Turkey**

As Cankaya(2017) mentioned in her integrative research study, in Turkey studies were based on students' and teachers' problems. Selvi (2014) argued this issue as EMI stays an intersection between “*national*” and “*bilingual*” concepts (p.146). In this part, the study presents previous studies on EMI in Turkey specifically focusing on language, lecturing problems, and ideology in Turkey.

EMI in Turkey is also a controversial topic for students and teachers. It emerged as polarization in sociolinguistic and language pedagogy. For some critics, EMI is a threat from a socio-political and pedagogical perspective. Köksal (2002) called this issue as a “*delusion*”. Günesligün (2003) maintained that EMI is “*a fast spreading tumor of our education system*”. (p. 99) Durmus (2009) described EMI as the most dangerous game played on Turkey. Moreover, Selvi (2014) argued that deficiencies of planning EMI in language education, policy, and other systemic weaknesses stay “*dark cloud*” over Turkey's language education. Karakas (2015) argued that EMI

students' language ideology had an impact on their English language usage, despite native speakerest approach, most of the students focused on the effectiveness of language usage. Apart from ideological negative opinions, there are also linguistic oriented negative ideas that are put forward by some researchers, including difficulty in understanding a lecture in English (see Sert, 2008; Collins, 2010; Başıbek, Dolmacı, Cengiz, Bür, Dilek, and Kara, (2014) According to one study (Kılıçkaya, 2006) instructors preferred Turkishmedium of instruction considering the challenges that EMI brought with such as students' participation and their proficiency level. These instructors were in favor of adopting a Turkish-English medium of instruction. Collins (2010) study reported similar findings even though most of the lecturer favored in EMI, they also thought that English medium instruction has negative effects on their self-assurance and creativity. Moreover, Civan and Coskun (2016) investigated that non-native medium instruction had negative effects on students' academic achievements, this negative impact showed himself more in freshmen year of students. However, their findings were not true for the merit-based scholarship students.

Importantly, a research study sheds light on these discussions in Turkey, the British Council and TEPAV carried out a study into university-level English language provision in Turkey in 2015 in order to make EMI programs at universities much better and stronger. The study was conducted with more than 20.000 participants including students, leadership teams, and academic staff from 38 universities in 15 cities across Turkey. The results of this study revealed that in an 'international context' such as Turkey, English deficiency had negative effects on students' lecture mobility, on the access to academic resources and on the quality of universities. In addition, in a national context, it turned out that students and academic staffs' English proficiency level narrowed down the learning outcomes showing that T-EMI was not suitable for these educational groups. The third finding was related to the institutional context; English language teaching was not sufficient for academic programs. The fourth finding was about departmental context; English teachers at universities did not have training on EAP/ESP and teachers did not provide a chance for student-student interaction. The final finding was related to English as a medium of instruction which stated that some universities could not find enough academic

staff to meet the requirement of the EMI program. In addition, lecturers in EMI pay no attention to students' language problems.

Despite all these negative arguments and deficiencies on the application of EMI programs, English as a language of instruction has continued to be spreading in Turkey especially at the newly founded private universities. The main reason behind this increasing number of private EMI universities is that these universities want to be globalized by attracting international students and staff and to increase their revenue (Dearden & Macaro 2016).

According to Başıbek, et al (2014), lecturers were sided with EMI rather than Turkish medium instruction (TMI). They thought that EMI would lead students to be better in academic and social life. In addition to that, they thought that students could reach all resources thanks to English. Kırkgöz (2014) elaborated on this issue in her study where she investigates the perceptions of EMI and TMI students on the instruction of language. According to results of this study, students had positive viewpoints about EMI, they thought that EMI provides them with improvement in the target language; give them chance to reach primary sources in their field; provide opportunities to get a better job and catch up global progress. Oruc (2008) examined the effects of content based teaching and TMI on the students' opinions in their field. According to the results of this study, TMI and content-based teaching have no effects on students' perception of their field. Atlı and Ozal (2017) argued that full EMI groups have more motivational intensity with the average of % 64, 2 and more focused on learning English while partial EMI has more instrumental motivation.

## **2.2 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES**

### **2.2.1 Clarifications on Language Learning Strategy**

Language learning strategy was defined by Rubin (1975) as “*The techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge*” (p.43). Another definition to gain insight into concept was “*specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferable to*

*new situations*” (Oxford, 1990, p.8). As it was understood from the definition the main point in strategy is to improve the autonomy of the students. Chamot’s (2004) definition was “*the conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning goal*” (p.14). In another article, he made the following definition; “*Learning strategies are procedures that facilitate a learning task*” (Chamot, 2005, p.112). Finally, Griffiths (2008) defined language learning strategy as “*activities consciously chosen by learners for the purpose of regulating their own language learning*” (p.87). In both definitions of Griffiths (2008) and Chamot (2004), the common point is the emphasis of the word “*conscious*”. That means that the language learning strategy is a consciously chosen activity that facilitates the development of autonomy of students. However, the ambiguity on the definition of language learning strategy has been still continued. Language learning strategy is a remarkable topic in the field of the second language acquisition. It is remarkable because through the investigation of language learning strategies we can better understand “*metacognitive*”, “*affective process*”, “*cognitive*” and “*social*” concepts (Chamot, 2005 p. 112).

### **2.2.2 Research on Good Language Learner**

Earlier studies on language learning strategies mostly focused on good language learners’ strategies, providing a roadmap for the less successful ones. One of the earliest researchers that shed light on the topic of language learning strategy of good language learner was Rubin (1975). Moreover, the other researchers were Stern (1975) and Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco, (1978). Chamot (2004) defined strategic learner as

*"Strategic learners have metacognitive knowledge about their own thinking and learning approaches, a good understanding of what a task entails, and the ability to orchestrate the strategies that best meet both the task demands and their own learning strengths"* (p.14).

Researchers such as Cohen (2011), Cohen and Macaro (2007) Griffith (2008), studied the connection between language learning strategy and students’ achievement. In her study, Griffith (2010) showed the value of the usage of language learning strategy. The study revealed that even though two successful language

learners were different from each other from many perspectives, the common point between these two language learners was the use of language learning strategies in their own way. Green and Oxford (1995) reported that there was a relationship between successful language learner and usage of language learning strategies, they argued that high achieving language learners used more language learning strategies than others. Nosratinia, Saveiy, and Zaker (2014) found that language learning strategies were closely linked to metacognitive awareness and self-efficacy. Moreover, Chamot (2005) stated that that high achieving language learners were the ones who apply the right strategy for the task, in other words who had the metacognitive knowledge on task demands.

### **2.2.3 Classification of Language Learning Strategies**

Classification is another issue relating to the language learning strategy. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) differentiated three main categories; cognitive, meta-cognitive and social language learning strategy. Moreover, Rubin (1981) divided language learning strategy into two subcategories: Direct and Indirect language learning strategies. Building on Rubin's (1981) categories, Oxford (1990) further sorted language learning strategies into direct "*learning and use if subject matter, in this case, a new language*" and indirect language learning strategies, which "*contribute indirectly but powerfully to learning*" (p.11) and also divided the groups into six categories. These are cognitive categories which convey the meaning that "*enable the learner to manipulate the language material indirect ways, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, and synthesizing.*" (Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003 p.316) and compensation strategy which means "*guessing intelligently and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing*" (Oxford, 1990, p. 47). Memory strategy means retaining new knowledge by "*creating mental linkages*", "*applying images and sounds*" etc. (Oxford, 1990, p. 38). According to these categorizations, social strategies "*help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language*". (Oxford 2003, p.14) and affective strategy helps taking control of negative emotions which preclude learning and meta-cognitive strategies "*are used to manage the learning process overall*" (Ehrman et al., 2003p.317). Relatedly, Yeh (2014) found the most frequent comprehension strategies that students used as "*concentration in class 68%*", "*taking*

*notes in class 54%*”, “*seeking help from peers 44%*”, and “*spending more time reviewing text 42%*”.

#### **2.2.4 Individual Factors in Language Learning Strategies**

To date, important factors on the frequency of use of language learning strategies have been studied extensively. In the following, a literature review of the effect of two mostly cited individual factors; proficiency and gender and their effects on language learning strategies are presented.

##### **2.2.4.1 Proficiency**

Green and Oxford (1995) studied the effect of 374 university students’ language proficiency on strategy use. They found more frequent use of learning strategies among successful learners. Park (1997) conducted research on the relationship between proficiency and language learning strategy use. Among the 332 university students, he found that those who had the highest TOEFL scores also had higher use of language learning strategies, preferring cognitive and social strategies. Griffith (2003) conducted research with 348 international students from 21 different countries to investigate the relationship between course levels, and language learning strategies. Course levels had been divided into seven levels from elementary to advance. She found that advanced learners have a positive correlation with frequent use of learning strategies. Moreover, Wharton (2000) conducted a research on 678 bilingual tertiary students who were studying French or Japanese, and came from a multicultural setting and different levels of proficiency, language learning strategy. Similarly, He also found that students with a higher level of language proficiency had a higher frequency of use of language strategy. Lan and Oxford (2003) conducted a study involving 379 sixth grade elementary school students in Taiwan and Peacock and Ho (2003) studied 1,006 EAP “*English for Academic Purposes*” students across eight disciplines. These two studies confirmed the previous results that there was a positive correlation between strategy use and proficiency. In addition, Hong Nam and Leavell (2006) found a positive correlation between language learning strategy use and intermediate level students.



#### **2.2.4.2 Gender**

When it comes to one of the most commonly used individual variable gender, many studies indicated that female learners more frequently use language learning strategies compared to the male learners (Hong-Nam and Leavell, 2006; Lan & Oxford, 2003). Green and Oxford (1995) examined the gender factor in strategy use with 178 male and 196 female students. They found that female students use language learning strategies more often compared to male students. Moreover, Tezcan and Deneme (2015) investigated 51 females and 60 male Turkish 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students' LLS and indicated that female students more frequently used strategies than male students did. Another remarkable research that confirmed the same result is Ho and Ng's (2016) study which involved 535 males and 1173 female students from a Malaysian public university. In another study Peacock and Ho (2003) found that female learners used memory and metacognitive strategies more often than male students. Liyanage and Bartlett (2012) conducted a study on language learning strategies of 886 Sri Lankan students taking into account their gender. They found that in general, female students preferred more metacognitive, cognitive, and social affective strategies than male students. (p.245) Finally, Gu (2002) reported that female students use more vocabulary learning strategies than male students do.

However, there are studies presenting contrasting findings. For example, Wharton's (2000) study and Tran's (1988) research on 327 adult Vietnamese participants whose age ranged were between 40 and 92 reached a different result by finding male students using language learning strategy use at a higher rate than females did. Nevertheless, it is important to say that studies finding male students using more strategies are fewer in number than studies confirming females having more LLS.

### **2.3 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF EMI STUDENTS**

Regarding language learning strategies of EMI students Rivero-Menéndez et al (2018) mentioned that when EMI students learning strategies were compared to Non-EMI students, it will be confirmed that EMI students did better in "*effort*", "*time*

*study management*", "*reading perseverance*", and "*setting organizational goals*"(p. 6). By and large, EMI students were highly motivated and tended to develop better learning strategies.

Evans and Morrison (2011) investigated the language challenges of the freshman-year-students of EMI universities. According to the results of this study, students' main challenges were comprehension of technical vocabulary, academic writing, understanding lectures and complying with institutional requirements. They reported that L1 freshman year students struggled with these language learning challenges they faced through vigorous motivation, studying, using learning strategies and co-operation with peers.

Min, Wang, and Liu (2018) examined the impacts of the cloud learning environment on EMI courses. They found that CLE- integrated learning strategy improved students' learning performance, professional skills and learning attitude. Another salient point among the findings of the study was that guidance in EMI courses carries a remarkable value for the strengthening students' motivation and application of EMI.

In Turkey, Soruç, Dinler, and Griffiths (2018) investigated EMI students' listening comprehension strategies. The study reported that students used strategies such as focusing on lecture and lecturer, taking note, and making the individual effort. In another study, Eser and Dikilitas (2017) found that EMI students did not have enough knowledge about the usage of translation strategies necessary for better comprehension. In addition to that, the most frequent strategies they applied were cognitive, social and memory strategies. However, they did not use metacognitive and compensation strategies.

Finally, Akyel and Ozek (2010) investigated the needs of students in EMI universities' prep schools with the ELT curriculum. The study investigated that one of the needs of students was the motivation for the use of needed learning strategies. They also suggested that strategies and the skills that students struggle should be taught in the lesson.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter describes the methodology of the current research. Throughout this chapter the research design, data collection methods, administration of these methods and detailed explanation of data analysis process were discussed.

#### **3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN**

This study investigates EMI students' language learning strategies, challenges they faced and how they dealt with these challenges. To investigate these issues a mixed method approach were applied using both quantitative and qualitative instruments to collect data. As Creswell (2013) stated, "*The combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a more complete understanding of a research problem than either approach alone*" (p.4). Dörnyei (2007) defined as

*"A mixed methods study involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study with some attempts to integrate the two approaches at one or more stages of the research process."* (p. 161).

Thus, a mixed method study design was adopted. For the quantitative instruments, "Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)" (see Appendix B) was used with a background information questionnaire (see Appendix A). For the collection of qualitative data, a structured open-ended questionnaire was employed. (see Appendix C).

### 3.2 SETTING

This study took place at EMI universities. All the participants were Turkish native speakers. At these universities, instructions were given in English. Therefore, the students participated to this study had to certify their language proficiency either by TOEFL or EILTS exams in order to be eligible to enter these universities. When the students fail to pass these exams, then they have to study English at prep school for a year. In order to pass prep school they need to pass a qualifying exam. In addition, if they fail this exam they have to repeat prep school for one more year. All the lecturers at these universities were Turkish native speakers and were experienced lecturers of EMI.

### 3.3 PARTICIPANTS

255 university students 111 males and 144 females -participated in the study. Their age ranged from 18 to 24. In terms of academic disciplines and the stages of courses participants varied with students coming from 13 different academic disciplines and different stages of education (See Table 1). English was the medium of instruction in all the departments that the participants studied.

Table 1. The Departments the Participants Majored.

Departments	Number of Participants
Industrial Engineering	88
International Trade	11
International Logistics Management	6

---

Biology Engineering	23
Sociology	1
Political Science and International Relations	3
Psychology	7
Molecular Biology and Genetics	28
Economics	1
Electrical Engineering	7
Business Administration	22
Computer Engineering	19
Law	13
Computer Education and Instructional Technologies	26

---

### 3.4 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The current study was conducted at tertiary education institutions in the fall semester of the 2018 – 2019 education years in Turkey. The students were chosen on the basis of the result of the national university entrance exams. These universities were preferred on purpose, as they studied at EMI Universities. In the study, two methods of data collection were used. One is the survey questionnaire, which was applied in order to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire approach was used in this research for three main reasons which Dörnyei (2003) summarized as: “*researcher time*”, “*researcher effort*”, and “*financial resources*” (p.9). Moreover, he called the questionnaire as “*versatile*” approach (p.10) which means that the questionnaire could

be applied in different context and settings. In this study, the questionnaire was conducted to investigate EMI students' language learning strategies, it also aimed to raise their awareness about language learning strategies. In the initial stage, the questionnaire was piloted in order to improve the quality of the survey. Twenty-four students participated in the pilot survey. The main aim of the piloting study is to increase the effectiveness of the research. The second approach, the qualitative data was obtained through an open-ended questionnaire. First, the approvals were received from each department's heads to carry out the survey in departments. Then got permission from the lecturers before the questionnaire was handed out to students. The participants of the study were informed about the questionnaire objectives and procedures. At the beginning of the questionnaire, a consent letter was handed out informing participants that participation in this study is voluntary and that they can withdraw at any time they wanted.

### **3.5 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS**

Two methods of data collection were utilized in this current research: a questionnaire survey with a demographic questionnaire and a qualitative open-ended questionnaire. Next section describes the research instruments' features in detail.

#### **3.5.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)**

SILL version 7.0 (Oxford, 1990) is the questionnaire that explored the frequency of adult L2 learners' use of language learning strategy. The questionnaire consists of 50 items, which are grouped as direct and indirect items. It is made up of six main categories for the measurement: memory (nine items), cognitive (fourteen items), compensation (six items), metacognitive (nine items), and affective (six items), and social (six items) (Oxford, 1990). The questions are based on five points Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5: 1 = "*never or almost never true of me*", 2 = "*generally not true of me*", 3 = "*somewhat true of me*", 4 = "*generally true of me*", and 5 = "*always or almost always true of me*". SILL was used by many researchers such as Oxford and Burry Stock (1995), Green and Oxford (1995), Wharton (2000), Ćirković-Miladinović (2014) and calculated high reliability score of above .90 high

Cronbach's alpha. To avoid any misunderstanding and confusion, a translated version of SILL (Cesur & Seval, 2007) was used and instructions were given in learners' native language, Turkish. Moreover, a demographic questionnaire was given to the participants. This questionnaire consisted of closed-ended questions in which participants' gender, age, departments were asked.

### **3.5.2 Open Ended Questionnaire**

In order to better understand students' opinions on their strategy use, they were also given an open-ended questionnaire. In this open-ended questionnaire, they were asked to express their opinions by reflecting on the following two questions. In addition, they were also provided with a comment section where they were able to express their views on any additional issue on this topic. Students were allowed to write in their mother tongue. The two main questions just mentioned are:

1. What challenges do you face in your education context?
2. How do you deal with the challenges you faced in the lesson?

Using qualitative data, it was both aimed to collect data and triangulate the data gathered by the survey. In an open-ended questionnaire, the students write more comfortably and express their feelings and or arguments more explicitly in an anxiety-free environment. This type of survey also encouraged the participants to think about EMI phenomenon in which they were engaged and reflected on it as they wanted because they did not have time constraints. All the advantages mentioned here were also observed by the researcher and the classroom lecturer.

## **3.6 DATA ANALYSIS**

In this current study, data were collected both quantitatively and qualitatively. While the open-ended questionnaires were analyzed using content analysis, questionnaires were analyzed by conducting descriptive and inferential statistics. Questionnaire items were written into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for version

22. The descriptive statistics were used in order to calculate means and frequencies. SILL Likert scale was analyzed according to the ranges recommended by Oxford and Burry Stock (1995) where the mean scores between “1.0 and 2.4” were regarded as low use of strategy; the mean between “2.5 and 3.4” as medium use of strategy; and mean between “3.5 and 5.0” as high use of strategy. Inferential statistics were used to calculate and analyze demographic variables that affect the use of language learning strategies. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality was conducted and all the items in the questionnaires were found normally distributed. As the data set distributed normally ( $p = .200$ ), parametric tests were used in inferential statistics. Independent sample t-test was used to compare gender differences in strategy use. For qualitative analyses, the data collected from the students’ comments were analyzed according to content analysis approach (Dörnyei, 2007). Creswell’s (2014) six steps for analysis were implemented in the study. Firstly, the data was organized and arranged; later data was read many times by taking some notes. As the third step, data were coded. Coding of data was done in two ways, namely bottom-up and top-down way and many different codes were created. Benefitting from the coding, many possible themes were sorted. At step five, the second coding process was creating many other themes. In the last step a detailed analysis of theme and subthemes were done. The thematic map was created where the comments on the first question, (see pg. 49) were coded into five themes. For the second question, comments were coded and codes were sorted out for themes and seven themes appeared for this question (see the result section).



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. The first section presents the frequency of the use of language learning strategy items and gender's impact on language strategy use. The second section shows challenges that EMI students face and the third section presents strategies how students deal with these challenges.

#### 4.1 QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

##### 4.1.1 Use of Language Learning Strategies with Mean Ratings

Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means, and standard deviations were conducted to explore participants' (N= 255) frequencies of use of language learning strategy items. Students answered the (SILL) (Oxford, 1990) questionnaire which consist of six groups memory, cognitive, compensation metacognitive, affective and social and overall fifty items. Questions are rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 to 5. Assessing the degree of use of strategy, items were calculated based on Oxford and Burry Stock (1995) criteria of the scale of strategy use which consisted of three categories, "*low frequency (1.0 - 2.4)*", "*medium frequency (2.5 - 3.4)*", "*high frequency (3.5- 5.0)*". Another criterion was Green and Oxford's (1995) recommended frequencies for the analysis of descriptive statistics of the use of language learning strategy. According to their study, if 50% or more than 50% of participants answered 4 "*generally true of me*" or 5 "*always or almost always true of me*", it could be analyzed as "*frequent use*", if 20 – 49% of participants answers 4 or 5, then it could be concluded as "*moderate use*", and if lesser than 20% of participants answered 4or 5 overall, It could be called as "*infrequent use*" (p. 272). As shown in

Table 2 descriptive statistics revealed that students used medium level strategy use (M = 3.19, SD = .59) (medium frequency = 2.5 - 3.4).

Table 2. Overall Language Learning Strategy Use

	Mean	N	SD
Total Language Learning Strategy Use	3,19	255	.59

When it comes to categories of language learning strategy, all groups of SILL had the medium degree use, the most preferred categories were metacognitive strategies (M= 3.39, SD= .79), compensation strategies (M= 3.36, SD=.71), cognitive strategies (M= 3.26, SD= .69), social strategies (M= 3.20, SD= .72), memory strategies (M= 3.03, SD= .68). However, the least preferred strategy was affective strategies (M= 2.83, SD= .75) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Six Categories of Language Learning Strategy Use

Categories of Language learning Strategy	M	N	SD
Memory Strategies	3,03	255	.68
Cognitive Strategies	3,26	255	.69
Compensation Strategies	3,36	255	.71
Metacognitive Strategies	3,39	255	.79
Affective Strategies	2,83	255	.75
Social Strategies	3,20	255	.72

#### 4.1.1.1 Use of metacognitive strategies with mean ratings

Among the categories of SILL, the most frequently used category was metacognitive strategies. When the frequencies were evaluated, mean and standard deviations of the items of metacognitive strategies, it was investigated that four items out of nine statements had high medium scores. The first highly rated item was item number 32, (M= 4.0, SD= .98). 36.5% of participants answered this item as “*always or almost always true of me*” (5). The second item that had the highest median score was item number 33, (M= 3.69, SD= 1.14) with 31% of participants responding this statement as “*always or almost always true of me*” (5). Other high- mean-scores-items were item number 31 (M= 3.57, SD= 1.02) where 21% of participants rated as it (5) and item number 38 (M= 3.55, SD= 1.16), as 25% of participants rated it (5). (see Table 4)

Table 4. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Metacognitive Items

Items	never or almost never true of me	generally not true of me	somewhat true of me	generally true of me	always or almost always true of me	M	SD
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	6.7	20	33.3	26.3	13.7	3.20	1.11
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2.4	11.8	33.3	31.4	21.2	3.57	1.02
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	2.0	6.7	15.3	39.6	36.5	4.01	.98
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of	3.1	14.1	23.9	27.8	31.0	3.69	1.14

---

English.							
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	14.5	25.1	30.2	17.6	12.5	2.88	1.22
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	15.3	21.2	23.1	22.7	17.6	3.06	1.32
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	9.8	25.1	26.3	20.8	18.0	3.12	1.25
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	7.1	13.3	24.7	36.1	18.8	3.46	1.14
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	5.5	13.3	27.1	28.2	25.9	3.55	1.16

---

#### **4.1.1.2 Use of compensation strategies with mean ratings**

Compensation strategies were the second most frequently used strategies among EMI students. Overall compensation strategies had medium level of use. However, among the items of compensation strategies, two items had high-frequency use. These items were item 29 (M= 3.96, SD= .94) with 33% of participants rated it (5), and item 24 (M= 3.52, SD= 1.12), with 23.9 % of participants rated it(5). (see Table 5)

Table 5. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Compensation items

Items	never or almost never true of me	generally not true of me	somewhat true of me	generally true of me	always or almost always true of me	M	SD
24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	4.7	12.2	32.5	26.7	23.9	3.52	1.12
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	5.9	14.9	26.7	29.0	23.5	3.49	1.17
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	23.1	17.6	18.0	25.5	15.7	2.92	1.40
27. I read English without looking up every new word.	4.7	21.2	33.3	26.7	14.1	3.24	1.08
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	12.5	22.0	27.5	27.5	10.6	3.01	1.19
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	1.2	5.9	22.0	37.6	33.3	3.96	.94

#### 4.1.1.3 Use of cognitive strategies with mean ratings

Cognitive strategies consisted of fourteen items. Among all these fourteen items, four items showed high rate of strategy use. These items were item 15 (M= 4.08, SD= 1.09) with 47.8% of participants rated it (5); item 18 (M= 3.68, SD= 1.12), with

28.2% of participants rated it (5); item 16 (M= 3.56, SD= 1.18) with 27.1% of participants rated it (5), and item 10 (M= 3.54, SD= 1.18) with 24.7% of participants rated it (5). (see Table 6)

Table 6. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Cognitive Items

Items	never or almost never true of me	generally not true of me	somewhat true of me	generally true of me	always or almost always true of me	M	SD
10. I say or write new English words several times.	7.5	11.0	26.3	30.6	24.7	3.54	1.18
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	6.3	16.1	29.8	28.2	19.6	3.38	1.15
12. I practice the sounds of English.	14.9	23.1	26.3	17.6	18.0	3.00	1.31
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	7.8	18.8	29.0	31.0	13.3	3.23	1.13
14. I start conversations in English.	22.0	20.0	31.8	15.7	10.6	2.72	1.26
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or to go to movies spoken in English.	3.1	6.7	16.5	25.9	47.8	4.08	1.09
16. I read for pleasure in English.	5.9	13.3	26.7	27.1	27.1	3.56	1.18

---

17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	12.5	14.9	29.0	17.6	25.9	3.29	1.33
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	4.3	11.0	23.9	32.5	28.2	3.69	1.1
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	13.3	14.5	24.3	28.6	19.2	3.25	1.29
20. I try to find patterns in English.	9.8	20.8	26.7	24.3	18.4	3.20	1.24
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	23.5	18.8	23.5	21.2	12.9	2.81	1.35
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.	5.5	18.0	30.2	25.9	20.4	3.37	1.15
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	27.1	28.6	21.2	14.5	8.6	2.49	1.26

---

#### 4.1.1.4 Use of social strategies with mean ratings

As seen in Table 7, Social strategies which consisted of six items (from item 45 to item 50) had medium level use. Among all items of social strategies, only one item had the highest mean score which was item 45, (M= 3.94, SD= 1.00). It was answered as “always or almost always true of me” (5) by 34.1% of the participants. (see Table 7)

Table 7. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Social Strategy Items

Items	never or almost never true of me	generally not true of me	somewhat true of me	generally true of me	always or almost always true of me	M	SD
45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	2.4	5.9	21.2	36.5	34.1	3.94	1.00
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	11.4	16.9	30.6	26.3	14.9	3.16	1.20
47. I practice English with other students.	23.5	27.8	26.7	16.1	5.9	2.52	1.18
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	6.7	14.1	25.1	32.9	21.2	3.47	1.16
49. I ask questions in English.	18.0	26.7	21.2	19.2	14.9	2.86	1.32
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	14.9	15.3	20.0	27.8	22.0	3.26	1.35

#### 4.1.1.5 Use of memory strategies with mean ratings

Overall mean scores of memory strategies ranged from 2.15 to 3.79 (see Table 9). Among these items, only one item, item 1, was the most frequently used strategy with 26.7% of EMI students reporting that they consider relationships between what they already know and new things they learn in English (M= 3.79, SD= 0.95). (see Table 8)



Table 8. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Memory Strategy Items

Items	never or almost never true of me	generally not true of me	somewhat true of me	generally true of me	always or almost always true of me	M	SD
1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	1.2	6.7	30.2	35.3	26.7	3.79	.95
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	9.0	20.0	34.5	22.7	13.7	3.12	1.15
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	12.5	19.2	28.2	20.4	19.6	3.15	1.29
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	9.8	15.3	28.2	27.5	19.2	3.30	1.22
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	15.7	17.3	25.5	24.7	16.9	3.09	1.31
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	46.3	17.6	17.6	11.4	7.1	2.15	1.30

7. I physically act out new English words.	26.7	24.7	27.1	14.9	6.7	2.50	1.21
8. I review English lessons often.	10.6	27.5	34.5	18.8	8.6	2.87	1.10
9. I remember new English words or phrase by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a screen sign.	8.2	16.9	27.1	29.8	18.0	3.32	1.19

#### 4.1.1.6 Use of affective strategies with mean ratings

Affective strategies had the lowest mean score compared to six categories of language learning strategies. As it was indicated in table 19, 6% of EMI students approved item 42 (M= 3.56, SD= 1.09). (see Table 9)

Table 9. Frequencies (%), Means, and Standard Deviations of Affective Strategy Items

Items	never or almost never true of me	generally not true of me	somewhat true of me	generally true of me	always or almost always true of me	M	SD
39. I try to relax whenever I fell afraid of using English.	5.9	14.5	31.8	33.3	14.5	3.36	1.08
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	7.1	19.2	27.5	28.2	18.0	3.30	1.17

41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	29.4	26.7	20.4	16.1	7.5	2.45	1.26
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	6.3	8.6	26.7	38.8	19.6	3.56	1.9
43. I write own my feelings in a language learning diary.	58.8	16.1	9.0	11.8	4.3	1.86	1.23
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	33.7	22.4	21.2	13.7	9.0	2.41	1.31

#### 4.1.1.7 Overall of use of strategy items with mean ratings

Among all the categories of language learning strategies only the following items had the high frequency use, these include four items of metacognitive strategies, two items of compensation strategies, four items of cognitive strategies, one item of social strategies, one item of memory strategies and one item of affective strategies. Overall, among all 50 items, fifteen items had the high mean scores language learning strategies. Regarding the mean score of overall items of language learning strategies, the most frequently used item was cognitive strategy, item15 (M= 4.08, SD= 1.09). The second item that had the most frequent use was metacognitive strategy item of 32 (M= 4.0, SD= .98) and the third most preferred strategy was item 29 (M= 3.96, SD= .94). Three least frequently used strategies were item 43 (M= 1.86, SD= 1.23); item 6 (M= 2.15, SD= 1.30) and item 44 “(M= 2.41, SD= 1.31).(see Table 10)

Table 10. Three Most Used and Three Least Used Strategies with Mean Ratings

ITEMS	M	SD
I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or to go to movies spoken in English.	4.08,	1.09
I pay attention when someone is speaking English	4.01	.98
If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.96	.94
I write own my feelings in a language learning diary	1.86,	1.23
I use flashcards to remember new English words	2.15	1.30
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English	2.41	1.31

#### 4.1.2 Gender Difference on Language Learning Strategy Use

Independent-sample t-test was used to examine whether or not there is any gender difference between male and female students on the use of language learning strategies. The results showed that there was not any significant difference in scores between male ( $M = 3.18$   $SD = .60$ ) and female students ( $M = 3.20$   $SD = .59$ ;  $t(253) = -.278$ ,  $p = .78$ ) (see table 11).

Table 11. Gender Difference in Overall Strategy Use

	Gender	M	SD	T	df	P
Overall Language Learning Strategy use	Male	3.18	.60	-.27	253	.78
	Female	3.20	.59			

Regarding the six categories of language learning strategies, there was not any difference between gender and memory strategies,  $t(253) = -1.06$ ,  $p = .29$ , cognitive strategies,  $t(253) = .37$ ,  $p = .71$ , compensation strategies,  $t(253) = -.70$ ,  $p = .47$ ,

metacognitive strategies,  $t(253) = -.74$ ,  $p = .45$ , affective strategies,  $t(253) = 1.25$ ,  $p = .20$ , and social strategies,  $t(253) = -.60$ ,  $p = .54$ . (see table 12)

Table 12. Gender Difference in Six Categories of Language Learning Strategy Use

Categories	Gender	M	SD	t	df	P
Memory Strategies	Male	3.32	.71	-1.06	253	.29
	Female	3.39	.66			
Cognitive Strategies	Male	3.28	.68	.37	253	.71
	Female	3.24	.70			
Compensation Strategies	Male	3.32	.69	-.70	253	.47
	Female	3.39	.73			
Metacognitive Strategies	Male	3.35	.81	-.74	253	.45
	Female	3.43	.78			
Affective Strategies	Male	2.89	.79	1.25	253	.20
	Female	2.77	.72			
Social Strategies	Male	3.17	.75	-.609	253	.543
	Female	3.23	.70			

Independent sample t-test was used to compare the most and the least used categories of strategies for male and female students. For both male and female students, the most used categories of strategies and the least used categories of strategies were the same. The least used category of strategy for males ( $M = 2.89$ ,  $SD = .79$ ) and females ( $M = 2.77$ ,  $SD = .72$ ) were affective strategies, and the most frequently used category of strategy for males ( $M = 3.35$ ,  $SD = .81$ ) and females ( $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = .78$ ) were metacognitive strategies. (see table 13)

Table 13. The Most Used Category of Strategy for Males and Females

Category	Gender	M	SD
Memory Strategy	Male	3.35	.81
	Female	3.43	.78

Table 14. The Least Used Category of Language Learning Strategy

Category	Gender	M	SD
Affective strategy	Male	2.89	.79
	Female	2.77	.72

Regarding the individual items of language learning strategies, one sample t-test was used to explore gender difference on the most preferred and the least preferred individual items. The most preferred strategy for males ( $M = 4.01$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ) and females ( $M = 4.13$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ) were item 15. The least preferred item for males was the item 6 ( $M = 2.06$ ,  $SD = 1.35$ ), and for females it was item 43 ( $M = 1.70$ ,  $SD = 1.14$ ). (see table 15)

Table 15. The most and least Preferred Language Learning Strategies

Categories	Gender	M	SD
	Male	4.01	1.11
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or to go to movies spoken in English.	Female	4.13	1.07
	Male	2.06	1.35
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	Female	2.22	1.27
	Male	2.08	1.31
43. I write own my feelings in a language learning diary	Female	1.70	1.14

## 4.2 QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This section presents the results of qualitative data analysis regarding EMI students' thoughts on the challenges they faced and their way of struggle with these challenges. The questionnaire included open-ended questions section. At the end of this section, the students were given a space to add their further suggestions. Overall 178 EMI students participated in the open-ended questionnaire. In the light of Creswell's (2014) suggestions on analysis of qualitative data themes, categories were created. We found five themes emerged about challenges and six themes about dealing with strategies.



## **4.2.1 Challenges That EMI Students Faced**

The first open-ended question was “*What challenges do you face in your education context?*” The students listed several challenges they faced regarding instruction in English including lack of understanding the lesson, particularly terminology; having a serious problem in understanding lecturers’ accent; communication problems, particularly speaking in class or participating in lesson and talking to foreign friends; failing to understand the exam questions in English, and anxiety.

### **4.2.1.1 Lack of understanding the lesson**

Among these challenges lack of understanding lesson turned out as the most frequently cited problems. 79 students reported failing to understand the lesson as a challenge in EMI. This theme of the lack of understanding of lesson included three categories: lack of terminology knowledge, failing to understand academic journals, English language proficiency. As many as 57 students mentioned about terminology as their problems in the understanding the lesson instructed in English, one specific response regarding lack of terminology knowledge was “*I had too many unknown words in the lesson which is related to my department, that’s why I could not follow the lecture. If it was in my mother tongue, everything could be different*”. Moreover, out of 57 students, 16 students claimed that they could not read academic journals because of the lack of terminology and inefficient reading skills. “*I could not understand academic journals in the lesson that teacher talked about or gave as an assignment to read at home*”. Moreover, 22 students reported that they could not follow the lesson as their inadequate English proficiencies fail them to catch up lesson. One specific response that emphasized their proficiency level was “*I could not understand the lesson because I was not used to listening lecture in English. I felt that I did not have enough basic skills to be able to understand the lesson*”.

### **4.2.1.2 Lecturers’ English accent**

Interestingly a good number of students mentioned lecturers’ English accent. Twenty-six students said that they did not understand the lecturers’ accent. 15

students stated that they could not follow lecturers' speaking because of his/her accent. The second category under the theme of lecturer's accent was the concentration problem. 11 students reported that they could not concentrate on the lesson. When they do not understand the pronunciation of the words they lose concentration on the topic and feel disturbed. An interesting response was "*I could not concentrate on the lesson, because sometimes I focused on lecturer's accent or his or her pronunciation mistakes*".

#### **4.2.1.3 Communication**

Thirteen students referred to the communication problems; these students said that they could not speak in English because they did not know how to pronounce some words. Out of thirteen students, ten students told that they felt uncomfortable while they were speaking; they said that they had never been offered opportunity to speak English before public. Moreover, three of them claimed that they did not have enough proficiency level to speak and participate in class or even spoke his/ her foreign friends and one claimed, "*I could not participate in the lesson and speak with my foreign friend*".

#### **4.2.1.5 Understanding exam questions**

Importantly six students stated failing to understand exam questions. This is an important problem because some of them said that they failed their exams, simply because they did not understand questions asked in English. One answer was "*I failed or got a low grade in the exam because sometimes even I could not understand the questions that were asked*". Four students claimed that they were not used to prepare for exams using English materials, moreover, one of them stated that they were not familiar with the terminology as they prepared for exam using Turkish materials at home. More importantly one student claimed that he/she failed the exam since did not have efficient writing skill to be able to express himself in the exam, even though he was well prepared.

#### **4.2.1.6 Anxiety**

Finally, three students reported feelings of anxiety when they need to speak and write in English. Anxiety theme consisted of two categories, feeling uncomfortable and feeling nervous. Some students touched upon the psychological barrier that they face during their EMI courses. One student response was *“I felt uncomfortable and nervous when I to need to do things in the target language”*. The other answer was *“I feel anxious when I want to participate in lesson that’s why I gave up and I did not participate in the lesson”* (see Table 16).

Table 16. Content Analyses of EMI Students Open-ended Questionnaire Responses

Questions	Themes	Category
What challenges do you face in your education context?	Lack of understanding lesson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>terminology</li> <li>failing to understand academic journals</li> <li>English language proficiency</li> </ul>
	Lecturers' English accent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>failing to follow lecturers' speaking</li> <li>Concentration problems</li> </ul>
	Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not know how to pronounce                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inefficient communication skill</li> </ul> </li> <li>Not enough speaking opportunities</li> </ul>
	Understanding exam questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfamiliar terminology</li> <li>not being used to English materials</li> <li>Do not have enough writing skill.</li> </ul>
	feelings of anxiety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeling uncomfortable</li> <li>Feeling nervous</li> </ul>

#### 4.2.2 Dealing with Challenges

Students reported several strategies they resorted to in order to struggle with the EMI challenges they faced. These strategies were categorized under six headings which

include using dictionary, note taking, using Turkish materials, asking help from friends, asking help from lecturers, memorizing vocabularies. More importantly, most of the students claimed not using any strategies.

#### **4.2.3.1 Use of dictionary**

The most frequently used strategy was the use of the dictionary. Twenty-two students stated using dictionary when they did not understand lectures. Eighteen of them claimed that they used Google translate. One student response was “*When I faced with the unknown word in the lesson, I used Google Translate*”. Other students claimed that they used digital dictionaries or other translator programs.

#### **4.2.3.2 Asking for help from friends**

Interestingly fourteen students asked help from friends. Eight students reported that they asked friends for the translation of lesson material or about things, they heard during the lesson. More specifically students’ response regarding the translation of the lecture was “*After the lesson mostly I asked my friends and they told me in Turkish*”. Six students claimed that they used their friends’ notes because they could not take notes and listen to the lecturer simultaneously.

#### **4.2.3.3 Asking help from lecturers**

Twelve participants claimed that they asked help from lecturers. Those who ask help from lecturers noted that they asked lecturers to switch into Turkish or repeat the topic. Ten participants reported that they asked their professor about Turkish meaning of some terminologies that they heard in the lesson. One specific participant response regarding the translation of some terminology was “*After the lesson I went to professor’s office and asked him Turkish meanings of some terminologies*”.

#### **4.2.3.4 Using Turkish materials**

10 students reported that they used Turkish materials to compensate for lack of understanding in English. Four students in this category regularly used YouTube videos in Turkish to be able to understand the topic. Some of them claimed that besides benefitting from YouTube, they were also using Wikipedia or other Turkish websites. One student response was “When I did not understand the lecturer, at home I used YouTube or other websites in Turkish”. 5 students explicitly claimed that they found Turkish materials so helpful that they think going to class does not help them enough to understand the topic. One specific participant response regarding the benefit of using Turkish material was “*At home, I used websites or YouTube videos in Turkish and I understood the content of the lesson so I thought going class was not very necessary*”.

#### **4.2.3.5 Note Taking**

Seven students said that they used note-taking and went over the topics at home revising their notes. Some of the students in this category noted that they recorded lectures and listened to the lecture repeatedly at home. These students found note-taking very helpful. “*I listened to professor carefully, took note and even sometimes recorded professor’s voice and later reviewed the notes*”. Two students explicitly claimed that they took notes and later translated it into Turkish, through this way they could understand the topic better. “*I listened to the lecturer carefully and took note well, later I went home, and translated my note by using online dictionaries*”.

#### **4.2.3.6 Memorizing**

Six students claimed that they tried to learn unknown words in the lesson by heart. Two of them claimed that they read their note and noted unknown words, later looked into these words in the dictionary and wrote these words many times to learn by heart. *“I write somewhere unknown words or terminologies, later at home I check their meaning and try to write them many times to not to forget them”*. One student preferred the memorized the words by writing them on flashcards. The relevant response was *“I wrote unknown words on flashcards and later I reviewed them”*.

#### 4.2.3.7 Using no strategies at all

As many as thirty-six students reported that they do not use any strategies at all. The response was “*I did not use any strategies I gave up; I did not spend any effort to deal with problems*”. These students did not want to deal with these problems. More importantly, many of these students also stated that they did not approve of using English as a language of instruction and that education should be in the mother tongue. “*I did not do anything to deal with problems and I thought education should be in mother tongue, we do not need English*”. Twenty students reported that they did not know any strategies, in other words, they do not know how to deal with their challenges. One specific response was “*I did nothing to deal with these problems because I did not know how to get through it*”. The other specific answer was “*Actually I want to improve my speaking and reading skills but I did not know the way to improve my basic skills*”.

Table 17. Content Analyses of EMI Students Open-ended Questionnaire Responses

Questions	Themes	Category
How do you deal with your challenges in the lesson?	Use of Dictionary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Google Translate</li> <li>• other translator programs</li> <li>• digital dictionaries</li> </ul>
	Asking for help from friends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• using their notes</li> <li>• asking for translation</li> <li>• asking help in Turkish</li> </ul>
	Asking for help from Lecturers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• asking lecture in Turkish</li> <li>• asking for the translation of the terms in Turkish</li> </ul>
	Using Turkish materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• YouTube</li> </ul>



---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiki</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turkish Websites</li> </ul>
Note Taking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reviewing</li> <li>• translating</li> </ul>
Memorizing vocabularies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• writing words many times</li> <li>• using flashcards</li> </ul>
Not dealing with challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• giving up struggle</li> <li>• do not know how to deal with</li> </ul>

---

### **4.2.3 Do You Have Any Additional Comments That You Would Like to Share?**

At the end of the open-ended questionnaire section, participants were asked to write if they had any further comments. 48 respondents added their additional comments. Participants' comments were analyzed and three themes emerged. These themes were Turkish Medium Instruction, English preparatory school, and English for academic purpose, and more speaking opportunities.

#### **4.2.3.1 Turkish medium instruction**

Seven students suggested that university education should be in the mother tongue rather than in English. Three participants explicitly stated that they regretted choosing English medium department rather than Turkish medium departments. One response was *"I regretted to choose English language medium department, if my department was in Turkish language, it would be better for my success in the department"*. Another response was *"I thought that Education should be in mother tongue to understand topics better in the lesson, English medium instruction was unnecessary"*.

#### **4.2.3.2 English preparatory school and English for academic purpose**

The second most mentioned topic was a need for Academic English programs and short duration of English preparatory programs. Five students explicitly stated that they were not content with duration of preparatory school programs. They further reported that English preparatory schools' educations were not enough to improve basic skills such as speaking and writing skills. Moreover, in another two comments, it was mentioned that the preparatory school did not develop their skills to follow their departmental courses. Students also reported the necessity of academic English programs, one response was *"9 months preparatory English school was not enough we still had deficiencies in speaking and writing; we also need academic English"*. Another response was *"The language education that I took was not enough for me; I did not feel competent in the classroom. Also, we need to learn more vocabularies related to our departments"*. One specific answer regarding academic English needs, *"If we had academic English courses, it would be better for our own success"*.

#### **4.2.3.3 More speaking opportunities**

Two students claimed that they did not have enough opportunities to improve their speaking skills. They thought that because they were not offered opportunities to improve their speaking skills, they could not also participate in the lesson. One answer was *"We did not have enough speaking opportunities, if we had opportunities; we could maybe more competent while participating lesson"*. The other answer was *"We need to do speaking practice; I could not improve my speaking skill"*.

Table 18. Content Analyses of EMI Students Open-ended Questionnaire Responses

Question	Themes	Category
Do you have any additional comments that you would like to share?	Turkish Medium Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>education in mother tongue</li> </ul>
	English Preparatory School and English for Academic Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the short duration of English preparatory programs</li> </ul>
	More speaking opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improvement of speaking skills</li> </ul>

## **CHAPTER V**

### **DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND SUGGESTION**

The present study investigated the strategies EMI students use in their lessons. This chapter summarizes the research questions of this study and discusses the main findings by referring to previous studies. Then it concludes by offering suggestions for further research. Moreover, this chapter also presents the contribution of this research to the existing knowledge and related literature.

#### **5.1 DISCUSSION**

The current study set out to explore the following four research questions:

1. What language learning strategies do EMI students utilize in the lesson?
2. Does language learning strategy use change according to gender?
3. What challenges do EMI students face in the lesson?
4. How do EMI students deal with their challenges in the lesson?

##### **5.1.1 Overall and Categories of Strategy Use by Turkish EMI Students**

This study was conducted to get better insight into language learning strategies in the context of EMI. According to the descriptive statistics (namely mean and median scores), the study found that all strategy categories were preferred at medium level by EMI students, with metacognitive strategy being the first (M= 3.39). Metacognitive strategy use was not unexpected to be the most frequently used strategy because according to Vandergrift (1999) these strategies are important because they monitor and coordinate the language. This finding is confirmed by another study, which implied salient place of metacognitive strategy, as the authors of this study

states “*Students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction and ability to review their progress, accomplishments, and future learning directions.*” (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo, and Kupper, 1985) (p. 24). The prevalence of metacognitive strategies is not the case in the EMI context; it is also the case in ESL and EFL contexts. Extensive research shows that metacognitive strategies were found to get the highest preference among the students when compared to the other strategy categories in ESL (e.g. Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006, Oxford & Burystock, 1995; Ho & Ng, 2016) and in EFL setting (Ćirković-Miladinović, 2014; Park, 1997; Oxford, 1990; Nisbet, et al., 2005). There are similar results in Turkish EFL context as well (Mutlu, 2018; Balcı&Ügüten, 2018).

Moreover, the present study found that EMI students also preferred to control, evaluate and plan their language learning process. This finding is consistent with Griffith's (2008) description of the good language learner behavior which controlling the learning progress. To put it another way, language learners continue to use metacognitive strategies even if the context change and this is considered as one of the good qualities of EMI students. This conclusion is supported by other studies as well. For example, Balcı and Ügüten (2018) in their study with English preparatory school students (namely with EFL students) suggested that preparatory schools' intensive English programs allow students to use metacognitive strategies as they focus on the target language when receiving education and they continued to use the metacognitive strategies in various other contexts. In addition, in EMI context students are not supported by their lecturers in dealing with the learning process. Being alone in this process, EMI students regulate and evaluate their own language learning process.

In this study, the second most used strategy in EMI context was found to be the compensation strategy. This strategy emerged as the most commonly preferred strategies for EMI students. This finding is consistent with both EFL (e.g. Lan and Oxford, 2003) and ESL contexts as well (e.g. Hong-Nam and Leavell, 2006). The possible reason why this strategy is a favorite strategy among students in EMI context is related to the fact that EMI students have limited exposure to the target language and have limited language practice opportunities. A third commonly used strategy this study found was cognitive strategy. In ESL setting, while Hong-Nam

and Leavell (2006) found high rate of the use of cognitive strategy; Ćirković-Miladinović (2014) found medium level use in the EFL context. In Turkish EFL context, Mutlu (2018) and Yılmaz (2010) found cognitive strategy use as one of the highest.

In the current study, Social and Memory strategies had medium level of use and ranged as the fourth and the fifth most used strategies, respectively. The analysis of social strategies show that one strategy item 45, “*If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again*” was highly preferred by EMI students in the study settings. The possible reason of this high frequency of item 45 is that understanding the lecturer important to achieve a good GPA, therefore asking for lecturers or friends to slow down or repeat their conversation to better understand the topic in the classroom could be mostly preferred by EMI students. Likewise, item 1 “*I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English*”, memory strategy was highly favored by EMI students. It might be speculated that this item was favored because EMI students were always using English terminology words and they added new terminological words by relating the previous one.

Findings of the current study are somewhat consistent with the previous research, which reveal mixed findings. Nisbet et al. (2005) indicated that memory strategy was the least preferred strategy used by Chinese students. In Turkish EFL context, Yılmaz (2010) found medium use for both social and memory strategy. Tezcan and Deneme (2015) also found memory strategy as the least preferred one. According to Mutlu’s (2018) study, social strategy is the fourth favored strategy while memory strategy was the fifth. In addition, Hakan, Aydın, and Bulent (2015) found that except for memory strategy, Turkish undergraduate students use language learning strategy at a high level.

One of the most important findings of the present study is the least use of affective strategy among EMI students. This minimal use of affective strategy derives from students’ lack of knowledge about the management of their feelings. This finding is reflected on the frequency scores of participants; for instance, one item (item 42), *I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English* had high frequency. The frequency of this item indicates that EMI students are aware of their negative

emotions however, they do not seem to manage their negative emotions. This aspect of language learning strategies merits further attention in future research.

The present study also examines individual items including SILL. Three most preferred and three least preferred individual items were examined. The most preferred item was item 15 about benefiting from audio-visual materials to improve English ( $M= 4.08$ ). This item belongs to the cognitive category. In her study, Griffith (2008) cited this learning strategy as beneficial. She stated that benefitting from sources as a behavior of good language learner. A possible reason for using media devices could be related to compensating for lack of authentic input. The second most favored was item 32 which was about paying attention to people who are speaking ( $M= 4.0$ ) which belongs to the metacognitive category. EMI students do not have opportunity to see people speaking English around since and hearing English is only limited to their campus environment, therefore when they have the opportunity to hear English, they make use of this opportunity efficiently. This finding is also true for the EFL context, Altan (2004) found that item 32 was frequently used by English preservice teachers ( $M = 4.33$ ). The third most used strategy was item 29 which was about using the same or similar phrases when the student cannot think of an English word ( $M= 3.96$ ) which belong to compensation category. The use of these three most used strategies reveal that EMI students have limited authentic materials knowledge, and settings. Therefore they use these strategies to deal with their shortage of opportunities to learn English. The present study found that the least used strategy was item 43 ( $M= 1.86$ ) which belongs to affective strategy category. This finding is consistent with Altan's (2015) finding which also found item 43 as the least preferred strategy. Second least used strategy was item 6 and the third least used strategy was item 44 ( $M= 2.41$ , affective strategy)(see Table 8). Based on the analysis of these least used strategies, It can be speculated that EMI students did not share their feeling about the learning process. They do not write their feelings, not do they share their feelings with anyone. EMI students' reluctance to share their feeling about learning process is also the case for the item 42 on the students' awareness of their anxiety during learning process.

### **5.1.2 Language Learning Strategy According to Gender**

The study reported in the dissertation has also aimed to find out if there is any difference between male and female students regarding their use of language learning strategies. According to the results, there was not find any difference between male and female students in their preference of strategy. This means that strategy use is not determined by gender, but it is more about becoming aware of language learning strategies. As the students become aware of strategies, they are most likely to benefit from them irrespective of the gender variable. This finding is in line with some studies conducted in both in ESL setting (see for example, Ho and Ng, 2016) and in EFL setting (see for example, Nisbet, 2005). However, the study findings do not conform to the following studies, which found gender an important determinant of language learning strategies. For example Hong-Nam and Leavell, (2006) found female students used more affective strategies in the ESL context; moreover, Ho and NG (2016) found that female students use more vocabulary strategies compared to males. In EFL setting Gu (2002) and Lan and Oxford (2003) found that female students had higher level of strategy use. Peacock and Ho (2003) found female students use more metacognitive and memory strategies. In Turkish EFL setting, research report mixed findings. For instance, Tezcan and Deneme (2015) found higher strategy use in female students. However, similar to the current study, Balyer, Karatas, and Alci (2015) did not find any gender difference on language learning strategy use except for compensation strategy. In addition, Balcı and Ügüten (2018) did not find any difference on language learning strategy use but found memory strategies related to gender. It could be speculated that in the study the lack of gender effect on language learning strategies is related to the issue of gender gap. In the context of the study as most of the participants were from private universities in a metropole city, Istanbul where the gender gap is less felt it was not possible to detect gender difference

Regarding gender difference, when the most and least frequently used individual items are analyzed closely, it was found out that item 15 about using audio-visual materials in English had the highest mean, while item 6 about using flashcards to help to remember new vocabulary was revealed to be the least frequent one for male students. This finding is similar to Balcı and Ügüten's (2018) result that male



students' use of memory strategies are lesser than that of females. The least favorite item for female students was item 43 (M = 1.70) about using diary in English. Even though item 43 least preferred by females, it was also the second least favorite item for males, to put it another way, item 43 was generally less preferred item. That is to say, Turkish EMI students generally did not prefer to express their feelings through writing.

### **5.1.3 Challenges That EMI Students Face in the Lesson**

The study also found a variety of challenges faced by EMI students in the classroom. One of the challenges that they face is linguistic, failing them to understand the content completely. This was reflected qualitatively by a number of students (n = 79). The students stated that their language proficiencies are not enough to understand the course. As Kim (2011) claimed in his study 10.4 % advance level students could understand less than 90 % of the subject area, 14.8% of intermediate students understand less than 70% of the subject area. This challenge is also very crucial as a comprehension problem and could create bigger problems in lessons. One of these problems could be affective one. As they cannot understand the lesson, they feel anxious, nervous or lose their self-confidence, which makes the situation worse. This result is consistent with the least used strategy: affective strategies. If they know more about the ways to deal with affections, then they might feel much better.

A related problem that would potentially affect these students is viewing going to lesson as a waste of time, since they do not understand the lesson. This could become a serious problem if the students feel that they do not need to go the class and even drop school completely. Kırkgöz (2005) investigated EMI students' motivation and perceptions. According to the result of the study, she indicated that students had a concern on the comprehension of content areas. She stated that "*Given that EMI inevitably makes subject learning more difficult, do the benefits of acquiring English outweigh the costs, that is, additional strain caused?*" (p. 118). As she stated the critical point is weight the advantages and disadvantages of the program.

Importantly, comprehension issue mostly stems from language proficiency and EMI is seen as the scapegoat of this problem. However, this is not the case. There are other variables that also had a negative effect on the comprehension issue. One important variable is motivation. Until the tertiary level, students are not motivated to learn English as university entrance exams do not have English language part, moreover, they won't acquire it as they want. Selvi (2014) also commented on this issue as *"When English language instruction was taught using only rote memorization methods confined entirely within the walls of the classroom, the failure was attributed to the English language as a medium of instruction"* (p. 147). As Selvi (2014) stated, another possible reason for the comprehension problem is inadequate language education in elementary and high school education. As Kılıçkaya (2006) stated a possible solution to this problem, is providing Turkish – English medium of instruction programs. However, in their report, British Council (2015) did not suggest T-EMI. They stated that *"Mixed-medium T-EMI teaching has, from the evidence in this survey, proved largely ineffective, with staff and students developing strategies for circumventing the use of English in favor of Turkish"* (p. 14). Another reason for lack of understanding of the lesson content that students (N = 57) claimed was their lack of terminological knowledge. In the other comments section of the questionnaire these students also suggested that they need academic English courses. As a language support besides EMI classes could be helpful for the students. Another related problem is concerned with lack of understanding of academic journals. The students (N = 16) claimed that they could not understand the academic journals because they did not have adequate reading skills or terminology knowledge. From this point, it can be speculated that EMI students actually are not ready for EMI courses, in other words they are not well prepared for English medium courses.

The second challenge that students claimed was the issue of English accent used by lecturers. Participants related that they could not understand lecturers properly due to lecturers' accent. This could lead to missing knowledge or misunderstanding the content. Some students claimed that because of the lecturers' improper accent, they could not give their attention to the lesson or follow the course. Jensen, Denver, Mees, and Werther (2013) examined EMI students' attitudes towards the non-native lecturers' language proficiencies. In line with current study results, these authors also

found that students related language proficiency of lecturer with their general lecturing success and knowledge. To put it another way, lecturers' language proficiency is an indication of the quality of lectures for the students. Having said that it can be also noted that there could be other variables that lead students to misconception lecturer's accent or proficiency. For instance, students may tend to generalize a few pronunciation mistakes by reaching a general conclusion about the teacher's language proficiency. Moreover, another reason could be that students may not have an adequate listening skill to be able to comprehend the lesson; however, rather than their listening skill, they could make lecturers' accent a scapegoat.

The third difficulty that they struggle was the communication issue. Students claimed that they could not speak English with their foreign friends in the classroom and they could not participate in the lesson. The main reason for this lack of participation in the classroom is due to inadequate communicative skills and lack of opportunities to practice English. Participating in lecture, expressing oneself, asking questions about what he/she does not understand is very crucial for the comprehension of content. Participation is also important for the lecturer, through the students' participation, the lecturer could easily check whether students understand the content or not.

The fourth difficulty was about understanding the items in the exams. Students claimed that sometimes they could not understand the exam questions. As some of the students studied the exam at home through Turkish materials, they did not get familiar with English terminology and they failed to understand the questions. This situation led them to failure. Even though they knew the answer, because of inefficient linguistic ability, they could not express themselves and got a low grade. One student claimed that "*I could not transfer my knowledge to exam paper, sometimes I forget some vocabularies*".

Anxiety was the fifth challenge that students face. Students told that they felt anxious and nervous in the classroom that's why they became passive in the classroom, even did not come to lessons. This is a really significant problem. All the challenges that they face in EMI context can lead students to depression and demoralization. When students cannot overcome their anxiety in EMI context, after a certain period they may lose their self-confidence. Moreover, they could even label themselves as insufficient and unsuccessful and could drop school. Finally, with regard to the SILL

results, it was found that the least used strategy was affective strategies; this finding is consistent with an extensive research (Park, 1997; Wharton, 2000; Altan, 2004; Yılmaz, 2010; Hong-Nam&Leavell, 2006; Ćirković-Miladinović, 2014; Mutlu, 2018). These findings show that EMI students could not struggle with an emotional barrier, in other words, they did not know how to overcome.

### **5.1.3 Dealing with Challenges that EMI Students Face in the Lesson**

EMI students tried to find ways to deal with the challenges that they faced in order to be successful in the program, graduate with a good GPA and get a good experience with the best results. The most frequently used strategy by EMI students was using a dictionary. As it was mentioned before, the most commented challenge was a linguistic challenge, lack of comprehension. To deal with a lack of comprehension and other problems, students use dictionary by checking unknown words. However, the data show that improper use of dictionary causes mistakes. If students did not know how to use a dictionary, they could translate the text incorrectly leading to misunderstanding.

The second most preferred way to deal with challenges was getting help from friends. Through peer supports, students could comprehend lesson easily and can eliminate any misunderstanding about the subject area. They also benefit from friends' help to improve their writing skills by asking for friends notes. The finding of the current study is similar to previous research. For example, Kagwesage (2013) investigated the ways EMI students cope with their challenges. She indicated that getting help from friends, reading extensively, coming classes, doing assignments, and memorizing were their ways of struggle with their challenges. In another study, Evens and Morrison (2011) also claimed peer support as one of the strategies that Chinese students applied. In both two studies, learners get help from their friend in their mother tongue or in other words, the language that they express themselves more comfortably. Therefore, it can be concluded that while learning the content students feel comfortable in their mother tongue and they understand better.

The third strategy was getting help from lecturers. This is consistent with the fourth most frequently used strategy, social strategy. Rather than understanding the content

in English the students who participated in this study want to understand the topic in Turkish as they feel themselves safer. Kim (2011) illustrated that while students who had high proficiency level preferred native English speaker lecturers, students who had lower proficiency level preferred non-native lecturers as they could help in their mother tongue. This method makes the learning process more comfortable. Another benefit of lecturer's support is correcting any misunderstandings or misinterpretations. In addition, it is a time-saving method. Trying to understand all the topic at home could take much time, however asking lecturer and revising the topic with a lecturer is less time consuming. In addition, lecturers' support as a strategy indicated that students were not alone in their learning process; they were assisted by their professors. Another interesting point is that students were asking for help from the lecturers in their mother tongue as they were getting help from friends in their mother tongue which made them express themselves more comfortably

Using Turkish material was the fourth mostly cited solution to the problems faced. As academic journals and other academic materials are at advanced level of English, students who did not use to read in the target language and students who had lower language proficiency could not understand the materials. As a solution to these problems, students claimed that they use Turkish websites or Turkish journals. However, using Turkish material could have disadvantages. For example, as the students study the content with Turkish materials, they could not recognize the English meaning of terminology in the exam, which is one of the frequently reported challenges of EMI in the current study. Moreover, as they studied with Turkish materials they may not express what they know in the classroom, as they are not familiarized context in the target language.

The fifth solution to the problems that EMI students face was taking note. Students took note in the classroom or record their lecturers' voice to better comprehend the content. Because of incompetence in English, some students could not write in English or understand the lecture; therefore, they were just writing what lecturer said without any process of knowledge. Later at home, they reviewed the note and translated it into Turkish to understand better. Note taking is another efficient strategy as it helps the student to remember when they forget what they learned.

This is consistent with cognitive strategy item 17 which was about writing in English (e.g. letters, notes, messages) (M = 3, 29).

The sixth strategy that students applied was memorizing. As it was discussed in previous sections lack of vocabulary and terminology was the greatest problem of students in their content comprehension process. Students learn new vocabularies through memorizing. They wrote a list of individual words many times, in other words, students were using decontextualized vocabulary learning.

Last but not least, it was found that there are students who use no strategy at all. When it was asked about what strategies they were using to deal with challenges in EMI context, as many as 58 students claimed that they did not use any strategy and had no ideas as to how to deal with challenges. Throughout their education years, students lacked language strategy support. Even until now they did not have enough motivation to learn the target language because they did not use English in elementary school entrance exam or university entrance exams. However, now the English language is very crucial for them to understand the content and graduate from university. Therefore, they need to learn strategies that help them to eliminate the language barrier and struggle with their challenges.

Regarding the analysis of the additional comments, as many as seven students claimed that they want Turkish medium instruction. Students want their education in their own language because it may eliminate all the difficulties that they encountered in this program. They will understand the content and they will not have any problem with lecturers' accent, they will communicate comfortably, they will not have language problem in the exam and thus they will feel better. These comments are similar to a study conducted by Kılıçkaya (2006) who also found the same results for lecturers, they preferred TMI. Because of the language barrier that the students had to deal with, many students felt regret about studying a program in English.

Another comment that students wrote was a requirement for academic English and duration of English preparatory school program. They thought that nine months language education was not enough to solve their linguistic problem in EMI context and that the preparatory program at the university was not adequate which was in the same line with British Council report (2015). To put it another way, in

universities' preparatory programs, students did not feel prepared well enough to study in EMI context. That's why they suggested academic English programs as they could be more helpful for the passing from EFL context to EMI context. Despite all these arguments against EMI, it has many academic benefits. As many academic materials are in English, by learning English students could reach vast academic materials (Başıbek, et al., 2014). Moreover, as Kırkgöz (2014) mentioned in her study, EMI could open the door of opportunities for their future jobs.

## 5.2 CONCLUSION

This study investigated Turkish EMI students' language learning strategy, the challenges that they face in EMI context and their way of struggling with these challenges to help them to facilitate learning. This study also investigated whether or not gender has any effect on these students' use of language learning strategy. To present a more holistic picture, mix method study design was adopted and both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. First a demographic questionnaire and SILL (Oxford, 1990) were given to students and students then were given open-ended questionnaire. The Current study revealed both the previous literature on language learning strategy use in ESL, EFL and EMI contexts and previous literature on EMI in European and Asian contexts.

Results of quantitative data revealed that EMI students had medium level strategy use for overall mean strategy use ranging from 4.08 to 1.86. Among six categories of SILL (1990), all categories had medium level of strategy use, further analysis of categories revealed that while metacognitive strategy and compensation strategy were most frequently preferred strategies, memory and affective strategies were least frequently preferred strategies. Results indicated that EMI students preferred to manage their own learning process without assistance from an outsource. They liked to give their attention when English was speaking around them, had awareness on their mistakes. They searched for ways to be a good learner and think over their learning process. Another most favored strategy was the compensation strategy that EMI students used in order to cope with the knowledge deficiencies. Regarding here

they compensated unknown words with the words with similar meanings and they already knew. Regarding the infrequently used strategies, memory, and affective strategies' individual items, it could be concluded that EMI student preferred to bound knew knowledge to previous one. In addition to that, students were clear about what they feel but did not know how to overcome it. Regarding the most favored individual items, language learning strategy survey reveals that EMI students like watching TV and movies in English and during these activities they gave their attention when the English language was spoken, compensated for unknown words with words they already knew. In regard to infrequently used individual items, expressing feeling through writing, using flashcards, sharing feelings about their language learning process were not much preferred by EMI students. It could be inferred that EMI students were using opportunities for the sake of authentic context and they try to make up for unknown words. In addition, generally, EMI students had deficiencies in expressing their feeling on the learning process and had deficiencies in memory strategy.

With respect to gender's effect on the language learning strategy use, this study revealed that gender did not have any effect on overall language learning strategy use, on the categories of language learning strategy and on the most preferred individual items. There was only found the difference in infrequently used strategy items. For female students, while the least used strategy was writing about feelings on a language learning journey, for males benefiting from flashcards to remember words was less preferred.

Regarding the results of qualitative data, students indicated that they experienced many hardships in regard to education in English. These challenges included lack of understanding of the content, lecturers' accent, exam questions, and having problems in communication and having anxiety. All these challenges encountered are mostly linguistic-oriented difficulties. Firstly, students did not understand the lesson because they had limited vocabulary knowledge, especially for the lack of terminology. Secondly, students had problem with lecturers' accent. Because of the lecturers' accent and mispronounced words, they could not focus on the lesson and couldn't follow the lecture. Thirdly, they had communication problems with poor speaking skills to talk to foreign friends and participate in the lesson. Finally, students had



problems in passing the exam. Students had comprehension problem in the exam context. Because of poor writing and reading skill, they could not express their content knowledge.

In addition to linguistic challenges, students have challenges in regard to what it is called, affective strategies. According to SILL results, affective strategies were the most infrequently used means to deal with challenges. That is to say, EMI students could not control or overcome their anxiety or nervousness, however, detailed analysis of affective strategy items indicated that at least they were aware of their emotional state.

In regard to the strategies students use to cope with these challenges, the data reveal that students used several strategies such as using dictionary, asking for help from friends and lecturers, using Turkish material, note taking and memorizing vocabulary. Students used dictionary or translator programs to deal with comprehensibility problems. To deal with their poor vocabulary knowledge they were using a translator or dictionaries. At times when they could not struggle with these challenges, they got support from their friends and lecturers in their mother tongue, Turkish. Through the friends and lecturers' assistance, they reduced the possibility of getting misinterpretations and were able to review the subject. Another way of getting help using the mother tongue was by using Turkish materials and using Turkish media devices to understand the subject area. They also took note to review at home or translate it into the mother tongue. The last strategy that they use was memorizing vocabulary. Students were writing words several times to memorize new words. In addition, some of the students reported that they did not use any strategy to cope with challenges. They either did not prefer to use any strategy or know the way to overcome problems. Last but not least, students provided additional comments, where they reported that they felt regret about choosing EMI departments rather than Turkish departments. In this section they also complained about deficiencies on prep school and felt a need for EAP and more speaking activity.

### 5.3 SUGGESTIONS

Findings of this research have a number of suggestions in order for a better learning environment and curriculum development in EMI context. Overall language learning strategy of EMI students had medium mean score. This finding shows that EMI students need strategy training to gain more awareness on strategy use. They might be offered selective language learning strategy courses, or alternatively, within a course a module on strategy instruction could be added. In the selective courses, teachers should identify strategies of successful EMI learners and share these strategies with other EMI students. In addition, in these selective courses teachers should give students opportunities to practice strategies and teach them that they need to be patient because seeing the outcomes takes time. Teachers should also help students on less used strategies among EMI learners such as affective strategies and memory strategies. Lecturers should assist learners to use various affective and memory strategies. In addition, in regard to dictionary use as Wingate (2004) stated students lacked essential strategies to benefit from dictionary and they need strategy training which is also the case for EMI students. Now that they used dictionaries as a weapon to solve their comprehension problems, they need to be given strategy training on dictionary use in order for a better result.

The current study also found that EMI students faced challenges that impede their learning process and mainly the problems they faced were related to linguistic challenges. They could not understand the lesson, exam questions and they could not speak. These results revealed that student have poor language skills and that's why they have comprehension issues. Usually, before students take EMI courses, they get prepared for required language skills and their language competence is tested by preparatory schools. Therefore, all things considered, it could be inferred that the language education received in the preparatory school is not sufficient, in other words, it does not prepare students well enough for the English departments. Therefore, the programs of the preparatory schools should be revised. Also rather than general English students should receive academic English and they should have more speaking activities. Another recommendation from the results is about the

duration of language education. As the students mentioned, nine months of language education could not be sufficient. For EMI students' in order to have a strong language education background, the duration of preparatory schools should be extended. When quantitative and qualitative results are considered, it could be inferred that students knew when they were stressed but they did not know how to cope with. They felt anxious when they needed to speak in the lesson. Their anxiety came from poor language proficiency and comprehension. Psychological issues could lead to bigger problems therefore before these problems become too serious, some measures should be taken. For example, lecturers should help them to understand content through visual aids and at the end of the session, they should review the content in the mother tongue. Moreover, students could receive pedagogical help through the conferences organized by universities. Above all as it could be understood from all hardships that students experience, rather than top-down curriculum plan without students' inputs, EMI curriculum planner should pay attention to voices of EMI students first, and then they should plan the curriculum.

### **5.3.2 Suggestions for Future Research**

Taking into consideration the current study results, following recommendation could be carried out. Firstly, replication of the current study could be done in different education levels such as EMI in high school to gain more overview of EMI in different educational level and their effects on comprehension level. This study examined only EMI students' language learning strategies, future research could compare learners' strategies in three different contexts EMI, ESL and EFL to get an insight of language learning strategies and different effect of language learning strategies on three contexts. Moreover, the study examined one variable, gender difference in strategy use, future research needs to include other variables such as GPA, year of study and language proficiency to see the effect of various other factors on language strategy use. In addition, researchers could also add the viewpoints of not only EMI students but also lecturers' and policymakers to have more insight into EMI strategies. Researchers could also compare language learning strategies of EMI and TMI students, to clarify the differences between applied strategies on mother

tongue and the target language. Moreover, these issues could be examined in a longitudinal study if possible. For instance, to test the comprehension of EMI students, the researcher could investigate EMI students' strategies using pre and posttests to get more knowledge on EMI students' challenges and the ways to deal with these challenges. Another suggestion for a possible longitudinal study could be forming experimental and control groups after training on language learning strategy use through the pre and post tests. These two groups could be compared in terms of the effect of strategy use in EMI program and in terms of various variables.

## REFERENCES

- Agai-Lochi, E. (2015). English as medium of instruction in university education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 340-347.
- Ahmed, K. M., Peeran, S. W., & Ahmed, M. A. Q. (2015). Attitudes of Libyan dental and medical students toward the use of English language as a medium of instruction. *Dentistry and Medical Research*, 3(2), 53.
- Akyel, A. S., & Ozek, Y. (2010). A language needs analysis research at an English medium university in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 969-975.
- Alenezi, A. A. (2010). Students' language attitude towards using code-switching as a medium of instruction in the college of health sciences: an exploratory study. *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences*, 7(1), 1-22.
- Altan, M. Z. (2004). Nationality and language learning strategies of ELT major university students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(2), 1-11.
- ASEAN (2013). Keynote address by H. E. Le Luong Minh, Secretary-General of ASEAN at the British Council Conference on 'Educating the Next Generation of Workforce: ASEAN Perspectives on Innovation, Integration and English'. Bangkok,
- Atlı, I., & Özal, D. (2017) Does English medium instruction (EMI) make a difference on student motivation? *Journal of Language Research*, 1(1), 25-36.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Balci, Ö., & Ügüten, S. D. (2018). The Relationship between EFL learners' language learning strategy use and achievement. *International Education Studies*, 11(2), 1-12.
- Balyer, A., Karatas, H., & Alci, B. (2015). School principals' roles in establishing collaborative professional learning communities at schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1340-1347.

- Barrios, E., López-Gutiérrez, A., & Lechuga, C. (2016). Facing challenges in English Medium Instruction through engaging in an innovation project. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 228, 209-214.
- Başıbek, N., Dolmacı, M., Cengiz, B. C., Bür, B., Dilek, Y., & Kara, B. (2014). Lecturers' perceptions of English medium instruction at engineering departments of higher education: A study on partial English medium instruction at some state universities in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1819-1825.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 57, 278-287.
- Belhiah, H., & Elhami, M. (2015). English as a medium of instruction in the Gulf: When students and teachers speak. *Language Policy*, 14(1), 3-23.
- Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In Clements, P., Krause, A., & Brown, H. (Eds.), *Transformation in Language Education* (pp. 328-334). Tokyo: JALT.
- British Council & TEPAV (2015) *The state of English in higher education in Turkey*. Ankara, Turkey: TEPAV and British Council.
- Brumfit, C. (2004) Language and higher education: two current challenges. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 3, 163-73.
- Cammarata, L. (Ed.). (2016). *Content-based foreign language teaching: Curriculum and pedagogy for developing advanced thinking and literacy skills*. Routledge.
- Cankaya, P. (2017). Challenges in English Medium of Instruction from the teachers and students' eyes. *Online Submission*, 5(4), 830-839.
- Cesur, M.O., & Fer, S. (2007) Dil öğrenme Stratejileri envanterinin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması nedir? *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 49-74
- Chamot, A. (1990). Cognitive instruction in the second language classroom: The role of learning strategies. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round*

*Table on Language and Linguistics* (pp. 496-513). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.
- Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130.
- Chuo J.-C., & Lu, Y. H. (2018). Development and Challenges of English Taught Programs in Asian Countries: Take Taiwan as an Example. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5(4), 148-155
- Ćirković-Miladinović, I. (2014). Language learning strategies used by adult learners: Benefits for the teacher as a researcher. *Andragoške Studije*, 1(1), 165-184.
- Civan, A., & Coskun, A. (2016). The Effect of the Medium of Instruction Language on the Academic Success of University Students. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 16(6), 1981-2004.
- Cohen, A., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, A.D. (2011). L2 learner strategies. In E. Hinkel (Ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, Vol. II, Part V. Methods and instruction in second language teaching . Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39(1), 1-14.
- Collins, A. B. (2010). English-medium higher education: Dilemma and problems. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 10(39), 97-110.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative enquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd Ed). London, Sage.

- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction—A growing phenomenon*. London, England: British Council.
- Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers' attitudes towards English medium instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3), 455-486.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2011). Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 345-359.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). Future challenges for English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 213–221). Canada: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Constructing, administering, and processing*. Mahwah (New Jersey, the USA) and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Durmuş, S. (2009). Yabancıdilde eğitim ihaneti [Betrayal of foreign language education]. [Blog post.] Retrieved on the 15th of February from <http://www.bilgicik.com/yazi/yabanci-dille-egitim-ihaneti/>
- Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning<sup>1</sup>. *System*, 31(3), 313-330.
- Eser, O., & Dikilitas, K. (2017). Learners' perceptions of translation in English as the medium of instruction (EMI) at university level. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(8), 124-129.
- Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first-year experience in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(3), 198-208.



- Fillmore, C. J., Kempler, D., & Wang, W. S. (Eds.). (2014). *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*. Academic Press.
- Goodman, B. A. (2014). Implementing English as a medium of instruction in a Ukrainian University: Challenges, adjustments, and opportunities. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 130-141.
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297.
- Griffiths, C. (2008). *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge University Press.
- Griffiths, C. (2010). Strategies of successful language learners. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 1(3), 1-18.
- Graham, S. J. (2004). Giving up on modern foreign languages? Students' perceptions of learning French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 171-191.
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31(3), 367-383.
- Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC Journal*, 33(1), 35-54.
- Güneşligün, E. (2003). *Eğitim sistemimizin hızlayayılan tümörü – Yabancı dilde bilim ve öğretim yanılgısı* [A fast-spreading tumor of our education system – Fallacy of foreign language education and doing science]. TMMOB II. Öğrenci Üye Kurultayı Bildirisi, pp.99–109. Retrieved on the 5th of February from [http://www.emo.org.tr/ekler/0340694826ab06b\\_ek.pdf](http://www.emo.org.tr/ekler/0340694826ab06b_ek.pdf)
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Arnold.

- He, J. J., & Chiang, S. Y. (2016). Challenges to English-medium instruction (EMI) for international students in China: A learners' perspective: English-medium education aims to accommodate international students into Chinese universities, but how well is it working? *English Today*, 32(4), 63-67.
- Ho, A. P., & Ng, L. L. (2016). Gender-based differences in language learning strategies among undergraduates in a Malaysian public university. *Issues in Language Studies*, 5(2), 1-17.
- Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34(3), 399-415.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Huang, Y. P. (2018). Learner Resistance to English-medium instruction practices: a qualitative case study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(4), 435-449.
- Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. London: Penguin
- Jensen, C., & Thøgersen, J. (2011). Danish University lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Ibérica*, 22(22), 13-34.
- 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*, 12(1), 87-112.
- Joe, Y., & Lee, H. K. (2013). Does English-medium instruction benefit students in EFL contexts? A case study of medical students in Korea. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 22(2), 201-207.
- Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.
- Kagwesage, A. M. (2013). Coping with English as language of instruction in higher education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2(2), 1-12.

- Karakaş, A. (2015). Orientations towards English among English-medium instruction students. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(1), 1-38.
- Karataş, H., Balyer, A., & Alci, B. (2015). An Investigation of Undergraduates' Language Learning Strategies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1348-1354.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2006). Instructors' Attitudes towards English-Medium Instruction in Turkey. *Online Submission*, 8(6), 1-12.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English-medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 101-123.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2014). Students' perceptions of English Language versus Turkish Language Used As the Medium Of Instruction In Higher Education In Turkey. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(12), 443-459.
- Kim, K. R. (2011). Korean professor and student perceptions of the efficacy of English-medium instruction. *Linguistic Research*, 28(3), 711-741.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as a medium of instruction in Asian education (from primary to tertiary): Implications for local languages and local scholarship. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), 99-120.
- Köksal, A. (2002). *Yabancı dilde öğretim: Türkiye'nin büyük yanılgısı* [Foreign-medium instruction: Turkey's great delusion]. Ankara: Öğretmen Dünyası.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 440-464.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *Tesol Quarterly*, 40(1), 59-81.
- Kym, I., & Kym, M. H. (2014). Students' perceptions of EMI in higher education in Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(2), 35-61.

- Lan, R., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *IRAL*, 41(4), 339-380.
- Liyanage, I., & Bartlett, B. J. (2012). Gender and language learning strategies: Looking beyond the categories. *The Language Learning Journal*, 40(2), 237-253.
- Min, Q., Wang, Z., & Liu, N. (2018). Integrating a cloud learning environment into English-medium instruction to enhance non-native English-speaking students' learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 56(4), 1-12.
- Mutlu, A. (2018). *Dil öğrenme inanışları ve dil öğrenme stratejileri: ingilizce öğretmen adayları üzerine birçalışma (Balıkesir üniversitesi örneği)*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved on the 15th of March from <http://dspace.balikesir.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/3382>
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978) *The Good Language Learner. Research in Education Series No.7*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nisbet, D. L., Tindall, E. R., & Arroyo, A. A. (2005). Language learning strategies and English proficiency of Chinese university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 100-107.
- Nosratinia, M., Saveiy, M., & Zaker, A. (2014). EFL learners' self-efficacy, metacognitive awareness, and use of language learning strategies: how are they associated?. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(5), 1080-1092.
- Oruç, N. (2008). English medium Instruction: Does It Work?. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17(1), 345-356
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner- Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning*, 35(1), 21-46.

- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Othman, J., & Saat, R. M. (2009). Challenges of Using English as a Medium of Instruction: Pre-service Science Teachers' Perspective. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher (De La Salle University Manila)*, 18(2), 307-316.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle.
- Oxford, R. L. (Ed.). (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Park, G. P. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(2), 211-221.
- Phillips, V. (1991). A look at learner strategy use and ESL proficiency. *Catesol Journal*, 4(1), 57-67.
- Phillipson, R. (2015). English as a Threat or Opportunity in European Higher Education. *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education: English in Europe*, 4, 19-42.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peacock, M., & Ho, B. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 179-200.
- Reiss, M. A. (1981). Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 65(2), 121 -128.
- Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press, New York. Retrieved on the 10<sup>th</sup> of March from <http://www.cambridge.org/elt/teacher-support/pdf/Richards-Communicative-Language.pdf>.

- Rivero-Menéndez, M. J., Urquía-Grande, E., López-Sánchez, P., & Camacho-Miñano, M. M. (2018). Motivation and learning strategies in accounting: Are there differences in English as a medium of instruction (EMI) versus non-EMI students?. *Revista de Contabilidad*, 21(2), 128-139.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51.
- Rubin, J. (1981). Study of Cognitive Processes in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 117-131.
- Ryhan, E. (2014). The role and impact of English as a language and a medium of instruction in Saudi higher education institutions: Students-instructors perspective. *Study in English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 140-148.
- Selvi, A. F. (2014). The medium-of-instruction debate in Turkey: Oscillating between national ideas and bilingual ideals. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15(2), 133-152.
- Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System*, 36(2), 156-171.
- Soruç, A., Dinler, A., & Griffiths, C. (2018). Listening comprehension strategies of EMI students in Turkey. In *Key issues in English for specific purposes in higher education Springer*, 11, 265-287.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(4), 304-318
- Sultan, S., Borland, H., & Eckersley, B. (2012, July). *English as medium of instruction (EMI) in Indonesia public junior secondary school: Students' language use, attitudes/motivation and foreign language outcomes*. In ACTA International TESOL Conference, Cairn Australia, Victoria University.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language teaching research*, 4(3), 251-274.

- Swales, J. M. (1997). English as Tyrannosaurus rex. *World Englishes*, 16(3), 373-382.
- 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(4), 252-270.
- Tran, T. V. (1988). Sex differences in English language acculturation and learning strategies among Vietnamese adults aged 40 and over in the United States. *Sex Roles*, 19(11-12), 747-758.
- Tezcan, S., &Deneme, S. (2015). A study on language learning strategy use of young Turkish learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 42-48.
- Tsui, A. P. Y., & Ngo, H. Y. (2017). Students' perceptions of English-medium instruction in a Hong Kong University. *Asian Englishes*, 19(1), 57-78.
- Tung, P., Lam, R., & Tsang, W. K. (1997). English as a medium of instruction in post-1997 Hong Kong: What students, teachers, and parents think. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(4), 441-459.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 53(3), 168-176
- Vann, R. J., & Abraham, R. G. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *Tesol Quarterly*, 24(2), 177-198.
- Yeh, C. C. (2014). Taiwanese students' experiences and attitudes towards English-medium courses in tertiary education. *RELC Journal*, 45(3), 305-319.
- Yılmaz, C. (2010). The relationship between language learning strategies, gender, proficiency and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 682-687.

- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language learning*, 50(2), 203-243.
- Wingate, U. (2004). Dictionary use the need to teach strategies. *Language Learning Journal*, 29(1), 5-11.



## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX-1

Sevgili Katılımcılar, bu çalışma “Üniversitelerde Yabancı Dilde Eğitim Alan Öğrencilerin Dil Bariyerini Aşabilmek için Kullandıkları Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri ve Karşılaştıkları Zorlukları” incelemektedir. Cevaplarınız araştırma dışında hiç bir şekilde başka kişilerle ya da kurumlarla paylaşılmayacaktır. Ayırdığınız vakit ve samimi cevaplarınız için teşekkürler.

1. Cinsiyetiniz

\_\_\_\_\_ Bay                  \_\_\_\_\_ Bayan

2. Yaşınız

.....

3. Sınıfınız

...1. Sınıf    .....2. Sınıf    .....3.Sınıf    .....4.Sınıf    .....Yüksek Lisans    ..... Doktora

4. Bölümünüz

.....

5. Not Ortalamanız .....

6. İngilizce Seviyeniz

.....Başlangıç Seviye    .....Temel Seviye    .....Ortanın Altı Seviye    .....Orta Seviye.....Ortanın Üstü Seviye.....İleri Seviye

Teşekkürler

APPENDIX-2

**DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ**  
Oxford (1990)

Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri İngilizce'yi Yabancı Dil olarak öğrenenler için hazırlanmıştır. Bu envanterde İngilizce öğrenmeye ilişkin ifadeler okuyacaksınız. Her ifadenin sizin için ne kadar doğru ya da geçerli olduğunu, derecelendirmeye bakarak, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5' ten birini yazınız. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiği ya da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, sadece sizin yaptıklarınızı ne kadar tasvir ettiğini işaretleyiniz. Maddeler üzerinde çok fazla düşünmeyiniz. Maddeleri yapabildiğiniz kadar hızlı şekilde, çok zaman harcamadan ve dikkatlice işaretleyip bir sonraki maddeye geçiniz. Anketi cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 10-15 dk. alır.	1= Hiçbir zaman doğruduğil	2= Nadirendoğru	3= Bazendoğru	4= Sıkıkdōğru	5= Her zaman doğru
1. İngilizce'de bildiklerimle yeni öğrendiklerim arasında ilişki kurarım.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri hatırlamak için bir cümlede kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri akılda tutmak için kelimenin telaffuzuyla aklıma getirdiği bir resim ya da şekil arasında bağlantı kurarım.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Yeni bir kelimeyi o sözcüğün kullanılabileceği bir sahneyi ya da durumu aklımda canlandırarak, hatırlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Yeni kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için, onları ses benzerliği olan kelimelerle ilişkilendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için küçük kartlara yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Yeni kelimeleri vücut dili kullanarak zihnimde canlandırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
8. İngilizce derslerinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık tekrar ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Yeni kelime ve kelime gruplarını ilk karşılaştığım yerleri (kitap, tahta ya da herhangi bir işaret levhasını) aklıma getirerek, hatırlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Yeni sözcükleri birkaç kez yazarak, ya da söyleyerek, tekrarlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Anadilimde bulunmayan İngilizce'deki "th /θ / hw " gibi sesleri çıkararak, telaffuz alıştırmaları yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Bildiğim kelimeleri cümlelerde farklı şekillerde kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
14. İngilizce sohbetleri ben başlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
15. T.V.'de İngilizce programlar ya da İngilizce filmler izlerim.	1	2	3	4	5
16. İngilizce okumaktan hoşlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
17. İngilizce mesaj, mektup veya rapor yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
18. İngilizce bir metne ilk başta bir göz atarım, daha sonra metnin tamamını dikkatlice okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimelerin benzerlerini Türkçe'de ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
20. İngilizce'de tekrarlanan kalıplar bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
21. İngilizce bir kelimenin, bildiğim kök ve eklerine ayırarak anlamını çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5

22. Kelimesi kelimesine çeviri <b>yapmamaya</b> çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Dinlediğim ya da okuduğum metnin özetini çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimelerin anlamını, tahmin ederek bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
25. İngilizce konuşurken bir sözcük aklıma gelmediğinde, el kol hareketleriyle anlatmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Uygun ve doğru kelimeyi bilmediğim durumlarda kafamdan yeni sözcükler uydururum	1	2	3	4	5
27. Okurken her bilmediğim kelimeye sözlükten bakmadan, okumayı sürdürürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Konuşma sırasında karşımdakinin söyleyeceği bir sonraki cümleyi tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Herhangi bir kelimeyi hatırlayamadığımda, aynı anlamı taşıyan başka bir kelime ya da ifade kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
30. İngilizce’mi kullanmak için her fırsatı değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Yaptığım yanlışların farkına varır ve bunlardan daha doğru İngilizce kullanmak için faydalanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
32. İngilizce konuşan bir kişi duyduğumda dikkatimi ona veririm.	1	2	3	4	5
33. “İngilizce’yi daha iyi nasıl öğrenirim? “ sorusunun yanıtını araştırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
34. İngilizce çalışmaya yeterli zaman ayırmak için zamanımı planlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim kişilerle tanışmak için fırsat kollarım.	1	2	3	4	5
36. İngilizce okumak için, elimden geldiği kadar fırsat yaratırım.	1	2	3	4	5
37. İngilizce’de becerilerimi nasıl geliştireceğim konusunda hedeflerim var.	1	2	3	4	5
38. İngilizce’mi ne kadar ilerlettiğimi değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
39. İngilizce’mi kullanırken tedirgin ve kaygılı olduğum anlar rahatlamaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Yanlış yaparım diye kaygılandığımda bile İngilizce konuşmaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
41. İngilizce’de başarılı olduğum zamanlar kendimi ödüllendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
42. İngilizce çalışırken ya da kullanırken gergin ve kaygılı isem, bunun farkına varırım.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Dil öğrenirken yaşadığım duyguları bir yere yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
44. İngilizce çalışırken nasıl ya da neler hissettiğimi başka birine anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Herhangi bir şeyi anlamadığımda, karşımdaki kişiden daha yavaş konuşmasını ya da söylediklerini tekrar etmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Konuşurken karşımdakinin yanlışlarımı düzeltmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Okulda arkadaşlarımla İngilizce konuşurum.	1	2	3	4	5
48. İhtiyaç duyduğumda İngilizce konuşan kişilerden yardım isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Derste İngilizce sorular sormaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
50. İngilizce konuşanların kültürü hakkında bilgi edinmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5

### APPENDIX -3

1. Derslerde karşılaştığınız zorluklar nelerdir?

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

2. Derslerde karşılaştığınız zorluklarla nasıl başediyorsunuz?

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

3. Başka yorumunuz var mı?

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

Saygılarıyla,

Betül Özkara

## CURRICULUM VITAE AND CONTACT DETAILS

**1.Name / Surname:** Betül ÖZKARA

**2. Date of the birth:** 03.09.1992

**3.Status:**English Instructor

**4.Affiliation:** Ministry of National Education

**5. Experience:**

2016 – Present English Instructor - Ministry of National Education

**6. Education:**

2016 – 2019 MA degree, English Language Teaching – Sakarya University –  
Institute of Educational Sciences

2011 – 2015 BA degree, English Language and Literature – Erciyes University –  
Faculty of Arts

**Conferences:**

2018 “An Investigation into the Relationship between Turkish EFL Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Burnout Level (Betül ÖZKARA) - CUELT, 4th Çukurova International ELT Teachers Conference – Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey

**Publication:**

2019 An Investigation into the Relationship between Turkish EFL Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Burnout Level (Betül ÖZKARA) - Journal of Family Counseling and Education

**Contact Details:**

English Instructor Betül ÖZKARA

Ministry of National Education

E-mail: [betul.trkmn@gmail.com](mailto:betul.trkmn@gmail.com)