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**Executive summary of the strategic recommendations:**

**For university leaders**

* **to reflect the importance of *holistic* EME development, provision, and training in institutional level policies and international strategies**
* **to view multilingualism, parallel language use, and translanguaging as assets in EME**
* **to standardise students’ admission to EME groups through language proficiency tests**
* **to increase the number of teachers with language proficiency tests**
* **to recognise the value of highly competent non-native-speaker teachers and move away from an over-evaluation of native-speaker Englishes**
* **to agree a benchmark level of funding for supporting the implementation and development of EME**
* **to standardise salaries for both EMI and English language teachers, in order not to destabilise the market and introduce perverse motivations for delivering EMI**
* **to build the online and offline resource base to support teachers and students in their preparation for classes and assessments**
* **to support students and teachers in their language proficiency improvement through English courses, extracurricular workshops, and discipline-specific language trainings**
* **to actively monitor teachers’ implementation of the British Council programme and assess the results at the end of the year**
* **to promote and support collaboration between language and content teachers**
* **to** **provide teachers with the right to initiate, request, and shape their EMI professional training in collaboration with teachers of similar disciplines at other universities in the country and overseas**
* **to continue to engage with external stakeholders (including British Council) treating professional development as a shared responsibility**.

**For teachers and university leaders**

* **to combat any fixation on the development of English proficiency alone (since that is not one of the EMI objectives) and concentrate on the broader educational environment shaping teaching and learning practices.**

**For professional bodies and training providers**

* **to address specific disciplinary needs and best practice through sector-wide discipline-specific training**
* **to deliver training in hybrid mode, where the materials could be available online and the active engagement of teachers achieved by bringing them together physically.**

**For the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education**

* **to consider establishing an EME Development Unit at sector-wide level to help to grow the EME training capacities within the country.**
1. **Introduction**

This report assesses the EMI (English Medium Instruction) in Higher Education (HE) project, a joint initiative of the British Council and the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan, organised as a response to national reform in HE. Responding to the role of EME (English Medium Education[[1]](#footnote-1)) in the development of the internationalisation agenda set out in the Presidential Decree *Concept of Development of the Higher Education System of Uzbekistan until 2030* (2019), the project being evaluated here set out to train a team of EMI professionals who would deliver high-quality EMI programmes at 16 state universities which would then cascade their knowledge of EMI pedagogy to EMI teachers across the sector. Provided by the Norwich Institute of Language Education (NILE), UK, the project’s longer-term aim is to help universities develop their EMI strategies and facilitate capacity-building for EMI development in HE nationally.

Following a competitive process, the evaluation contract was awarded to the team from the University of Westminster in London. The research team conducted an evaluation focusing on the main strands identified in the British Council Evaluation Framework. This report details the collected data and draws out research-driven strategic recommendations for EME stakeholders in Higher Education in Uzbekistan.

1. **EME and EMI globally and contextually**

The standard definition of EMI is set out in Dearden (2014: 2): “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”. EMI as a *research field* is relatively new, but the phenomenon has already been metaphorically described as an “unstoppable” (Macaro 2015: 7) or ‘runaway’ train, which has arrived in Uzbekistan as well as many other countries around the world without English as an official language. In 2021 there were 27,874 EME courses worldwide (British Council 2021) and their number is growing rapidly. Largely associated with internationalisation, EMI is thought by influential agents in many countries to play a crucial role in the realisation of internationalisation agendas. However, the consensus of researchers is that “a convincing case for internationalization through EMI has still not been made… the ideological assumption that internationalization through EMI improves societies is still questionable…” (Bowles & Murphy 2020: 21). Since EMI is so widely pursued in HE, there is a great need for supportive and thoughtful studies to help stakeholders in universities and the relevant ministries manage the challenges that EMI brings with it.

EME has been helpfully conceptualised in the recently developed ROAD-MAPPING Framework by Dafouz and Smit (2020), showing that it indeed spans beyond mere *instruction* (classroom delivery) and entails an interplay of several key factors, or, as the authors of the framework call them, ‘dimensions’. These dimensions include *Roles of English*, *Academic Disciplines*, (Language) *Management*, *Practices and Processes*, *Internationalisation and Glocalisation*, which are all interconnected and revolve around the *Discourse* dimension. This holistic approach to EME is also supported by British Council which has been investigating EME and contributing to the research field via numerous studies worldwide, not least in Central Asia and the South Caucasus (Linn & Radjabzade 2021). Veitch (2021: 12), for example, writes of “a holistic approach to EME which recognises that EME in HE impacts on the whole education system, institution and curriculum”.

British Council supported research in the region has suggested that EME may have the strongest chance to evolve and develop successfully under certain conditions, such as good funding, clear internationalisation strategies, and commitment to English language skills development (Linn, Shrestha, Bezborodova & Hultgren 2021). The implementation of high-quality EME also faces numerous challenges, and enthusiastic acceptance in Uzbekistan as elsewhere may not always address those challenges. The results of the research study from the South Caucasus show that “…there are non-trivial practical challenges for both students and teachers in engaging with the experience, and support for the enterprise [of EME] tends to be limited in HE institutions, which introduce EME without notable training and support for those involved” (Linn & Radjabzade 2021: 54). In many respects, this is a common issue for EME, and it is important that local implementation be fully aware of the research findings from across the world and respond to them in developing the best possible infrastructure around EME provision.

Uzbekistan is a country where only a small percentage of the population knows English. Based on a study conducted in 112 countries among non-native speakers of English, Uzbekistan is designated a “very low” English proficiency country (EF English Proficiency Index 2021). Uzbekistan was ranked 88/100 globally in 2021, and 18th out of 24 countries in Asia. Despite this low base, EME is pursued with great enthusiasm by the government and in wider society. Liddicoat (2019) states that the association of English with modernisation and internationalisation has also positioned English as the dominant foreign language within the education system, and at the tertiary level in particular. English is used as a medium of instruction at most international universities (including those HEIs not linked to anglophone countries) as well as at state universities where “English groups” are becoming more prevalent in response to national guidelines on the development of HE.

The importance of English and a desire to strengthen its position in Uzbekistan has resulted in a number of decrees and official orders. For example, the presidential decree that was signed in 2012 *On Measures to Further Improve Foreign Language Learning System* highlighted the importance of foreign language learning. As a follow up to this decree, with effect from the academic year 2013/14, all schoolchildren started learning English from the first grade, aged six or seven. In 2013 the Cabinet of Ministers’ order *On Adopting the State Educational Standards of Continuous Education in Uzbekistan* outlined the alignment of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) levels to the state requirements. In 2017 the President signed an order *On Further Development of the Education System* which led to the *English for Academics* programme of the British Council. This focused on English language learning and prepared teachers from different disciplines to develop skills for effective study abroad. As a result, a group of successful graduates were sent abroad for short courses, Masters and PhD programmes (British Council Newsfeed 2020). A further decree signed the same year lists IELTS or TOEFL test score as an alternative for the English language section of the national standardized test that students take to be accepted at HE institutions.

In 2019 the President signed the decree with the profoundest impact on the implementation of EME, *Concept of Development of Higher Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030*. According to the decree, at least 10 universities in Uzbekistan should be ‘internationally recognized’. International ranking is tightly connected with the research activity of the university, and HEIs are adopting measures to increase the number of outputs in peer-reviewed journals. However, these measures do place researchers and teachers under significant pressure. To help realise the long-term aims of the decree, the British Council initiated the EMI in Higher Education project under evaluation here.

It should be noted that the involvement of external NGOs is not limited to the British Council, however. In 2020 the Minister of Education signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the President of Education First, the Swedish company responsible for the annual English Proficiency Index referenced above, that grants Uzbekistan $60 million of direct investment for English language development in the country (Kun.uz 2020).

The government has also set the expected proficiency level for teachers of English and EMI teachers and the exact deadline for achieving it. The Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan decree on *Effective Measures to Organize the Promotion of Foreign Language Learning* (2021) specifies that by the 2024-2025 academic year 50 % of EMI teachers working in state universities must have a national certificate of at least B2 level or equivalent. By the same year, teachers of foreign languages working in general secondary, secondary specialized, and vocational education institutions must have a national certificate of at least B2 level or equivalent. The base for these goals is the CEFR, where B2-level users are described as “independent users of language”, able to function in a workplace in English.

The most recent development is a Presidential decree *On Measures to Bring the Promotion of Foreign Languages in the Republic of Uzbekistan to a Qualitatively New Level* (2021), which stresses the importance of English in education through the improvement of the quality of education in foreign languages, training qualified teachers for the field and increasing the population’s interest in learning foreign languages. As a result of the decree, the Agency for Promoting Foreign Language Learning (LPA), organised under the Uzbekistan Cabinet of Ministers, was established with the task of realising the above-listed goals.

EMI is a major phenomenon in Uzbekistan, and it is growing rapidly within HE. In addition to simply evaluating the project, this report is intended to underscore for the relevant authorities that they are involved in something more global and impactful than a more narrowly conceived *EMI*, and that there is a need to understand the phenomenon holistically as ***EME***.

1. **Methods**

Our previous research on EME and EMI in Uzbekistan has aimed at developing a university language policy (Linn et al. 2020) and mapping the current practices of teachers, students and administrators (Bezborodova & Radjabzade 2021). Broader research on EME in the region has also analysed this phenomenon in relation to the internationalisation of HE and its local implementation (Linn et al. 2021). In all the above studies and in the current impact evaluation project our core approach is *people-centred*, in line with the previous work of the NILE team, who also tailor their training to the needs of teachers and their students identified through the needs assessment. The current project intervention serves the main goal of understanding what the stakeholders in EME in Uzbekistan need to be better served. The theoretical basis for the evaluation is ROAD-MAPPING (see section 2 above) which allows the researcher to “zoom in” on the different dimensions of EME, including agency, practices and processes, and language management. To tie in the ambition of HE in Uzbekistan to realise its internationalisation strategy, our evaluation will follow the Key Development Indicator (KDI) matrix (Diaz 2020) which comprises *governance*, *management*, *praxis* and *outcomes*.

Since the British Council requirements for the evaluation explicitly dictated the data collection methods, the project team conducted interviews with the main stakeholders, distributed an online survey, and carried out desk research. The data presented in the report is based on 325 student and 159 teacher online survey responses, three one-hour-long focus group discussions with each of students, teachers, and university leaders, as well as a one-hour interview with the NILE team and separately with British Council representatives. Semi-structured interviews with the partner universities’ senior leaders, teachers, students, NILE partners, and British Council Uzbekistan representatives were tailored to each group enabling us to clarify or question best practices and areas of main concern. This report also utilises the online survey, mentioned above. The existing questionnaire from our earlier studies in Central and South Asia as well as the South Caucasus was adapted to include the questions that helped the research team understand what the reality of the training needs is and what the different agents believe their training should focus on.

The time-limited evaluation project started in late January and finished in late March 2022. The initial findings presented in this report help furnish a better, evidence-based understanding of the impact of EMI in HE as it expands exponentially. Focusing on the four strands that the British Council identified for evaluation (i.e., relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, and headline recommendations), we identify areas for further focus in EMI training and EME development in Uzbek HE in general.

1. **The NILE training programme**

The British Council strategy project for EMI in Higher Education in Uzbekistan was delivered between October 2019 and March 2021 by a team of trainers from NILE. NILE has a long history of working with teachers from Uzbekistan. The responsive approach that they chose in setting up the course allowed the team to undertake a needs-based analysis through class observations, interviews with stakeholders, Ministry representatives and the British Council team. In addition, NILE senior adviser, Rod Bolitho, who has more than 15 years of experience working with teachers in Uzbekistan, provided a valuable resource at the planning stage. Multiple insights from this stage and the professional experience of the training team formed fundamental principles relating to awareness-raising, the receptive and productive skills of learners, multilevel classes, teachers’ awareness about their proficiency level and how to manage that, etc.

The first stage of training was based on identifying quite broad typical needs, mainly focusing on very practical aspects of delivering sessions through English where some topics and content were informed by CLIL methodology. In subsequent phases (two and three), the content and the training responded specifically to the needs of teachers. The NILE team could then proceed identifying needs, responding to those needs, and implementing them in another phase of the project.

Given that some stages of the project delivery had to be done remotely and the training was partially conducted online during the pandemic, the NILE team were satisfied with the results of their work. They stated that they were able to engage with the numbers that they hoped to reach, were able to maintain engagement physically and remotely, and sustain completion of activities among participants. Most importantly, according to the NILE team, they managed to empower the teachers so they could feel ownership for the training, make their voices heard, and respond to their needs accordingly.

Most teachers were also very happy with the training, which was evident from the focus group discussions and online survey responses. Out of 159 teachers who took part in the online survey, 91 took the training course (the tables with the data are included in the Appendix).

The online survey results show that for 79.1% of the teachers the course content met all their expectations (table 1). The course was also considered to be relevant to the teachers’ needs by 80.2% of the participants, while 13.2% thought that it was irrelevant (table 2). 90.1% would recommend this course to other colleagues (table 3) and 82.4% of teachers would take a similar course again (table 4). All these views also found support during the focus group discussions.

68.1% stated that the knowledge gained during the course was easy to apply, 20.9% were neutral regarding this statement, while 11% considered that the gained knowledge was difficult to apply (table 5). The focus group discussion indicated that many teachers could use some of the software applications they had learned, some activities, and teaching techniques with their students during the online period of teaching, but they could not apply them all yet. Overall, the training sessions on the use of e-resources and software applications were highly appreciated by the teachers.

Appreciation for the opportunity to work *in collaboration* was one of the most common comments during the focus group discussions. In the online survey, 78% of teachers reported that they enjoyed working in collaboration with other colleagues, 13.2% were neutral, and 8.8% reported dissatisfaction (table 6). The NILE team also stated that ESP and EMI teachers’ collaboration was one of the key aspects of the project. During the interview they also highlighted that collaboration and support from the ESP teachers for their EMI colleagues can only happen if it is strategically driven by the institutions. If ESP teachers continue to work with EMI teachers, to observe them, to help them with the materials, to help them with their training, they need to be given time and be rewarded financially to do so.

When the NILE team was asked about the willingness of teachers from Uzbekistan to take part in peer observations, they were also positive. The team members noted that the teachers were open and eager to receive feedback on their classes. The teachers, even though they did not specifically highlight that they wish to be observed themselves, were eager to observe someone else’s classes. The online survey results also show that peer observations were welcomed by 74.7% of teachers (table 7). The content teachers in particular expressed willingness to observe EMI classes in their disciplines at different universities in the country and overseas.

While the teachers during the interviews highlighted the importance of the NILE team’s feedback on their progress, the online survey results for feedback from students were less positive. Only 60.5% of teachers agreed that they benefited from their students’ feedback, 23.1% remained neutral, and 16.5% disagreed that student feedback was helpful (table 8). One reason for high numbers for “disagree” and “neutral” responses may be that it is not very common to ask students to give feedback on teaching at state universities.

Overall, the cohort of teachers enrolled in the training was also open to what the trainers were offering. NILE trainers did not experience any resistance from the participants. 75.8% of teachers also appreciated the opportunity to critically reflect on their teaching practice, 15.4% evaluated their engagement with critical reflection on their teaching as neutral, while only 8.8% thought that critical reflection did not help them to improve (table 9).

Confidence with the use of the tools (i.e., peer observation form, template for critical incident reflection, learner feedback form, EMI course syllabus template, and checklist to self-evaluate confidence in relation to professional development competencies) developed during the course; 75.8% of teachers considered themselves confident, 14.3% were neutral, and 9.9% were not confident (table 10). Among the key tools that were developed during the project, the most frequently used by the teachers was the *Methodological Guidelines for Teaching English as the Medium of Instruction (EMI) in Higher Education in Uzbekistan*. It is used all the time or often by 65.9% of teachers. The document has been adopted by the Ministry as a teaching standard framework, which is a unique descriptor of EMI teaching practice that is now a national resource. This is a major step towards the development of EME in the country and a good sign of bottom-up policy development.

Teachers’ participation in the course was believed to be supported by the university/administration by 70.3% of the participants, while 20.9% did not think the university/administration supported them well. During the interviews, a few teachers stated that they were overwhelmed with their teaching responsibilities, participation in the training, and domestic responsibilities (table 11). Even though 64.8% did not consider their participation in the course in addition to their teaching to be time-consuming, 14.3% thought that training was time-consuming (table 12).

The online survey also explored what the participants liked most and least about the training. Among the best practices are work in collaboration, teaching methods and techniques, course organisation, specific tools taught (e-tools and online software in particular), friendly/safe learning space, and professionalism of the NILE trainers. The areas for improvement included course length (teachers would like the course to last longer), delivery mode (a high preference for offline mode), and low level of English proficiency of some participants.

1. **Headline findings following the Key Development Indicator matrix**
	1. **Governance**

This parameter of the matrix encompasses decision-making at the highest administrative level, focusing on the processes and practices of agents regarding policy implementation, university international strategy, and resourcing. A well-rounded sense of how the university leaders felt about their experience with the teacher training projects was realised through the focus group discussions with 17 university leaders from 15 universities. Overall, the university leaders were pleased with the training and would ideally like to continue to be part of the programme. They said that staff are motivated, and some of the leaders also took part in the training to better understand it.

* + 1. **Policy Implementation**

The focus group discussions showed that reasons for taking part in the project for the university leaders were not so much to do with a commitment to EME pedagogy, but rather a response to perceived or actual strategic requirements by the university. The 2019 presidential decrees noted above, and in particular *Concept of Development of Higher Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030*, clearly influence their commitment to internationalise HE by significant expansion of EMI. Believing that achieving a rank amongst the top 1000 of world universities “all depends on knowledge of English”, university leaders and senior managers are highly focused on world rankings, the attraction of international staff and students, and publications in Scopus journals. These colleagues spoke more about support for *research* in the focus groups than they did about the furtherance of EMI pedagogies.

It was also evident that there is little agreement on how the policies are interpreted across the state universities. This particularly applies to the increase in salary for the teachers of English and those teaching through EMI. In the LPA policy document (2021) it is stated that if teachers have C1 level (CEFT or IELTS equivalent) in English, they are eligible for a 50% salary increase. Those who have a B2 level are entitled to a 40% increase. During the focus group discussions, university leaders referenced salary bonuses of 40%, 15%, “double bonus”, indicating significant discrepancy. There is an assumption that salaries will be enhanced for those who take part in EMI and then it is up to the individual university to decide by how much. **It is recommended that institutions standardise salaries for both EMI and English language teachers**, in order not to destabilise the market and introduce perverse motivations for delivering EMI. It should be as attractive to teach EMI courses in all universities to combat the phenomenon of teachers seeking to move employer based on how EMI is rewarded.

* + 1. **University International Strategy**

Most universities have international strategies, which focus heavily on EME, but there is also evidence of recognition of other languages. By way of example, the Andijan Machine Building Institute is committed to other languages as part of an internationalisation strategy not focusing solely on English, which is good practice; there was reference to a new language centre with resources in Korean, Japanese and French, with German materials also planned. The idea of the internationalisation of HE is largely realised through ‘more English’, and university leaders wish for a disciplinary focus in future teacher training, so their interest is very much in English for Specific Purposes rather than generic pedagogies. **It is recommended** **that there is a role to be played here by professional bodies as part of a multi-sector approach to supporting an English-medium professional community**.

It also became apparent that university leaders are focused on native speakers, both visiting and permanent staff. 66% of teachers and 64.9% of students think that international staff are an important factor in EME. The results for the presence of international students are a little lower with 61% of teachers and 58.2% of students’ responding favourably. An obsession with the native-speaker model is not necessarily helpful. On the one hand, the presence of native speakers may enhance the university profile (against one particular performance indicator), but without proper support for the local staff and students, it may lead to certain tensions and result in numerous inequalities**. It is recommended that universities recognise the value of highly competent non-native-speaker teachers and move away from an over-evaluation of native-speaker Englishes**, which have less relevance in an economy where virtually all users of English are precisely not native speakers.

During the focus group discussions with the university leaders and teachers, we sensed a valorisation of EMI as ‘a thing’ rather than a set of processes and practices, a sort of tokenism or label for something that should be done, rather than more strategic thinking about the useful practices of EME and the potential for culture change within the university. There is a dangerous teleology in the notion that, “if you do ‘EMI’, you can get into international rankings”. This disconnect between developing pedagogy and enhancing students’ experience on the one hand and *doing* ESP or ‘EMI’ may be detrimental to university practices. Therefore, **it is recommended that universities’ international strategies should reflect the importance of holistic EME development with a clear strategy for EMI provision, training, and language support for all stakeholders**. **We also strongly advise this holistic approach to be reflected in institutional level policies on EME.**

* + 1. **Resourcing**

Another concern arising from the interviews with university leaders and with teachers was the amount of budget available for supporting EMI. The findings show that such funds are very variable, giving rise to concern about equality of opportunity. Some said that there is nothing available at the institution to support EMI training going forward, while other universities reported a generous budget. Proper funding for EME as in education in general is a significant consideration. Linn et al. (2021) included a case study of a small private university in neighbouring Kazakhstan which was seen to present optimal conditions for EME development, one of which was “…a more than adequate level of resourcing”. The recent Presidential Decree that grants financial freedom to selected HEIs in the Republic is a promising opportunity for institutions to allocate funds for EME development. One way to invest in the development of EME is already observed at Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, where an Education Development Centre is being established. **It is recommended that universities agree a benchmark level of funding for supporting the implementation and development of EME and share best practice in this area**. EME cannot be well implemented without proper consideration being given to the resources required to support it.

* 1. **Management**

The next parameter in the KDI matrix involves decision-making at the level of faculty and department. It concerns student admissions, staff and students’ language competence, teaching and learning resources, and professional development support.

**5.2.1 Student Admissions**

During the focus group discussions, it became apparent that students at state universities were not selected to join an EMI group based on their language proficiency tests, which is a requirement at international universities. Most students had never taken any of the proficiency tests and were selected to EMI groups based on an internal exam, interview, or by simply signing up for them. As noted above, without standardised English proficiency tests, students and teachers end up in a mixed-level classroom environment, where it may be difficult to ensure a uniformly positive experience without proper training and support from the university.

**5.2.2 Students’ Language Competence**

Of the 325 student survey responses, 52.3% are from Tashkent Medical Academy (table 13). Even though the data set provides little sector-wide insight, it still reflects the practices of students in the state university context.

88% of students use more than one language when at university (table 14). The use of the national language, Uzbek, prevails in communication with other students and teachers outside class, during office hours and supervision meetings, formal meetings, and trainings, and even in email writing. English is predominant in the classroom and research, however the difference between the use of English and Uzbek is very insignificant in all cases, which is a sign of *parallel language use* in practice, a “concurrent use of languages in one area” (Hultgren 2016: 158) (table 15—23). The data shows that during class only 30.2% of students use English, almost exactly in line with the use of Uzbek (27.4%), which points to translanguaging. From a theoretical linguistic perspective and in relation to pedagogical practice, translanguaging is a widely discussed topic in EMI. Defined as a meaning-making practice of bilinguals and multilinguals to maximise their communication, translanguaging is viewed as normative language mixing, which is a liberating practice in EME (Garcia & Li Wei 2014; Li Wei 2018). **It is recommended that a rather low percentage of English use in class should not be considered a negative characteristic, but it should be viewed as a reality that cannot be ignored**. Stakeholders in EME should view it as a multilingual endeavour which is in itself a powerful educational tool.

Overall, when students were asked if they think that their English level meets their needs at university, 46.5% stated that they are met to some extent and 12.6% replied that they are not met at all, which are rather high numbers indicating that students need (or perceive that they need) to develop their language capability (table 24). This is supported by the figures on how well students can discuss their academic subjects in English and their native language. 44.6% of students state that they can discuss their academic subjects in both English and their native language, while 41.5% feel more confident doing so in their native language. The number of those who find it easier to discuss their academic subjects in English is low (13.8%) (table 25).

Most students (73.2%) have never taken an English proficiency test, but 26.8% of students who took proficiency tests mostly reported IELTS results with band 8 being the highest score, and band 5 being the lowest. Those few students who reported their CEFR scores have them ranging from B1 to B2. It is assumed that those students who have their proficiency tests in place took them to enter the international HEIs, where these tests are required. Overall, the study findings show that there are no standardised English proficiency requirements across the universities, which renders EMI classes mixed-level. During the interviews numerous teachers professed this to be one of their biggest challenges.

Rating the importance of their fluency in English as a factor in quality EMI provision, 54.5% of students deem it important, while only 20% think the opposite (table 26). Overall, English language development is a key motivation for 72.6% of students to study through EMI along with its associated opportunities to get a higher salary (52%) and work in international companies (51.7%) (table 27). These findings suggest that from the student perspective EMI is not only about the educational experience; it is a very generic thing, and it is future-focused.

**5.2.3 Teachers’ Language Competence**

Along with their subject knowledge, 85.5% of teachers stress for themselves the idea of good English proficiency as one of the most crucial factors of a good EMI course, while for students their teachers’ language skills are of lesser importance.

Survey results show that 60.4% of teachers think that their level of English proficiency meets their needs at the university, and 37.7% think that it is only the case to some extent. The results also indicate that, in line with the students’ responses, the greatest motivation for 67.3% of teachers to teach through EMI is also to improve their English proficiency and for 65.4% it is an opportunity to professionally develop (table 28). Most teachers (85.5%) also rate their own fluency as a more important factor of good EME than the students’ fluency (65.4%).

66% of teachers can discuss their academic subjects in both English and their native language, and 14.5% felt that it is easier to do that in English (table 29). Most of the teachers (62.9%) have IELTS certificates ranging from 5.0 to 7.5. CEFR and Aptis level results range from B1 to C1. **It is recommended that the number of teachers with language proficiency tests should be increased** which will allow for training to be based on a real training needs assessment. It will also enable teachers to receive a higher salary.

71.1% of the teachers were offered a course to improve their English by their university, but 73.6% were still looking for additional English support outside the university. This may signify that either the courses offered at the university are not sufficient, or not continuing, compelling teachers to seek support outside the academy, which they may be funding from their own resources.

It should be noted that the EMI in HE project, although good, has unintended consequences for the management of the workforce because there are ancillary compelling reasons why teachers seek to improve their English proficiency, notably the opportunity to work in international universities with a higher salary. To give an example, during the focus group discussions, one of the state university teachers revealed that some of their colleagues with a good English level, who took part in the EMI training, have left the university for an international one, and now the teacher also hopes to improve their English proficiency and use their EMI certificate to gain employment elsewhere. **It is recommended that efforts be made to combat any fixation on the development of English proficiency alone (since that is not one of the EMI objectives) and concentrate on the broader educational environment shaping teaching and learning practices.**

**5.2.4 Educational Resources**

Survey results show that for 60.3% of students the importance of access to online resources and for 60.9% access to English resources in the library are important factors in EME. The numbers are higher for teachers. 71.1% evaluate online and 76.7% offline resources as one of the most important factors in effective EME. But the focus group data shows that the availability of English resources online and offline is still a big issue in HE in Uzbekistan. Lack of reference resources in the university library compels both students and teachers to search for the information elsewhere, which may result in increased dissatisfaction with EME. **It is recommended that universities develop their online and offline resource base to support teachers and students in their preparation for classes and assessments. Viewing multilingualism, parallel language use, and translanguaging as assets in EME, the resources should not be limited to English-only books and articles.**

**5.2.5 Language and Professional Development Support from the University**

61% of teachers would wish to continue the training programme being evaluated here, 58.5% would want their university to provide them with more support with their English development, and 57.2% would want to have more training on how to teach through English (table 30). Even though 74.2% of students took courses offered at the university (e.g. ESP or EAP) to improve their English, 93.5% of students would also sign up for additional English courses if their university offered them, which shows overwhelming interest in the development of English proficiency. **It is recommended that the universities consider additional English courses, extracurricular workshops, and discipline-specific language trainings to facilitate students in their English development.** More than half of students (52.6%) who took part in the online survey stated that they have taken courses outside the university to improve their English. From the focus group discussions with students and teachers, we found some good practices of initiating English speaking and debating clubs at a few participating HEIs, but there could be more. Universities seeking to develop EME might consider various means of English language support for students including setting up writing centres, speaking and reading clubs, subject-specific clubs in English. *It is worth reiterating that 93.5% of students would be very likely sign up for any additional English professional support if offered* (table 31).

42.2% of the students (table 32) also stated that they are exposed to more English in their spare time than in university, listening to music, watching movies, reading, etc. On the one hand, this figure demonstrates that the students are keen to use English outside academia, but, on the other, it signifies that the opportunities for nearly half the students to use English when at university may be no greater than in the rest of their lives. **It is recommended that universities provide more opportunities for students to engage with English outside class, creating university spaces that encourage students to develop their language skills**.

What is interesting is that the majority of students considered that the most important factors of a good EMI course are teachers’ subject knowledge (76.3%) and their teaching abilities (78.5%), which shows that in students’ perspective it is the pedagogical skills training, which is the most valuable, while the findings from the teachers’ survey and the focus group discussions with the university leaders show that for them EME is mostly about developing English proficiency. When asked what else the university or external provider could do to help in improving EMI teaching experience, teachers replied that they would want the training programme to continue, and they would also appreciate support with English development. **It is recommended that future EMI teacher trainings should take into account research-evidenced EMI practices that often different to anecdotal assumptions about what is important in EMI.**  Future trainings should not only further develop teachers’ pedagogical skills, but also share and debate research findings on the matters of proficiency of teachers and students, English-only ideology, multilingualism, and translanguaging.

* 1. **Praxis: Academic Disciplines**

The final parameter focuses on the practices around the use of English and other languages across disciplines. Following the most commonly referenced classification of academic disciplines by Biglan (1973), the online survey responses show that the 16 participating HEIs include a range of *pure hard* (e.g. mathematics, chemistry, biology), *pure soft* (e.g. history, geography, psychology), *applied hard* (e.g. IT, medicine, food safety), and *applied soft* disciplines (e.g. business, law, education).

The online survey also attempted to assess whether teachers and students considered the importance of discipline-specific literacies in their EMI classes. Not surprisingly, the highest importance here was assigned to specialised vocabulary by 80.5% of teachers and 65.8% of students. During the interviews, students also raised their concerns with the specialised vocabulary that they often struggle with, and indeed discipline-specific literacies appeared for many informants to be limited to vocabulary teaching and learning. The least important factors according to the teachers’ survey responses are ‘teaching nuanced differences when reading discipline-specific texts (e.g., grammar, genre, structure)’ with 66.1% of responses, followed by ‘teaching nuanced differences when writing discipline-specific texts’ with 66.7% of responses. Even though the numbers in all categories are rather high, during the interviews none of the informants mentioned the importance of academic literacies in the EMI classroom. What was stressed, however, was a desire to observe discipline-specific classes in different universities.

1. **Evaluation Findings**

Following the four evaluation criteria that the British Council identified for the project, we particularly wish to highlight the following:

**6.1 Relevance**

Overall, the findings suggest that the project stakeholders felt it to be very relevant. The training focused on diversifying EMI teaching methodology. The teachers particularly appreciated, for example, the use of scaffolding techniques and software. However, in terms of inculcating a broader EMI pedagogy framework, informed by the international debate on EMI identified by Mendez-Garcia and Agullo (2020), future training should also emphasise translanguaging pedagogy and assessment practices.

**6.2 Effectiveness**

The effectiveness of the training was also highly evaluated. British Council representatives themselves stated that the “course has exceeded expectations”. The teachers and university leaders were also particularly pleased with the enhanced and ongoing collaboration between language and content teachers. Effective collaboration between language and content specialists has long been one of the central desiderata in the literature (Costa and Coleman 2013), which requires financing (Macaro 2018) for effective EMI development. Collaboration via the training has already established a solid base for teachers’ cooperation across disciplines within each participating university. The training identified key pedagogical principles in EMI, common-core and divergent EMI practices, and obstacles to overcome. **It is recommended that this good practice should continue; and content and language teacher collaboration should be encouraged and supported.** Taking this good practice, Macaro (2022: 12) suggests that there should be a “jointly established research agenda” that would allow language and content teachers to own the EMI agenda in their context.

Another point that the teachers made was that the impact of the training may have been greater had it been delivered *offline* because it would be a more enjoyable experience, but there is no direct evidence to suggest that the online delivery of the course was less effective. **It is recommended that in future any training should be delivered in hybrid form**, where the materials could be available online and the active engagement of teachers achieved by bringing them together.

We should also acknowledge that it may be too early to judge the effectiveness of the training, which will emerge in retrospective reports by teachers. In a year we should be able to look at the materials that the teachers are using, how they are organising their classes, and the extent of innovation in their assessments. **It is recommended that universities actively monitor teachers’ implementation of the training and assess the results at the end of the year.**

**6.3 Sustainability**

The intended sustainability of the course via the cascading of the training does indeed appear to be happening within and without the universities. Another means of maintaining ongoing enthusiasm for development is observed in teachers’ willingness to participate in more EMI training and to undertake discipline-specific class observations. Finally, the materials and tools developed by the NILE team remain available to help teachers embed EMI pedagogies. On 17 March 17, 2022, the Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan endorsed the EMI guidelines developed as part of the project with recommendations to Uzbek universities to use them. However, to what extent these materials will continue to be used in the future and to what ends does remain to be seen.

**6.4 Headline Recommendations**

* **It is recommended that HEIs reflect the importance of holistic EME development, provision, and training in institutional level policies**. This will help mainstream EME and resist tokenism. Such an approach will also support a discourse in which ‘top-down’ meets ‘bottom-up’. Ideally, the discourse should shift from a perceived disjuncture between fixation on “the world top 1000” and “publications in Scopus journals” at one end of the continuum and teachers’ fixation on “getting better at English to secure a job at a better university” at the other end towards a clearer understanding of the complexity of EME. If an institution can adopt the NILE model and commit to *EME as a pedagogy*, it would recognise the need to address EME *challenges* in teaching and learning practices and agree priorities in EME development, leading to a shared perspective across all key stakeholders.
* **It is recommended that HEIs standardise students’ admission to EME groups through language proficiency tests**. Only in this way will teachers be able to address the challenges arising from teaching mixed-level classes, and students will also be better equipped to learn the content in English at the same pace.
* The fact that students enter the university with a certain level of English does not mean that they do not need any additional support with their English proficiency development. I**t is recommended that HEIs support them in their language proficiency improvement not only through standard ESP or EAP classes but also with resources and extracurricular activities in English**. Teachers also need language support and EME professional development training support within the university.
* What is apparent from the survey results and interviews is that ‘one-size-fits-all’ professional training in EMI may need to be reconsidered to address more specific disciplinary variations and teachers’ professional needs. Professional development opportunities should be diversified to provide EMI teachers with support on the sources they can best deploy in class, the teaching methods they should apply to address discipline-specific skills, and what disciplinary literacies to focus on. **It is recommended that professional bodies in different professional areas address specific disciplinary needs and best practices in their professional training.** This is a national challenge that should be supported by relevant professional organisations.
* Since teachers are the most familiar with the norms and standards in their disciplines, with due support from their HEIs, **it is recommended that university leaders provide teachers with the decision-making right to initiate, request, and shape their EMI professional training within their departments, faculties, schools, and in collaboration with teachers of similar disciplines at other universities in the country and overseas**. For university leaders, **it is also recommended to continue to engage with external stakeholders (including British Council) treating professional development as a shared responsibility**.
* I**t is recommended that the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education consider establishing an EME Development Unit at sector-wide level to help to grow the EME training capacities within the country**. Such a unit could run professional development training, conduct EME research, disseminate the holistic approach to EME in the country, and monitor the work of EME programmes.
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**Appendix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 46 | 50.5 | 50.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 26 | 28.6 | 79.1 |
| Neutral | 12 | 13.2 | 92.3 |
| Strongly disagree | 4 | 4.4 | 96.7 |
| Disagree | 3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 1: “The course content met all my expectations”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 48 | 52.7 | 52.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 25 | 27.5 | 80.2 |
| Strongly disagree | 7 | 7.7 | 87.9 |
| Neutral | 6 | 6.6 | 94.5 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 2: “The course was relevant to my needs”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Strongly Agree | 48 | 52.7 | 52.7 |
| Agree | 34 | 37.4 | 90.1 |
| Strongly disagree | 6 | 6.6 | 96.7 |
| Neutral | 2 | 2.2 | 98.9 |
| Disagree | 1 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 3: “I would recommend this course to other colleagues”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Strongly Agree | 45 | 49.5 | 49.5 |
| Agree | 30 | 33.0 | 82.4 |
| Neutral | 8 | 8.8 | 91.2 |
| Strongly disagree | 6 | 6.6 | 97.8 |
| Disagree | 2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4: “I would happily take part in a similar course again”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 37 | 40.7 | 40.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 25 | 27.5 | 68.1 |
| Neutral | 19 | 20.9 | 89.0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5.5 | 94.5 |
| Strongly disagree | 5 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 5: “The knowledge learned during the course is easy to apply in practice”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Strongly Agree | 43 | 47.3 | 47.3 |
| Agree | 28 | 30.8 | 78.0 |
| Neutral | 12 | 13.2 | 91.2 |
| Strongly disagree | 6 | 6.6 | 97.8 |
| Disagree | 2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 6: “I enjoyed working in collaboration with other colleagues”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 40 | 44.0 | 44.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 28 | 30.8 | 74.7 |
| Neutral | 12 | 13.2 | 87.9 |
| Strongly disagree | 7 | 7.7 | 95.6 |
| Disagree | 4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 7: “I was eager to do peer observations”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 37 | 40.7 | 40.7 |
| Neutral | 21 | 23.1 | 63.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 18 | 19.8 | 83.5 |
| Strongly disagree | 10 | 11.0 | 94.5 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 8: “I benefited from students’ feedback”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 39 | 42.9 | 42.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 33.0 | 75.8 |
| Neutral | 14 | 15.4 | 91.2 |
| Strongly disagree | 6 | 6.6 | 97.8 |
| Disagree | 2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 9: “My engagement with critical reflection on my teaching practice helped me to improve”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 36 | 39.6 | 39.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 33 | 36.3 | 75.8 |
| Neutral | 13 | 14.3 | 90.1 |
| Strongly disagree | 7 | 7.7 | 97.8 |
| Disagree | 2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 10: “I am using the tools developed during the course with confidence”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Strongly Agree | 33 | 36.3 | 36.3 |
| Agree | 31 | 34.1 | 70.3 |
| Strongly disagree | 14 | 15.4 | 85.7 |
| Neutral | 8 | 8.8 | 94.5 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 11: “My participation in the course was supported by my university/administration”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 38 | 41.8 | 41.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 21 | 23.1 | 64.8 |
| Neutral | 19 | 20.9 | 85.7 |
| Strongly disagree | 7 | 7.7 | 93.4 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |  |

Table 12: “Taking the course in addition to my teaching was not time-consuming”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Tashkent Medical Academy | 170 | 52.3 | 52.3 |
| Karakalpak State University | 28 | 8.6 | 60.9 |
| Urgench State University | 23 | 7.1 | 68.0 |
| Tashkent State Pedagogical University | 19 | 5.8 | 73.8 |
| Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization Engineers | 15 | 4.6 | 78.5 |
| University of World Economy and Diplomacy | 14 | 4.3 | 82.8 |
| Samarkand branch of Tashkent State University of Economics | 12 | 3.7 | 86.5 |
| Tashkent State Institute of Oriental Studies | 12 | 3.7 | 90.2 |
| International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan | 8 | 2.5 | 92.6 |
| Fergana State University | 6 | 1.8 | 94.5 |
| Tashkent State University of Law | 6 | 1.8 | 96.3 |
| Bukhara State Medical Institute | 4 | 1.2 | 97.5 |
| Andijan Machine-Building Institute | 2 | .6 | 98.2 |
| Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology | 2 | .6 | 98.8 |
| Uzbekistan State University of Journalism and Mass Communication University | 2 | .6 | 99.4 |
| Uzbekistan World Languages University | 2 | .6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 13. Students’ responses from the universities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Yes | 286 | 88.0 | 88.0 |
| No | 39 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 14. “Do you (students) use more than one language when at university?”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 163 | 50.2 | 50.2 |
| National language, Other | 44 | 13.5 | 63.7 |
| English | 40 | 12.3 | 76.0 |
| Other | 26 | 8.0 | 84.0 |
| English, National language, Other | 25 | 7.7 | 91.7 |
| English, National language | 21 | 6.5 | 98.2 |
| Not applicable | 4 | 1.2 | 99.4 |
| English, Other | 2 | .6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 15. Students’ use of languages with other students outside class

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 168 | 51.7 | 51.7 |
| English | 47 | 14.5 | 66.2 |
| National language, Other | 30 | 9.2 | 75.4 |
| Other | 29 | 8.9 | 84.3 |
| English, National language | 25 | 7.7 | 92.0 |
| English, National language, Other | 17 | 5.2 | 97.2 |
| English, Other | 6 | 1.8 | 99.1 |
| Not applicable | 2 | .6 | 99.7 |
| Other, Not applicable | 1 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 16. Students’ use of languages with teachers outside class

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | English | 98 | 30.2 | 30.2 |
| National language | 89 | 27.4 | 57.5 |
| English, National language, Other | 45 | 13.8 | 71.4 |
| English, National language | 33 | 10.2 | 81.5 |
| Other | 27 | 8.3 | 89.8 |
| National language, Other | 17 | 5.2 | 95.1 |
| English, Other | 14 | 4.3 | 99.4 |
| Not applicable | 2 | .6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 17. Students’ use of languages during class

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 154 | 47.4 | 47.4 |
| English | 46 | 14.2 | 61.5 |
| National language, Other | 35 | 10.8 | 72.3 |
| Other | 31 | 9.5 | 81.8 |
| English, National language, Other | 23 | 7.1 | 88.9 |
| Not applicable | 19 | 5.8 | 94.8 |
| English, National language | 15 | 4.6 | 99.4 |
| English, Other | 2 | .6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 18. Students’ use of languages during office hours

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 135 | 41.5 | 41.5 |
| English | 77 | 23.7 | 65.2 |
| National language, Other | 31 | 9.5 | 74.8 |
| Other | 28 | 8.6 | 83.4 |
| English, National language | 19 | 5.8 | 89.2 |
| English, National language, Other | 19 | 5.8 | 95.1 |
| Not applicable | 13 | 4.0 | 99.1 |
| English, Other | 3 | .9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 19. Students’ use of languages during supervision meetings

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 93 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| English | 88 | 27.1 | 55.7 |
| Other | 41 | 12.6 | 68.3 |
| English, National language, Other | 40 | 12.3 | 80.6 |
| English, Other | 23 | 7.1 | 87.7 |
| National language, Other | 18 | 5.5 | 93.2 |
| English, National language | 15 | 4.6 | 97.8 |
| Not applicable | 6 | 1.8 | 99.7 |
| Other, Not applicable | 1 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 20. Students’ use of languages to email

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | English | 110 | 33.8 | 33.8 |
| National language | 76 | 23.4 | 57.2 |
| English, National language, Other | 42 | 12.9 | 70.2 |
| Other | 32 | 9.8 | 80.0 |
| English, Other | 21 | 6.5 | 86.5 |
| English, National language | 20 | 6.2 | 92.6 |
| National language, Other | 19 | 5.8 | 98.5 |
| Not applicable | 5 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 21. Students’ use of languages for research purposes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 131 | 40.3 | 40.3 |
| English | 68 | 20.9 | 61.2 |
| National language, Other | 34 | 10.5 | 71.7 |
| English, National language, Other | 28 | 8.6 | 80.3 |
| Other | 26 | 8.0 | 88.3 |
| English, National language | 18 | 5.5 | 93.8 |
| English, Other | 13 | 4.0 | 97.8 |
| Not applicable | 4 | 1.2 | 99.1 |
| English, Not applicable | 3 | .9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 22. Students’ use of languages during formal meetings

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | National language | 100 | 30.8 | 30.8 |
| English | 91 | 28.0 | 58.8 |
| English, National language | 34 | 10.5 | 69.2 |
| English, National language, Other | 31 | 9.5 | 78.8 |
| Other | 27 | 8.3 | 87.1 |
| National language, Other | 23 | 7.1 | 94.2 |
| English, Other | 9 | 2.8 | 96.9 |
| Not applicable | 8 | 2.5 | 99.4 |
| Other, Not applicable | 2 | .6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 23. Students’ use of languages during training sessions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | To some extent | 151 | 46.5 | 46.5 |
| Yes, completely | 133 | 40.9 | 87.4 |
| No | 41 | 12.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 24. “Do you (students) think your level of English proficiency meets your needs at university?”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | I can discuss my academic subjects in both English and my native language | 145 | 44.6 | 44.6 |
| I am more confident using my native language to discuss my academic interests | 135 | 41.5 | 86.2 |
| Discussing my academic subjects in English is much easier for me compared to my native language | 45 | 13.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 25. Which of the following sentences is true about you (students)?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Important | 93 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| Very important | 84 | 25.8 | 54.5 |
| Neutral | 83 | 25.5 | 80.0 |
| Relatively important | 47 | 14.5 | 94.5 |
| Not at all important | 18 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 26. Importance of students’ English fluency in EMI classroom

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| It helps me improve my English skills | 236 | 72.6 |
| It allows me to earn a higher salary now or in the future | 169 | 52.0 |
| It gives an opportunity to work in international companies | 168 | 51.7 |
| It gives me access to the most up-to-date knowledge | 167 | 51.4 |
| It teaches international or global content | 156 | 48.0 |
| It uses the most up-to-date materials | 142 | 43.7 |
| It uses the most up-to-date methods of teaching | 124 | 38.2 |
| It stresses the importance of international research practices | 89 | 27.4 |
| It is prestigious | 77 | 23.7 |
| It offers less crowded classes | 49 | 15.1 |
| It has fewer teaching hours than other education sectors | 47 | 14.5 |
| It wasn’t my choice (e.g., family, manager, etc. decided for me) | 30 | 9.2 |

Table 27. “Why did you decide to study in an English Medium Programme?”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| It helps me improve my English skills | 107 | 67.3 |
| It provides many opportunities for professional development | 104 | 65.4 |
| It gives me access to the most up-to-date knowledge | 92 | 57.9 |
| It teaches international or global content | 86 | 54.1 |
| It uses the most up-to-date methods of teaching | 86 | 54.1 |
| It uses the most up-to-date materials | 72 | 45.3 |
| It allows me to earn a higher salary now or in the future | 70 | 44.0 |
| It gives an opportunity to work in international companies | 64 | 40.3 |
| It stresses the importance of international research practices | 53 | 33.3 |
| It is prestigious | 43 | 27.0 |
| It offers less crowded classes | 31 | 19.5 |
| It has fewer teaching hours than other education sectors | 30 | 18.9 |
| It wasn’t my choice (e.g., manger decided for me) | 16 | 10.1 |
| Table 28. “Why did you decide to teach through EMI?” |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | I can discuss my academic subjects in both English and my native language | 105 | 66.0 | 66.0 |
| I am more confident using my native language to discuss my academic interests | 30 | 18.9 | 84.9 |
| Discussing my academic subjects in English is much easier for me compared to my native language | 23 | 14.5 | 100.0 |
| I am a native speaker of English | 1 | .6 | 85.5 |
| Total | 159 | 100.0 |  |

Table 29. Which of the following sentences is true about you (teachers)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Continue the ‘EMI in Higher Education in Uzbekistan’ training programme | 97 | 61.0 |
| Provide more support with my English development | 93 | 58.5 |
| Deliver professional development trainings in how to teach through English | 91 | 57.2 |
| Provide more support with students’ English development | 78 | 49.1 |
| Provide me with more materials in English | 74 | 46.5 |
| Fund my professional development outside the university | 63 | 39.6 |
| Decrease the amount of paperwork | 52 | 32.7 |
| Decrease the number of teaching hours | 51 | 32.1 |
| Decrease the number of students in class | 42 | 26.4 |

Table 30. “What could the university and external providers do to improve your teaching experience in an English Medium Programme?”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Very likely | 222 | 68.3 | 68.3 |
| Somewhat likely | 82 | 25.2 | 93.5 |
| Somewhat unlikely | 17 | 5.2 | 98.8 |
| Very unlikely | 4 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 31. “If you (students) were offered additional professional English support by the institution, how likely would you be to sign up?”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | More English in spare time | 137 | 42.2 | 42.2 |
| Less English in spare time | 83 | 25.5 | 67.7 |
| About the same | 63 | 19.4 | 87.1 |
| All English in spare time | 24 | 7.4 | 94.5 |
| No English in spare time | 18 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |  |

Table 32. “How often are you (students) exposed to English in your spare time (for example, through music, computer games, or films) compared to when you are at the University?”

1. The term *English-Medium Education* is preferred to *EMI* to reflect the fact that the experience extends to more than just *instruction*, but both terms are used in the course of this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)