 International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning (2014) **9**(2): 130–141.

Implementing English as a medium of instruction in a Ukrainian University: Challenges, adjustments, and opportunities

Bridget A Goodman
Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Astana, Kazakhstan

Abstract: *English as a medium of instruction (EMI) programs are an increasing phenomenon in European universities. This paper takes an ethnographic approach to understanding the impact of EMI on pedagogy in a private university in eastern Ukraine. Fieldwork was conducted over the 2010–2011 academic year in nine English-medium and three Russian-medium classes. Data indicated that EMI education posed staffing challenges, as teachers were either language experts with low content knowledge or were content experts with anxiety about their English language skills. In addition, it was at times difficult to obtain textbooks and other print resources in English. Some teachers found teaching in a foreign language necessitated adjustments to speaking pace, discipline, and general classroom discourse. Despite these issues, teachers and students saw teaching and learning in English as a worthwhile opportunity.*

Keywords: medium of instruction, English, Ukraine, language policy

Policies and programs involving English as a medium of instruction (EMI) are truly a global phenomenon nowadays, but the purpose and shape of these policies and programs are highly context-dependent. In the European Union (EU), the sharp rise in EMI programs in tertiary education can be attributed to the Bologna Process, a series of multi-national educational reforms initiated with the Bologna Declaration in 1999 (Council of Europe, 2014; Dafouz, Camacho, & Urquia, 2014). The goal of the Bologna Process is to create a barrier-free European Higher Education Area characterized by 'compatibility and comparability' among the higher education systems of Europe (Papatsiba, 2006). An additional major goal is to internationalize higher education by increasing the mobility of students within the EU as well as encourage scholars from other continents to enroll in European universities (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; European Union, 2007; Papatsiba, 2006). While some scholars point out that programs being taught in a foreign language have arisen as a result of EU goals of promoting multilingualism (Smit & Dafouz, 2012), critics argue that internationalization policies drive universities to implement English-medium education and generally pose a threat to goals of multilingualism and linguistic diversity in Europe (Phillipson, 2006; Saarinen, 2012; Tosi, 2006). In fact, the predominance of English-medium university programs since 1999–2000 has been documented in European contexts such as Finland (Saarinen, 2012), Italy (Gazzola, 2012), and Denmark (Mortensen & Haberland, 2012).

At the classroom level, observational research studies in EMI classrooms in Europe indicate there are implementational spaces (Hornberger, 2003) in EMI policy for multilingualism to develop. Hult (2007) reported that in a city in Sweden, student teachers and their instructors found ways to navigate around the hierarchies embedded in official language policy and treat multilingualism as a resource. Söderlundh (2012) conducted ethnographic research in a university in Sweden and found that teachers allowed for dynamic use of multiple languages for exams. Hélot and Laoire (2011, p. 17) describe teaching approaches in similar contexts as *pedagogy of the possible*, in which teachers and learners 'respond to all possibilities and potentialities at the classroom level, thus forging one's own policies that are locally effective and empowering.'

Ukraine is not a member of the EU but has participated in the Bologna Process since 2005. Compared to the EU (Wächter & Maiworm, 2008), the number of Ukrainian universities offering English-medium programs is low. As of 2013, only 7 out of 107 universities in central,

eastern, and western areas of Ukraine (Kyiv[1] city, Dnipropetrovs'k, and L'viv) stated on their Web site that they offer English-medium programs or groups. Of these, two universities offer programs that allow students to obtain a dual degree issued by the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and a university in an EU country. Nevertheless, it has been predicted that the number of EMI programs in Ukraine will increase in the future (Tarnopolsky & Goodman, 2014).

The purpose of this paper is to show how changing the medium of instruction to a foreign language, English, can impact pedagogy in the Ukrainian higher education context. In particular, by looking in-depth at a single university that is implementing EMI in a large, predominantly Russian-speaking city in eastern Ukraine, it will be shown that changing the medium of instruction poses new challenges and necessitates adjustments to pedagogy, while also affording students and teachers new teaching and learning opportunities.

Language-in-education planning and the medium of instruction

Within the framework of *language-in-education planning* – which involves decisions about which languages will be taught, when, by whom, with what materials, and with what assessment and evaluation measures (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997) – *medium of instruction* planning involves decisions about the language or languages (media) which will be used to teach language and content courses (Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2003; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). The importance of the relationship between language-in-education planning and the medium of instruction cannot be underestimated. Schools are the 'transmitter and perpetuator of culture' (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 123) and have a direct impact on users of the language. Medium of instruction policies are 'a key arena in which political conflicts among countries and ethnolinguistic, social and political groups are realized' (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004, p. 2). For example, if a minority language is endangered due to social or political pressure to shift to a majority language, educators can cultivate the use of a language among a younger generation, giving the language a better chance of survival (Dick & McCarty, 1997; King, 2001). These efforts can be weakened or complicated, however, by the increasing demand for knowledge of English (Tollefson, 2013).

Decisions about language-in-education and medium of instruction can occur at multiple levels. Ricento and Hornberger (1996) outline four layers of the 'onion' where language planning, policy, and practice occur: (1) legislation and political processes; (2) states (i.e., nations) and supranational agencies; (3) institutions (including schools); and (4) classroom practitioners. Hornberger and Johnson (2007) describe how language policies are developed, interpreted, implemented – and in some cases resisted – at multiple levels of society in Peru and Philadelphia. García and Menken (2010) speak of 'stirring the onion' to reflect the dynamic ways in which language policies are implemented in schools. From these perspectives, EMI is investigated as a case of language-in-education planning and fluid practice at the institutional level.

Nuances of language policy and education in the Ukrainian context

To understand how an English-medium policy (or any language-in-education policy) program works in the Ukrainian context, it is important to understand the geographical, historical, and political influences on language policy and language use. The use of language in Ukraine has clear geographic patterns, though there are individual variations across the country (Bilaniuk, 2005). Russian tends to be used more in the east, while Ukrainian is used more in the western part of the country. The eastern two-thirds of Ukraine was part of the Russian empire and then part of the Soviet Union for 70 years (1920–1991). Both governments placed restrictive policies on the use of Ukrainian. Because of its proximity to Russia, eastern Ukraine also tends to have more residents who are ethnic Russian and prefer to speak Russian. The western third of the country became part of the Soviet Union during World War II. Before that, this region was controlled by Poland or the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where

[1] All names of cities in Ukraine are transliterated from Ukrainian.

there was social discrimination but political space for the Ukrainian language to develop (Magocsi, 2010; Shevelov, 1989). Historically and presently, villages across Ukraine tend to be predominantly Ukrainian-speaking, while cities in eastern and central Ukraine tend to be predominantly Russian-speaking (Shevelov, 1989).

In addition, there is a historical divide between language policy and educational practice. Historically, 'Soviet language policy[…]exhibited characteristics that exemplified the 'covert' in conflict with the more overt policy' (Schiffman, 2006, p. 115). This distinction between overt and covert policy in Ukraine has been documented specifically with regard to the medium of instruction in Ukrainian schools before and after independence. From 1938 to 1991, Russian was officially required in schools without excluding *indigenous languages* – languages of the nationalities of the Soviet republics such as Ukrainian (Solchanyk, 1985). Pragmatically, however, the need to know Russian in order to pursue higher education or rise in party leadership and the purges of Ukrainian language activists in the 1930s made it clear to Ukrainians that Russian was the sole language of power. Since Ukraine became an independent country in 1991, there have been increasing numbers of schools using Ukrainian rather than Russian as a medium of instruction. In Kyiv and western regions in particular, these numbers exceed the percentages of individuals reporting Ukrainian as their native language (Arel, 1996; Bilaniuk & Melnyk, 2008; Janmaat, 1999; State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, 2003/2004).

Given this historical and current orientation to language policy in education, the actual choice(s) made regarding the medium of instruction itself as well as the pedagogies enacted in that medium become an empirical question. For this reason, ethnographic research methods were applied. It will become apparent in the description of the methods and the findings that even if a group is in a designated English-medium program, this does not necessarily mean every class observed was taught in English. In the case of one group, it even means that classes connected with Ukrainian culture cannot be presumed to be taught in the state or national language.

Research site and methods

The current study is an ethnographic case study which was carried out at Alfred Nobel University, a private university in the eastern city of Dnipropetrovs'k. With over 1,000,000 residents, Dnipropetrovs'k is the third largest city in Ukraine. According to the 2001 Census, 51% of residents of Dnipropetrovs'k are either ethnic Russian or are Ukrainians who declared Russian their native language (State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, 2003/2004). Participant observation was conducted for 9 months in the 2010–2011 academic year with two focal groups. The first group consisted of 25 students (17 Ukrainian, 6 Nigerian, and 2 Algerian) of international economics; these students were in the preparatory year of a joint-degree program between Alfred Nobel University and the University of Wales. Referred to at Alfred Nobel University as 'the Wales program,' this group was offered the chance to take all subjects in English for 5 years of study, and possibly study abroad in Wales. The second group consisted of 24 third year students of international economics who were invited from existing groups to take an English placement test and, based on the results, to take one subject together in English. Since generally in Ukrainian universities students take all of their coursework for the 5-years of study with the same groupmates, the existence of this composite group in itself represents a shift in practice with the introduction of EMI.

Observations were conducted in a total nine English-medium and three Russian-medium courses (both lectures and seminars) covering diverse subjects including economics, social sciences, and mathematics. Table 1 shows the courses and the amount of time spent observing each course.

Further information was gleaned through the following activities: Teaching English to faculty members who were preparing to teaching academic subjects in English; attending school events; having informal conversations with teachers and students over coffee or tea; and conducting semi-structured interviews with 22 students and 4 teachers. In an attempt to encourage interviewees to speak in the language they were most comfortable in during arranged interviews, I made an

Table 1: Groups, subjects, and number of lessons observed

Subject	Medium of instruction	Number of 80-minute lessons
Wales program classes		
Math (lectures and seminars)	English	16
Economic science (lectures and seminars)	English	15
Psychology (lectures and seminars)	English	9
Regional economics (lectures and seminars)	English	8
Enterprise systems technology (EST) (lectures and seminars)	Russian	7
International economics (lectures and seminars)	English	21
Philosophy (lectures and seminars)	English	6
Sociology (lectures and seminars)	English	4
Life safety (lectures and seminars)	English	3
Informatics (lectures)	English	2
Ukrainian history and culture (lecture)	Russian	1
International economics classes		
Marketing (seminar)	Russian	1
Total number of lessons		93 (124 hours)

explicit offer of speaking in English, Russian and/or Ukrainian and that offer was made in three languages:

> You have the right and the possibility today, to choose the language of our conversation, English, *i na angliiskom i na russkom, tol'ko na russkom*, **anhlyis'koiu ta ukraïns'koiu, abo til'ko ukraïns'koiu**, **iak vy bazhaete,** *kak vy khotete* [in English and Russian, only in Russian, English and Ukrainian, only in Ukrainian, as you wish, as you wish] as you wish (original language from audio file; English in plain text, Russian in italics, Ukrainian in bold).

Nevertheless, my position as a native English speaker led nearly half the interviewees (N = 11) to choose English; some students even described it as an opportunity to practice their English. Many other interviewees began speaking English with me before I could formally introduce the options (N = 8). The remainder indicated they would speak English and Russian (N = 5), or chose not to choose by saying it was all the same to them (N = 2).

In interviews, the majority of Ukrainian students indicated that their primary or dominant language was Russian, although a few students indicated they speak both Russian and Ukrainian at home. The students from Nigeria grew up in a country where English is a national language. While they acknowledge speaking Igbo at home and with each other, they also identified English as a first language. One Nigerian student, Samuel, said studying 'on my language' [English] was an advantage for him (original language from audio file, March 3, 2011). Interestingly, Ukrainian teachers and students I spoke with not only explicitly recognized Nigerian students' status as native speakers of English, they often positioned Nigerian students in the classroom as high achievers or even honored guests.

Data analysis was an iterative process consisting of reviewing data artifacts through member checks and discourse analysis. Member checks, defined by Preissle and Grant (2004, p. 174) as 'sharing data or tentative interpretations with participants and revising them accordingly,' were conducted during and after fieldwork to confirm the linguistic accuracy of field notes and class audio/video recording transcriptions, and to compare my interpretation of the social meaning of events observed with the interpretations of the actors involved. Blommaert (2005) defines *discourse* as a complex combination of multiple semiotic resources that are used in action (including language). Gee (2011, p. 30)

refers to Discourse with a capital D as 'a characteristic way of saying, doing, and being.' Pennycook (2010, p. 22) connects linguistic discourse with the notion of practice by noting, 'the usually pluralized term 'practices' turns literacy, language, and discourse from abstract entities into everyday activities that need to be accounted for.' From the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), van Dijk (1993) argues these discourses can circulate in ways that reproduce power structures and power inequalities. In the present study, discourses that were analyzed include actual language use, non-verbal semiotics, practices (especially pedagogical practices), and the power relations inherent in the discourses and their circulation.

Pedagogical challenges and adjustments of English-medium instruction

Teachers' level of English for teaching in English

Among the challenges of managing English-medium programs at Alfred Nobel University, first and foremost was finding teachers with a sufficient level of English. At times, teachers with stronger English language skills than content knowledge were asked to teach content courses. Some of these teachers also had a background in English as a Foreign Language pedagogy, but others were experts in different subjects who happened to be proficient in English. This privileging of English knowledge over content knowledge was not seen as problematic by the university.

Teachers who were experts in their subject matter, regardless of how proficient they were in English, often expressed anxiety about whether their knowledge of English was sufficient for teaching. Nadezhda Sergeyevna,[2] another teacher of English classes for faculty members who were preparing to teach in English, told me:

> [The teachers] are very nervous about delivering lectures in public. They are not sure they can speak in English for 80 minutes, and I am not assured that they have the stamina to present in English (paraphrased quote[3] from original English, field notes, August 31, 2010).

I was similarly concerned when Olga Nikolayevna gave a mini-lesson as an assignment for a class I was teaching. A month later, however, Olga Nikolayevna was teaching and Nadezhda Sergeyevna, who attended Olga Nikolayevna's classes as a language assistant, assured me that Olga Nikolayevna was managing to deliver lectures. I also heard from students that her class was fine. When I finally had a chance to observe Olga Nikolayevna's class, I thought she did admirably well lecturing in English. Nevertheless, my discussion with her after one lesson revealed her anxiety about her English:

> Olga Nikolayevna asked me afterwards how it went. She asked me about her mistakes. I said the only thing I noticed was 'summarize.' I switched to Russian and said that 'summarize' is *prochitat' tekst i raskazat'* [to read through a text and retell it]; 'to add up' is the verb she needed [in the context of adding numbers]. She said, 'what about my grammar tenses?' I said everything was fine. I also assured her that students don't complain about her English. She still seemed insecure as she asked Precious, 'can you understand?' (field notes, March 9, 2011).

By asking me about her 'mistakes' and her grammar, Olga Nikolayevna expresses a high degree of concern about her linguistic accuracy in English. Her question to Precious, a student from Nigeria, further indicates a concern about her comprehensibility for non-Ukrainian, native speakers of English.

Teachers in particular may have been concerned about the link between teaching in a foreign language and their professional identity. As Alexander Nikolayevich said to me in our first meeting:

> I don't want to be judged based on my English. I'm not a professional English speaker. I didn't get linguistic training[…] No one wants to feel himself a fool,

[2] All names in this paper are pseudonyms. Consistent with local classroom norms, teachers are identified by first name and patronymic (a middle name derived from one's father's name). Students are identified by first name only.

[3] 'Paraphrased quote' indicates a statement which was written down and soon after reconstructed in my typed field notes. It is the best and most accurate representation of the speaker's words available without an audio recording.

> a clown. We want to respect ourselves as a professional. In this situation it's difficult to respect yourself (paraphrased quote from original English, field notes, February 18, 2011).

Airey (2012) also found that physics teachers in Sweden explicitly rejected the notion that they were language teachers. In contrast to Airey's participants, who expressed their views as a general matter of pedagogical focus, Alexander Nikolayevich expresses a fear of judgment about his language ability. This fear may reflect a socio-historical practice in Ukraine of evaluating speakers' language quality – a practice which impacts his use of not only English but possibly his native language(s) (see Bilaniuk, 2009).

Resources for teaching in English

A second challenge was finding sufficient resources in English. According to Lkhamsuren, Dromina-Voloc, and Kimmie (2009, p. 7), in Ukraine the indicators that a transition to a capitalist economy is not yet complete and that there is insufficient investment in education result in 'a lack of technological and informational resources.' Given these conditions, it is understandable that I observed teachers hand out class exercises and test papers with the instruction 'one for two,' meaning that two students must share one test sheet, record their answers on separate pieces of paper, and return the handouts to the teacher at the end of class.

I was greatly surprised, however, when I heard Viktor Andreyevich say during an EMI lecture, 'to make it clear for you, I will give you some printouts. These printouts you can take with you. I don't want them back' (paraphrased quote from original English, field notes, November 1, 2010). Other teachers gave students multi-page booklets of lecture notes. After obtaining a copy of one 20-page booklet from Olga Nikolayevna, I asked if they use such brochures in Russian classes. She said no. It appeared that English-medium students had greater access to print resources to support learning, and that English-medium programs had more financial resources to pay for such extra printing.

Another account of these observations is that additional print sources were intended as a substitute for textbooks. Academic subjects taught in Russian or Ukrainian used textbooks written either by individual teachers or by the department. EMI courses, however, fell on a continuum of access to textbooks or other educational materials. At one end were classes that had no textbook in English. Other courses had textbooks in the original English language, usually downloaded from the Internet. In the middle were classes that had English textbooks translated from Russian and which were not available until several weeks into the semester. When asked about the challenges of acquiring textbooks in English, teachers offered multiple reasons. Books published abroad can be prohibitively expensive for students, and shipping multiple copies of books can result in lengthy delays with Ukrainian customs. It can be difficult to find English-medium textbooks or online resources for Wales program courses which are required by the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and very specific to the Ukrainian context such as regional economics. Larisa Ivanovna said that there was no textbook for her course because they were changing the program [curriculum] (field notes, September 30, 2010).

One solution offered by some teachers was reading Russian-medium supplementary materials. Viktor Andreyevich told his students that 'Russian-speaking students, students who know Russian' can use the original textbook written in Russian. While Viktor Andreyevich's framing of this option indicates he is aware this solution is only applicable to the Russophone Ukrainians in the class, the language of text resources was nevertheless a challenge for students from countries where neither Russian nor Ukrainian is a first language. Precious and Samuel, two students from Nigeria, were not overly critical of the university but were aware of the need for more resources:

> Bridget: Do you feel the resources here, the textbooks, the computers, are they enough for your studies?
>
> Samuel: About the textbooks, they are not enough. Because some of them, most of their textbooks, they are not in English. Like the computer they are all okay.
>
> Precious: Yeah, the computers are okay but for the textbooks I think we need more textbooks be-, you know, I don't really blame them because most of the textbooks are written in Russian. And, there you might find much

> information. But the English textbooks are not very much. Can get 1 or 2 and that's all. So that's an issue. (original language from audio file, March 3, 2011).

When I asked Viktor Andreyevich, he was also aware of the need but expressed optimism about the situation: 'It's a problem, it's a problem, but it's a problem that can be solved[…]we are going to ask for help from the University of Wales and so on' (original language from audio file, February 21, 2011). Issues with resources can arise anytime a new program is being established (see Kovtun & Stick, 2009), but the lack of resources can also be understood as a direct consequence of changing the medium of instruction without preparing materials in advance.

Classroom management

Another effect of changing the medium of instruction from Russian or Ukrainian to English was the need to 'adjust' classroom management practices. My initial understanding of this issue came from observing Aleksandr Nikolayevich teaching the same subject in English and Russian. Because I wanted to confirm my understanding of what had taken place in the Russian-medium class, I gave him a copy of my field notes for the Russian-medium lesson. We met a week later in his office to discuss what I had written. He reacted to my comments on his corrective feedback to students as follows:

> Aleksandr Nikolayevich [Reading my field notes aloud]: 'The tone in the Russian-medium class is much harder [than the English-medium][…]He seems much less generous and much less satisfied with the student's performance – in part because of unsatisfactory content and in part because the content is in the native language with native students.' Uh, the last part is completely right. You see, I have to keep it in mind, every time, every moment that, for all of us, this language is not native language. And, of course I have, um, (snaps fingers), it's the Russian expression, *delat' popravku*. Uh, *popravka* something like, some correction.
>
> Me: Correction.
>
> Aleksandr Nikolayevich: Yes, as if we are aiming our gun on something, and we are changing.
>
> Me: Ah ha, adjustment.
>
> Aleksandr Nikolayevich: Adjustment, right. Something like that. I have to make an adjustment, taking into account their, let's say, the, surreality of this situation (laughs) (original English and Russian from audio file, March 18, 2011).

In other words, Aleksandr Nikolayevich confirmed that he feels he cannot critique his students as harshly in English as he would in Russian due to the 'surreal' situation that neither the teacher nor the students are performing in their native language. This explains why other teachers chose to discipline students in EMI classes in the Russian language (Tarnopolsky & Goodman, 2014; see also Bonacina-Pugh & Gafaranga, 2011; Kirkebæk, 2013; Söderlundh, 2013).

For Tatiana Konstantinovna, the discipline in class posed a challenge which was more a function of the ethnic makeup of English-medium classes than the medium of instruction:

> She then tells me she has an 'internal conflict.' 'These guys' (pointing to her right side of the room, where mostly only the Nigerian students sit), 'get involved. Then these guys (pointing to her left, where all the Ukrainian students sit) cannot understand humor, jokes, or movies in English. They prefer force and enforcement. The Nigerian students are older, 22-23 years old, and more objective' (paraphrased quote from original English, field notes, April 29, 2011).

In other words, Tatiana Konstantinovna feels it is a challenge to teach students from two different cultural backgrounds who need different levels of discipline. Another issue with her Ukrainian students in particular, though, is that although she can communicate in English, she believes she cannot draw on the full range of language resources in English that she can in Russian because her students would not comprehend those same expressions in English. Kirkebæk (2013) refers to this feeling as a phenomenon of 'reduced personality' vis-à-vis the medium of instruction.

Speaking pace

The relationship between fluency, speaking pace and good teaching practice emerged as a recurring theme which can be connected to students' and teachers' challenges, adjustments, and opportunities for teaching and learning in English.

At one point during the year, I gave Alexander Nikolayevich copies of audio and videorecordings of lessons he had conducted in English. A few weeks later we sat down for coffee and he said the following about the video:

> He talked about watching himself in English and said there's a 'strange effect.' He said he knows his English is not so fluent as he wants, but 'don't you think there's some slowing down effect in the recording? Words fall out just like drops[…][I] feel pity for students, they have no chance, of listening like drops' (paraphrased quote from original English, field notes, May 6, 2011).

At first I considered the possibility that copying the files to a smaller size format had caused a 'slowdown' in his speech. When transcribing the video and audio of the class later, I noted to myself that I could transcribe without having to stop and rewind or slow it down. I did not feel, however, that Aleksandr Nikolayevich's speech was problematically slow, perhaps because of soliloquies in which he showed great depth of vocabulary and grammar, hesitations which were filled with appropriate sounds such as 'uh' and 'mmm,' target-like intonation, and fully comprehensible segmental sounds. Aleksandr Nikolayevich's assessment of the video quality, then, needs to be understood as an instantiation of his anxiety about his level of English for the purposes of conducting courses in English.[4]

Remarks from two students about Aleksandr Nikolayevich's speech, however, suggest that from their point of view they do not need any 'pity.' The same day that Aleksandr Nikolayevich first expressed concerns to me about his English, Andrei overheard and quipped, 'after Mikhail Grigoryevich, it's good' (paraphrased quote from original English, field notes, February 18, 2010). In an interview, another Wales program student, Miroslav, commented that Aleksandr Nikolayevich always talks about how bad his English is but that in so doing Aleksandr Nikolayevich 'makes an elephant from the fly' (original English from audio file, February 28, 2011).

[4] In an online chat over a year after fieldwork, he told me that his speaking pace in English is rising (personal communication, October 20, 2012).

While Alexander Nikolayevich was concerned about whether he was speaking too slowly for students, two other teachers deliberately spoke more slowly. Svetlana Petrovna, whose training is in economics, explained it as a response to the students: 'The problem is the level of the English. The first lecture was too fast; they asked me to slow it down. They are first years. We have to follow their wishes' (paraphrased quote from original English, November 16, 2010). Viktor Andreyevich told his class directly, 'I'm going to speak slowly and if you don't understand, whatever, raise your hand. I'll explain even using Russian if need be' (paraphrased quote from original English, field notes, November 1, 2010). He then came to my desk and said quietly, 'It's difficult. I have to repeat several times slowly. I hope they understand.' Arkın (2013) showed through quantitative and qualitative analysis that professors in Cyprus also spoke slower when lecturing in English for pedagogical purposes.

In other cases, it is the students who adjust to the teacher's speaking pace. Larisa Ivanovna, who has training in EFL teaching, delivered her lectures to third year economics students 'so fast, it is hard for me [Bridget] to get everything down' (field notes, October 14, 2010). Observations of Larisa Ivanovna speaking in Russian on the telephone during our interview, during an end-of-the-semester test, and at a conference conducted in Russian and Ukrainian suggest that Larisa Ivanovna's rate of speech in English during lectures and in Russian at other times are very similar. One group of students I interviewed from this class also commented on the teacher's pace of speaking:

> Katya: It's quite interesting to study in English. And it's not difficult as I thought about it.
>
> Natalia: No, it's not difficult.
>
> Katya: In the beginning.
>
> Natalia: On our first class it was, it was really scary.
>
> Marina: Yeah.
>
> Natalia: From the very first minute she started talking English. Only English.
>
> Natalia: And so quick. So fast.
>
> Marina: But eventually, it's okay now. (Original English from audio file, March 28, 2011).

Opportunities for teachers and students

Even teachers who lamented the challenges of teaching in English were likely to talk about that challenge in positive terms. Aleksandr Nikolayevich interspersed his comments about the difficulties of teaching in English with comments such as 'at first it was so difficult…but it starts to get interesting,' '[it is a] unique possibility to well to some extent at least to improve my English speaking skills,' and 'it's a challenge. I want to respond.' The notion of 'responding' to the challenge can be interpreted here as 'rising to the occasion.' Tatiana Konstantinovna said of the challenge of developing a new course in English:

> Everyone knows it's possible to tell me, you will have a new course in one month. Are you ready? There are two psychological types: Inventors, or conservatives who don't like to invent anything new. I'm an inventor (paraphrased quote from original English, April 29, 2011).

Students talked about the opportunity to study in English in three ways. Along with Ukrainian, Russian, and foreign languages, studying in English is a means to a more prosperous future. As Oksana said in my interview with her:

> I think that uh, studying in English in our country, it's uh, much better and then easier to find work, and because, mm, English nowadays is very important. Popular. Because Ukraine has relationships with other countries and they don't speak Ukrainian with them and Russian (original English from audio file, March 10, 2011).

Other students were hoping to study abroad after completing the degree. Like teachers, some students described studying in English as something that was difficult in the beginning but has gotten easier over time. As Nikolai said:

> I think it's normal for me to study in English. At first time it was difficult, not difficult, it's not, *neprivychno, neprivychno*, [I was unaccustomed, I was unaccustomed,] but, in a few weeks, I, *privyk, privyk, privyk, vot* [got accustomed, got accustomed, got accustomed, so], and, now it's normal for me. I understand almostly what's teachers said and it's normal (original English and Russian from audio file, February 24, 2011).

Multiple students reported that they chose to enroll in English-medium classes at Alfred Nobel University because they heard English-medium teachers are better than the Russian-medium teachers. While students did not give specific reasons or comparisons of instruction in English and Russian, observations of Larisa Ivanovna's teaching suggest discursively why English-medium classes might be perceived as 'better' than Russian-medium classes. In this excerpt, a student has told Larisa Ivanovna that they were studying the same term in another class, but Larisa Ivanovna explains why and how she will go beyond the work of the Russian-medium class:

> Larisa Ivanovna: (hh) Ah. So you are studying this topic? You are also studying uh, foreign exchange market or what?
>
> Yaroslav: Operations, um,
>
> Larisa Ivanovna: Mm hmm. And you studied them with graphical description of-
>
> 2-3 Students at once: Nooo.
>
> Larisa Ivanovna: What are they studying?
>
> Marina: Only definitions.
>
> Larisa Ivanovna: Definitions and that's all?
>
> 2-3 Students: Futures and
>
> Larisa Ivanovna: Okay so that's good, you will study, we will have more about, we already discussed futures (xx) and you studied mechanism of them, no?
>
> One student: No.
>
> Larisa Ivanovna: So just –
>
> Marina: Just the definition.
>
> Larisa Ivanovna: Definition (sigh) but it's not enough (5.0) (Sigh) But maybe then it will be easier for you. Here you will just study it in English. Here, these are just terms, but later we will use this in some models and examples (original English from audio file, April 21, 2011).

Another vignette which illustrates the opportunities associated with English-medium instruction at Alfred Nobel University is the story of Katya, a student in Larisa Ivanovna's class. She told me she had a 'bad teacher' of English in school and did not start to study English seriously until she entered Alfred Nobel University. She chose to take the English-medium course in international economics

because her friends were taking it too. Whereas in a November seminar I noticed Katya was not very fluent and at one point reverted to Russian during a problem-solving exercise at the board, at the final paper defense the following May, Katya was able to present complex economic material and respond in English to questions from Larisa Ivanovna. Larisa Ivanovna praised Katya and other students at the end of class: 'Your presentations are very good, and I'm quite satisfied with your oral defense[…]I think you will defend your diploma in English because you proved them quite successfully' (original English from video file, May 26, 2011). The chance to defend their diploma paper in English – and the associated prestige – is an additional opportunity afforded by EMI in this context.

Conclusion

It has been shown in this paper that changing the medium of instruction from a native to a foreign language greatly impacts pedagogy in a Ukrainian University context a number of ways. English-medium education impacts who teaches, as only those professors with proficiency in the target language can teach. It affects what is taught, as those who are proficient in English may not necessarily have proficiency in the target subject and students may not have full or equal access to textbooks and other print resources in any language. It affects how confident teachers feel in their interaction with students due to their own fluency issues as well as the need to adjust their discipline style, speaking pace, and general classroom discourse. To be fair, Alfred Nobel University has taken some of these issues into account. They have provided extra English courses for teachers, and an 'assistant' program in which content experts assist in classes taught by language experts, and language experts assist in classes taught by content experts.

Despite the pedagogical challenges of teaching in English, teachers and students still feel strongly that the opportunity to teach and learn in English outweighs the disadvantages. While further research is needed to see the long-term outcomes of pedagogies and practices used to teach and learn in a context with an institutional EMI, there is some evidence that, despite the previously mentioned limitations, students have access to more information and better pedagogical approaches in English-medium classes than in Russian-medium classes from an *emic* perspective.

That said, overall the findings suggest that when institutions or policymakers are developing policies and programs in a new medium of instruction (or media of instruction), they should consider training content teachers in methods of teaching content in a foreign/additional language. For example, it may help a teacher like Aleksandr Nikolayevich overcome his anxiety about his English to know that slowing down one's pace for students is helpful and preferred for their learning, and that he can serve as a model of how to cope with temporarily forgetting a word in the target language. This training could take the form of a module on Content and Integrated Language Learning (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010; Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2008), or an intensive English course for teachers that is designed to develop speaking skills for academic purposes, improve general English fluency, and simultaneously boost teachers' confidence in their abilities to provide content in English. Either type of course could also offer suggestions for teaching students from diverse backgrounds.

Acknowledgments

The research presented in this article was supported by the US Department of Education Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Grant [grant number P022A0100065]. Special thanks to Hanna Schlosser and Li Bai for reviewing the Ukrainian University Web sites. Finally, special thanks to Nancy Hornberger, the editors of this journal, and two anonymous reviewers for comments on previous drafts. Any subsequent errors are my own.

References

Airey, J. (2012). 'I don't teach language': The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden. *AILA Review, 25*(2012), 64–79.

Arel, D. (1996). A lurking cascade of assimilation in Kiev? *Post-Soviet Affairs, 12*(1), 73–90.

Arkın, I. E. (2013). *English-medium instruction in higher education: A case study in a Turkish university context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, Northern Cyprus.

Bilaniuk, L. (2005). *Contested tongues: Language politics and cultural correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bilaniuk, L. (2009). Criticism and confidence: Reshaping the linguistic marketplace in post-Soviet Ukraine. In L. M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych & M. G. Rewakowicz (Eds.), *Contemporary Ukraine on the cultural map of Europe* (pp. 336–358). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Bilaniuk, L., & Melnyk, S. (2008). A tense and shifting balance: Bilingualism and education in Ukraine. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*(3–4), 340–372.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bolsmann, C., & Miller, H. (2008). International student recruitment to universities in England: Discourse, rationales and globalisation. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 6*(1), 75–88.

Bonacina-Pugh, F., & Gafaranga, J. (2011). 'Medium of instruction' vs. 'medium of classroom interaction': Language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(3), 319–334.

Cooper, R. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. (2014, May 5). *Bologna for pedestrians*. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/ehea2010/bolognapedestrians_en.asp

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, M. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Dafouz, E., Camacho, M., & Urquia, E. (2014). 'Surely they can't do as well': A comparison of business students' academic performance in English-medium and Spanish-as-a-first-language medium programs. *Language and Education, 28*(3), 223–236.

Dick, G. S., & McCarty, T. L. (1997). Reclaiming Navajo: Language renewal in an American Indian community school. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up* (pp. 69–94). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

European Union. (2007, May 10). *Frequently asked questions: The Bologna Process*. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-07-184_en.htm?locale=en#fn1

García, O., & Menken, K. (2010). Stirring the onion: Educators and the dynamics of language policies (looking ahead). In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 249–261). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gazzola, M. (2012). The linguistic implications of academic performance indicators: General trends and case study. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 216*(2012), 131–156. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0043

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hélot, C., & Laoire, M. Ó (Eds.). (2011). *Language policy for the multilingual classroom: Pedagogy of the possible*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H. (2003). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 315–339). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509–532.

Hult, F. M. (2007). *Multilingual language policy and English language teaching in Sweden* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, PA.

Janmaat, J. G. (1999). Language politics in education and the response of the Russians in Ukraine. *Nationalities Papers, 27*(3), 475–501.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

King, K. A. (2001). *Language revitalization process and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kirkebæk, M. J. (2013). 'Teacher! Why do you speak English?' A discussion of teacher use of English in a Danish language class. In H. Haberland, D. Lønsmann, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 143–159). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Kovtun, O., & Stick, S. (2009). Ukraine and the Bologna Process: A case study of the impact of the Bologna Process on Ukrainian state institutions. *Higher Education in Europe, 34*(1), 91–103.

Lkhamsuren, M.-E., Dromina-Voloc, N., & Kimmie, R. (2009). *Financing higher education: A myriad of problems, a myriad of solutions* (Issue Brief June 2009). Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Magocsi, P. R. (2010). *A history of Ukraine: The land and its peoples* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Mehisto, P., Frigols, M.-J., & Marsh, M. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning and multilingual education*. Oxford, England: Macmillan.

Mortensen, J., & Haberland, H. (2012). English – the new Latin of academia? Danish universities as a case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 216*(2012), 175–197. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0045

Papatsiba, V. (2006). Making higher education more European through student mobility? Revisiting EU initiatives in the context of the Bologna Process. *Comparative Education, 42*(1), 93–111.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as local practice*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2006). English: A cuckoo in the European higher education nest of languages? *European Journal of English Studies, 10*(1), 13–32.

Preissle, J., & Grant, L. (2004). Fieldwork traditions: Ethnography and participant observation. In K. DeMarrais & S. D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences* (pp. 161–180). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 401–427.

Saarinen, T. (2012). Internationalization of Finnish higher education – is language an issue? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 216*(2012), 157–173. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0044

Schiffman, H. (2006). Language policy and linguistic culture. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 111–125). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Shevelov, G. Y. (1989). *The Ukrainian language in the first half of the twentieth century (1900-1941): Its state and status*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues, and research practices across Europe. *AILA Review, 25*(2012), 1–12.

Söderlundh, H. (2012). Global policies and local norms: Sociolinguistic awareness and language choice at an international university. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 216*(2012), 87–109. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0041

Söderlundh, H. (2013). Language choice and linguistic variation in classes nominally taught in English. In H. Haberland, D. Lønsmann, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, Language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 85–102). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Solchanyk, R. (1985). Language politics in the Ukraine. In I. T. Kreindler (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic perspectives on Soviet national languages* (pp. 57–105). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

State Statistics Committee of Ukraine. (2003/2004). *Vseukraïns'kyi Perepys Naselennia 2001* [*All-Ukrainian population census 2001*]. Retrieved from http://www.ukrcensus.gov.ua

Tarnopolsky, O., & Goodman, B. (2014). The ecology of language in classrooms at a university in Ukraine. *Language and Education, 28*(4), 383–396. doi:10.1080/09500782.2014.890215

Tollefson, J. W. (2013). Language policy in a time of crisis and transformation. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 11–34). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tosi, A. (2006). The devil in the kaleidoscope: Can Europe speak with a single voice in many languages? In C. Leung & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Reconfiguring Europe: The contribution of applied linguistics* (pp. 5–20). London, England: Equinox.

van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249–283.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The picture in 2007*. Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

Received 09 May 2014 *Accepted 17 September 2014*