

English-only Approach in Vietnamese Non-major EFL Tertiary Education: Teachers' and Students' Perceptions**Tran Thi Thuy Lien**Doctor of Philosophy, Korea - Vietnam Friendship Information Technology College, Danang
University**Abstract**

English-only approach has been prevailing in many English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching contexts. However, when being applied in EFL classes, this practice has been shown to be challenged by different factors such as students' and teachers' limited proficiency. This qualitative study investigates how lecturers and students perceive an English English-only approach in non-major EFL classes at two public colleges in Vietnam in order to enhance the efficiency of using English to teach English and improve students' English skills. Data were collected by interviewing lecturers and focus groups of students. Findings reveal that both lecturers and students shared viewpoints on the benefits of an English-only approach, but not all of them thought this approach would be effective in classes. Results also show the complexity of lecturers' perspectives regarding the feasibility of an English-only practice, which was explained by the lecturers' previous education and the interwoven experiences as language learners and language teachers. This study suggests a bilingual English-dominant approach in non-major EFL classes in the Vietnamese context.

Keywords: English-only approach; English-only teaching; English as a medium of instruction; EFL teachers; non-major EFL classes.

Introduction

English as a medium of instruction classes has been offered and applied in both public and private tertiary institutions in Vietnam since 2008 (Vietnamese Government, 2008). Up to the end of 2019, more than 20 universities in Vietnam had introduced English as a medium of instruction in many different training fields and disciplines. The implementation of this instruction has been criticised for increasing demands on teachers without providing the necessary support structures that would allow teachers to gain adequate English language proficiency levels and learn relevant teaching skills and techniques (Nguyen et al., 2016). Also, Vietnamese EFL teachers and students face many other challenges related to the teaching and learning culture, including large classes, lack of teaching facilities, and students' low learning motivation. These have hindered the success of the English-only teaching approach and quality of overall English language education at colleges and universities.

Therefore, this study explores how lecturers and students perceived English-only teaching in non-major EFL classes at two public colleges in Vietnam with an aim to find solutions to overcome the challenges and enhance the efficiency of EFL education not only in the research sites but also in many EFL teaching contexts. The focus of this study is on EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of an English-only teaching approach. This research mainly provides

answers to the question: *How is an English-only teaching approach perceived by EFL teachers and students in non-major classes?*

Review of Literature

Benefits and Constraints of English-only Teaching Approach

Empirical research has highlighted the benefits of an English-only teaching practice. Firstly, English-medium instruction helps students significantly improve all four skill areas with speaking and reading being the most obvious (Rogier, 2016). Students learning in English-only classes are less anxious and then feel more confident and motivated to use English, which can improve their language proficiency (Rahmadani, 2016). Research (e.g. Ekoç, 2020; Shvidko, 2018) also noted that English instruction programs better prepare students with ability to use English in real-world communication and in future situations at work. English-only practice is particularly beneficial to students in EFL contexts because classrooms are among the few opportunities for them to be able to practise English (Savaşçı, 2014).

However, an English-only approach has also been associated with certain challenges and constraints. One of these constraints pertains to students' English proficiency, which can impact learning in English-only classrooms in many ways (Beckett & Li, 2012). Students' heterogeneous English competency is the main challenge for teachers because it forces them to spend a lot of time dealing with finding relevant materials as well as suitable activities to match students' varying proficiency levels (Li & Wu, 2017). Kim and Tatar (2017) also noted that it is not easy for non-native teachers to deliver lectures in English "since teachers need to address students' English proficiency in addition to other instructional concerns" (p. 158). Furthermore, Aguilar (2017) pointed out that low English proficiency can be a challenge for both teachers and students. In the Indonesian EFL teaching context, teachers' lack of a clear understanding of key areas such as the selection of learning materials or ways to test students' learning were found to further constrain the implementation of an English-only approach (Simbolon et al., 2020).

Teachers' and Students' Attitudes toward English-Only Teaching

Research has shown complexity of attitudes toward English-only teaching by teachers and students.

Research into learners' perceptions towards English-only teaching in EFL classrooms have captured both positive and negative attitudes. For example, Al Sharaeai (2012) studied tertiary students whose first languages and English proficiency levels and majors are varied. Results showed that the students preferred the maximal exposure to English and totally supported English-only instruction in their classes. Similarly, Akhter (2018) reported that undergraduate students expected their teachers to use mostly the target language in the English classrooms, explaining that the first language killed students' curiosity and discouraged them from speaking

English. However, a majority of the Bangladeshi university students surveyed by Murtaza (2016) thought that the English-only practice was difficult for them. The students did not favour this instruction because they felt uncomfortable when having to ask and answer questions in English. Similarly, Indonesia non-English major students in the study of Junining et. al (2020) favoured bilingual instruction approach over English-only classroom because the first language was perceived by the students to be more advantageous for their English acquisition.

Teachers also seem to have mixed views on with an English-only teaching approach. While being aware of the benefits that an English-only teaching approach entails, they support the simultaneous use of both L1 and L2 as means of classroom-based communication (Simbolon et al., 2020). Similarly, no teachers argued for the total support of “English-only” and some of them had tried to use this approach in their teaching but regarded it as unnatural because L1 is believed to be the best language to make comparison of give clarification (Awaiko Westin, 2019). A mismatch between teachers’ and learners’ perception of the English-only teaching approach has also been highlighted. In the study of Rogier (2016), while teachers thought their students’ language ability does not meet the requirement for them to study in English-medium classes, students generally felt that studying in English-only classes does not cause any problems for them.

English-only Teaching in the Vietnamese EFL Context

To enhance the English language proficiency of future Vietnamese students, the Ministry of Education and Training suggested that English should be used as the only medium of instruction in many educational institutions in 2008 (Vietnamese Government, 2008). As a result, despite not being a prevalent trend, English-only teaching practices have been applied at some Vietnamese universities, particularly for teaching the English subject. However, like many other EFL contexts, this approach has posed challenges for both Vietnamese learners and teachers.

Studying how English-only instruction is effective and desirable in Vietnamese tertiary EFL teaching contexts, Nguyen et al. (2010) reported that most of the students (70%) cannot fully understand lessons. Moreover, about two thirds of the students felt they had difficulties using English to present their ideas with others. About 55% of students were opposed to the English-only instruction; and around 70% of them recognised the use of Vietnamese as a beneficial teaching and learning medium. Dang and Moskovsky (2019) composed a critical review of relevant policy documents related to English-medium instruction in Vietnam’s tertiary sector, including the English-only teaching in EFL classes. The findings show that the current English medium instruction policies “promote practices of direct borrowing EMI programs from overseas higher education institutions, while at the same time lacking clear guidelines or recommendations for language management, internationalisation strategies, and proper involvement of multiple agents at different levels” (p. 1343). All these abstract and decontextualised policy documents were found to result in an ineffective implementation of

English-only instruction. Dang and Moskovsky (2019) recommended that Vietnamese policymakers should respond to the interests and concerns of micro-level actors (e.g. learners). The study also suggested that English-only teaching can be successful when there is effective communication between the macro and micro level.

Similar to other EFL education contexts, in the Vietnamese EFL teaching setting, the implementation of English-only teaching has been challenged by teachers' inadequate English proficiency, students' irrelevant English competence and passive study habits, ineffective teaching methods, and limited classroom resources (Nguyen et al., 2016; Vu & Burns, 2014). Those have led to the bilingual approach being quietly applied in EFL teaching contexts in Vietnam.

Methodology

Participants Recruitment

The author used purposive sampling to select lecturers and students to be research participants who are willing to participate and able to express their opinions deeply with their interest and knowledge about the research phenomenon (Palinkas et al., 2015). Purposeful selection was found to be appropriate for this case study research since it helps obtain a rich data sample, which aims at a better understanding about what is being studied (Astroth & Chung, 2018). Firstly, the author conducted surveys and sent them to all English lecturers from two colleges to choose suitable participants. As a result, based on the criteria, the author chose five lecturers to be interviewed. The lecturers had at least five-year experience of teaching English and the classes had first or second-year non-English major students aged from 19 to 21. For each lecturer, one group of students were selected via a short survey under the purposive sampling technique. A total of 21 students were chosen to participate in this study. The table below gives the background information of the lecturer and student participants.

Table
Background of lecturers and students participating in the study

		School A	School B
Major sectors of education		Information technology	Tourism
Lecturers of English	Number	2	3
	Years of teaching experience	5-10 years	5-15 years
	Number of lecturers with overseas education/training	One (For 6 months)	One (For 1 year)
Students of English	Number	7	14
	Level of English	Basic	Basic
	Geographical background	Lower-intermediate	Lower-intermediate
		Cities	Cities
	Remote	Remote	
	Highland areas	Highland areas	

Data Collection and Analysis

A qualitative research is adopted for this study since it helps approach rich experiences of participants who find the topics meaningful to them (Alston & Bowles, 2018). Since interviewing people is effective in understanding their beliefs or opinions and in gaining rich insights (Christianson et al., 2009), interviews are used to establish an understanding of teachers' and students' perceptions on the English medium instruction. In order to explore teachers' perceptions comprehensively (Yin, 2014), in-depth interviews were conducted with five available lecturers for about 50 minutes each. Because the format of focus group interviews promotes differing opinions and reflections (Krueger & Casey, 2009), they are useful in understanding different perceptions experienced by students of the English-only teaching practice. Five groups of students (one for each teacher) totaling 21 students participated in the study. Each focus group interview lasted between 60 and 80 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded.

This study analyzed the qualitative data by adopting thematic analysis which “provides a flexible and useful research tool, which can potentially provide a rich and detailed, yet complex account of data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 5). All the interview audio recordings interviews were firstly transcribed (via <https://transcribe.wreally.com/>) and quoted in the interview language (Vietnamese). Once developed, all the themes and supporting extracts were then translated into English. This study followed the six-step approach taken by Terry et al. (2017). Those steps are *Familiarisation, Coding, Developing themes, Reviewing themes, Defining and naming themes,* and *Producing the report*.

Findings

All the lecturers in this study supported an English-only approach and realised its benefits for both lecturers and students, explicitly expressing their strong desire for maximum L2 classroom practices. Here are some sample opinions:

Using 100% English is ideal because it is the ultimate aim of English teaching. It benefits students' learning outputs and interests lecturers. (Polly)

There will be an authentic communication environment for both teachers and students in English-only classes. (Olive)

Polly and Olive both agreed that teaching English in English was an ultimate target because it creates an authentic environment that benefits students' communication ability. They also believed that English-only instruction would increase lecturers' interest in their teaching. However, as can be seen from Ellen's and Una's comments, the common belief among the lecturers was that an English-only practice in their classrooms was unrealistic or inapplicable:

I totally support it [English-only approach] and that is what I want. The more English to be used, the better. But I do not think it works smoothly. (Ellen)

I also like this practice [English-only], but I am afraid that it is not suitable for students' proficiency levels. (Una)

The above extracts show that the lecturers fully supported the idea of English-only instruction. Yet, they did not believe in its effectiveness when being applied into real practices for reasons that are exemplified by the following excerpts from their interviews:

It would be perfect if English can be used up to the maximum level, but as you may know, students' English levels are too low for us to apply English-only teaching successfully. Our students will be stressed. (Ellen)

This [English-only policy] sounds good but it will not be effective with current students' proficiency level. Some of them cannot say a simple English sentence correctly and their listening skills are really poor. They may be shocked and stop attending classes. (Polly)

Most students are familiar with the method of bilingual teaching from previous classes and are not willing to welcome new teaching practices. Therefore, it is very difficult to apply the monolingual approach in non-English major classes. (Amy)

Students' limited comprehension level leading to their negative reactions when lecturers used English entirely was identified to be the biggest problem to English-only teaching, as stated by Ellen and Polly. They were worried that using English only might cause students to feel stressed, shocked, and stop attending classes. From Amy's perspective, it would be difficult to make students adapted with English-only classes because they had not encountered this approach before. The above-mentioned factors were perceived to be barriers to the application of English-only practice. Further and deeper discussions on other factors affecting lecturers' use of oral English in non-major classes that may shed further light on lecturers' cautious attitude toward an English-only approach will be presented in 4.3.

As can be seen from the comments, even though all lecturer participants supported a monolingual approach in class, they effectively applied a bilingual method in practice. This tension is mainly caused by the lecturers' belief that this was impossible due to students' limited English proficiency, which aligns with previous research (e.g. Beckett & Li, 2012; Ekoç, 2020).

Although most lecturers did not believe it was possible to successfully apply English immersion practice in their classrooms, they shared their views on the conditions that are required for this practice to work. Firstly, Amy, who believed that this practice was impossible and would not be successful, expressed the view that native-English teachers should be invited for low level proficiency classes to make better progress. Her suggestion indirectly supports the effectiveness of English-only teaching practice, since it is likely that native English-speaking teachers do not speak Vietnamese and hence use only L2 to speak and communicate in classes. Secondly, Ellen said that everything started from habits; if teachers used Vietnamese right from the beginning of the course, then students would remain comfortable with Vietnamese. She added that once an English-only policy was applied right from the beginning with really simple language, both students and lecturers would be in the habit of using L2 in class, which would ensure its success.

Lastly, Olive added: “Once solutions are found to tackle the problem of helping students better understand lecturers’ English speaking, the English-only teaching will come into an effective practice”. Here she voiced the belief that English-only instruction classes could work if effective strategies that would assist students to better comprehend oral English were applied. The comments presented above demonstrate the complexity of lecturers’ beliefs regarding the use of English as the medium of instruction in EFL education, which aligns with research (e.g. Awaiko Westin, 2019; Simbolon et al., 2020).

As for students, only five of 21 interviewed said that they totally supported English-only teaching practice. Eight students voiced their support for the English-dominant and the others did not have ideas on this issue. Here are their opinions:

English classes are the only environment where students have opportunities to listen to and use English, so lecturers and students should take this opportunity. (IS1)

When learning English, students should have the right to listen to and speak English entirely; listening to lecturers speak English helps us find out our mistakes and learn how to speak English and use it properly. (TS4)

It is useful when lecturers can speak a lot of English; but not 100%. I think we still need them 10% for explaining really difficult words. (IS2)

I do not think my teacher can entirely use English to teach us because we will not be able to understand them. But they really need to speak English predominantly to help us improve our English listening. (TS14)

IS1’s and TS4’s comments suggest that they considered the language classroom to be the main place where they can receive English input and perform output. Typically, they believed that English-only teaching would help them identify their language gaps and improve their performances. Similarly, IS2 and TS4 thought that lecturers’ maximal English use was useful for them to improve their English listening skill. The students did not totally favour the English-only practice but support an English-dominant approach since they still worried about not being able to understand all the English spoken by their lecturers. Those findings reconfirm previous studies that showed learners had both positive (e.g. Al Sharaeai, 2012; Akhter, 2018) and negative attitudes (e.g. Junining et. al, 2020; Murtaza, 2016) towards the implementation of the English-only approach in EFL classrooms.

Discussion

Findings show inconsistencies within the lecturers’ perceptions on the application of the English-only approach which implicitly showed their beliefs on the potential feasibility of the English immersion practices. Taking Amy as an example, who did not believe in the success of English-only teaching but suggested inviting English L1 teachers to help students better improve their skills. As widely known, those teachers normally do not share L1 with students and hence normally use L2 as a medium of teaching and communication. Amy’s recommendation for

native speaker English teachers might come from the ideas that English L1 speakers should be the ideal model in term of pronunciation teaching, suggesting that the native speaker norms predominated in their relationship to pronunciation (Buss, 2016). Another lecturer - Ellen said she never tried teaching in only English thinking that it was unrealistic to non-English major classes. Yet, she then believed that L2 habit use would be formed; and the English-policy policy would definitely be successful once it was applied right from the beginning with really simple L2. Ellen's perception seems to have common with the view of behaviourists (Demirezen, 1988), who argue that language is acquired through imitations and habituations. As can be seen, the lecturers did not believe in the applicability of this practice, but when making suggestions on what better helped students learn better, they indirectly showed that it can be effectively applied. These show the contradictions within the beliefs of Amy and Ellen on the English-only teaching practice.

To explain the inconsistencies and challenges, it is necessary to refer back to what shapes teachers' beliefs. Firstly, all teachers must be trained and educated to be qualified to teach, and this professional education may shape affect or at least affect their beliefs about teaching (Blume et al., 2019; Busch, 2010). It is the education of second language acquisition that are likely to form the lecturers' beliefs on the benefits of English immersion practice and that target language should be the predominant language in the classroom. Hence, this may lead to their highest level of support in theory for the English-only teaching policy. However, two other sources of teachers' beliefs also affect their beliefs in the application of the policy: experience as language learners (Baker, 2011; Borg, 2003) and experience as language teachers (Levin & Wadmany, 2008). Before becoming lecturers, they were in the roles of language learners who had not experienced English-only practice because the English-only approach was still new then in Vietnam. As mentioned, it was only until 2008 that the English as a medium of instruction was proposed by the Ministry of Education; but it was not a prevalent practice then. This indicates that they did not have much experience on learning in the English-only environment nor have any ideas on its practical success. During their teacher training, they were mostly trained under the Grammar-Translation and bilingual method. These previous learning and teacher training experiences may affect the beliefs of EFL teachers as they develop learning and teaching strategies. As a teacher, they frequently interaction with students and experience both negative and positive reactions to their teaching practices. Therefore, they thought that implementing the English-only policy would make students feel uncomfortable and demotivated. All the above may account for the inconsistencies and tensions between lecturers' beliefs and practices of the English-only approach.

Meanwhile, the students' perceptions were both congruent and incongruent with the lecturers' perspectives. Among the 21 interviewed students, five of them showed their total support for an English-only instruction and eight students voiced their support for the English-dominant approach. Students' perspectives are found to echo lecturers' beliefs regarding the benefits of English-only approach. Students raised reasons for the potential success of an English-only

instruction once it is applied in their classes such as they could be definitely adapted when English was used all the time, since they had already had English knowledge foundation. These findings have indicated the conflicts between teachers' beliefs and students' perspectives regarding the feasibility of English-only teaching application. This further support the findings of Dang and Moskovsky (2019) that better and more effective communication between teachers and students will make the English-only teaching approach more successful.

Conclusion and Implications

In short, although most lecturers supported and realised the benefits of an English-only practice, they doubted its feasibility for the current setting and did not apply this practice because they thought that their students would not understand and subsequently provide negative feedback on the class. However, some students strongly believed that they would get more benefits with English-only classes. A majority of students voiced their expectation that their teachers would use English predominantly in their EFL classes.

This study has demonstrated that English as an English-only teaching approach is not a wholly suitable practice in non-major EFL contexts because both lecturers and students rely on the use of L1 for effective language teaching and interpersonal functions. Thus, when an English-only policy is believed to be inapplicable, an English-dominant approach is suggested to be an effective alternative in non-English major classes. There could be some benefits when an English-dominant policy is implemented in all EFL contexts. Currently, as there have not been any official policies on English medium instruction in Vietnamese EFL teaching, lecturers can decide for themselves how much English is used in their classes. This may lead to significant differences in the levels of L1 and L2 use across lecturers, and across the many teaching contexts around the country. Thus, if an official English-dominant policy was to be ratified, it could be a useful and empowering first step for EFL lecturers and students to become more aware of their language use, which could help minimise the dominant or subconscious L1 use and maximise L2 input and output opportunities for students.

References

- Aguilar, M. (2017). Engineering lecturers' views on CLIL and EMI. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(6), 722–735.
- Akhter, N. (2018). Role of English-Bangla code-switching in vocabulary retention: A case study at university of Dhaka. In R. Chowdhury, M. Sarkar, F. Mojumder, & M. M. Roshid (Eds.), *Engaging in educational research: Revisiting policy and practice in Bangladesh* (Vol. 44, pp. 299–314). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0708-9_16
- Alston, M., & Bowles, W. (2018). *Research for social workers: An introduction to methods* (4th ed.). Allen & Unwin.

Astroth, K. S., & Chung, S. Y. (2018). Focusing on the fundamentals: Reading qualitative research with a critical eye. *Nephrology Nursing Journal*, 45(4), 381–386.

Awaiko Westin, C. I. (2019). Student motivation in L2 English teaching and learning: A study on students' perspectives of L2 classroom-centered motivational practices at a lower-secondary school [Bachelor's paper, Stockholm University]. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:su:diva-179649>

Baker, A. A. (2011, Sept. 2010). *ESL teachers and pronunciation pedagogy: Exploring the development of teachers' cognitions and classroom practices*. The 2nd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference., Ames, IA.

Beckett, G., & Li, F. (2012). Content-based English education in China: Students' experiences and perspectives. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, 7(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.20355/C5B59J>

Blume, C., Gerlach, D., Roters, B., & Schmidt, T. (2019). ABCs of inclusive teacher education: A quantitative and qualitative study examining the attitudes, beliefs and (reflective) competence of pre-service foreign language teachers. *TESL-EJ*, 22(4), 1–18.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research* 14(3), 318–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365239>

Christianson, M. K., Farkas, M. T., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Weick, K. E. (2009). Learning through rare events: Significant interruptions at the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Museum. *Organization Science*, 20(5), 846–860.

Dang, H. T., & Moskovsky, C. (2019). English-medium instruction in Vietnamese higher education: A ROAD-MAPPING perspective. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(4), 1330–1347.

Demirezen, M. (1988). Behaviorist theory and language learning. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(3). <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/hunefd/issue/7834/103129>

Ekoç, A. (2020). English medium instruction (EMI) from the perspectives of students at a technical university in Turkey. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(2), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1527025>

Junining, E., & Prawoto, S. (2020, October). *The implementation of English as a medium of instruction in an Indonesian EFL setting*. In Brawijaya International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Technology (BICMST 2020) (pp. 205-208). Atlantis Press.

- Kim, J., & Tatar, B. (2017). Nonnative English-speaking professors' experiences of English-medium instruction and their perceived roles of the local language. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(3), 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1295811>
- Krueger, R. A., and Casey, M. A. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Sage.
- Levin, T., & Wadmany, R. (2008). Teachers' views on factors affecting effective integration of information technology in the classroom: Developmental scenery. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 16(2), 233–263.
- Li, M.-Y., & Wu, T.-C. (2017). Creating an EMI program in international finance and business management. In W. Tsou & S.-M. Kao (Eds.), *English as a medium of instruction in higher education: Implementations and classroom practices in Taiwan* (pp. 21–38). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4645-2_2
- Murtaza, A. (2016). Students' perceptions of English language instruction (EMI) at a private university in Bangladesh: A survey. *Language in India*, 16(11), 1–11.
- Nguyen, H. T., Hamid, M. O., & Moni, K. (2016). English-medium instruction and self-governance in higher education: The journey of a Vietnamese university through the institutional autonomy regime. *Higher Education*, 72(5), 669–683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9970-y>
- Nguyen, T. B. H., Sun, H. J., & Yang, Y. (2010). *English-only classrooms: Ideology versus reality* [Paper presentation]. AARE Annual Conference 2010, Melbourne. <https://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2010/1755HoangJangYang.pdf>
- Palinkas, L. A., & Wisdom, J. P. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Rahmadani, D. (2016). Students' perception of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in English classroom. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 6(2), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v6i2.432>
- Rogier, D. (2012). The effects of English-medium instruction on language proficiency of students enrolled in higher education in the UAE. [Doctoral thesis, The University of Exeter]. <https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/bitstream/handle/10036/4482/RogierD.pdf>
- Savaşçı, M. (2014). Why are some students reluctant to use L2 in EFL speaking classes? An action research at tertiary level. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2682–2686.

Shvidko, E. (2018). Learners' attitudes toward "English-Only" institutional policies: Language use outside the classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 34(2), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v34i2.1261>

Simbolon, N. E., Oliver, R., & Mercieca, P. (2020). Lecturers' perceptions of English medium instruction (EMI) practice at a university in Indonesia. *Social Sciences & Humanities*, 28(2), 1065–1081.

Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In C. Willig & Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 17–37). Sage.

Vietnamese Government. (2008). Decision No. 1400/QĐ–TTg Approval of the national project, Teaching and Learning Foreign Language in the Public-Sector Educational System for the 2008–2020 Period. Ha Noi. http://vanban.chinhphu.vn/portal/page/portal/chinhphu/hethongvanban?class_id=1&_page=1&mode=detail&document_id=78437

Vu, N. T., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese tertiary lecturers. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(3), 1–31.

Wei, D. (2013). The implementation of English-only policy in the tertiary EFL context in Taiwan. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v2i2.164>

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th Ed.). Sage.