

Why do students choose EMI courses? An analysis of their motivational drives

IRATXE SERNA-BERMEJO

DAVID LASAGABASTER

University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU

Received: 02/01/2023/ Accepted: 06/04/2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi40.27025>

ISSN paper edition: 1697-7467, ISSN digital edition: 2695-8244

ABSTRACT: Motivation has historically been an issue of great interest to scholars in the area of education and language teaching. The influence of motivation in the learning process is widely acknowledged, since it plays a key role in any learning context. However, as educational realities change, researchers are assailed by new questions that must be resolved. The present study aims to discover the motivations that lead university students to enrol in EMI (English-medium Instruction) courses instead of choosing courses in their L1, BMI (Basque-medium Instruction) or SMI (Spanish-medium Instruction). To this end, a total of 455 EMI students from the University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU completed a questionnaire in which they were asked about their motivations towards EMI, taking Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) as theoretical framework. The statistical analysis revealed that the majority of students showed motivations related to the Ideal L2 Self and to personal preferences, while they did not feel pressured by their tutors or by the university itself for studying in English (the Ought-to L2 Self). The innovative nature of this study lies in the fact that students' choices included both a minority language (Basque) and a majority one (Spanish), which has allowed us to identify the reasons underlying students' motivations for choosing EMI over BMI or SMI in a multilingual university context in which three different languages are used as medium of instruction.

Key words: Motivation, English-medium Instruction (EMI), Basque-medium Instruction (BMI), Multilingualism, Higher Education.

¿Por qué eligen los estudiantes matricularse en EMI? Análisis de sus motivaciones

RESUMEN: Históricamente, la motivación ha sido un tema de gran interés para los estudiosos del área de la educación y la enseñanza de lenguas. La gran influencia de la motivación en el proceso de aprendizaje ha sido ampliamente reconocida en numerosos estudios, ya que juega un papel fundamental en cualquier contexto de aprendizaje. Sin embargo, a medida que las realidades educativas van cambiando, nos encontramos con nuevas preguntas que deben ser resueltas. A través de esta investigación pretendemos conocer las motivaciones que llevan a los estudiantes universitarios a matricularse en cursos EMI (English-medium Instruction) en lugar de elegir cursos en su L1, BMI (Basque-medium Instruction) o SMI (Spanish-medium Instruction). Para ello, un total de 455 estudiantes de EMI de la Universidad del País Vasco UPV/EHU cumplimentaron un cuestionario en el que se les preguntó acerca de sus motivaciones hacia EMI, tomando como marco teórico el *L2 Motivational Self System* (L2MSS) de Dörnyei (2005, 2009). El análisis estadístico reveló que la mayoría de los estudiantes mos-

traron motivaciones relacionadas con el Yo ideal y con las preferencias personales, mientras que no se sentían presionados por sus tutores ni por la propia universidad (el Yo deóntico) para estudiar en inglés. El carácter innovador de este estudio radica en que la mayoría de estudiantes que han participado en esta investigación tienen como L1 el euskera (lengua minoritaria) y/o el castellano (lengua mayoritaria). Esto ha permitido identificar las motivaciones de los estudiantes para elegir EMI frente a BMI o SMI en una universidad multilingüe.

Palabras clave: Motivación, Instrucción en inglés, Instrucción en euskera, Multilingüismo, Educación Universitaria.

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivation is a widely used word in most areas of our life, from a conversation with a friend to an academic paper. It seems that we all understand what this term means when we use it in our daily life, but if we look at the literature there does not seem to be such a consensus. Etymologically, the word motivation comes from the Latin verb *movere*, which means to move. Thus, this coincides with our common understanding of motivation, being what moves a person to do something. During the last decades, motivation has been the subject of numerous studies in the field of education, as it is considered one of the most powerful aspects related to the learning process for most education staff and researchers (Henry, 2012). Although there is not a unique definition of motivation, most researchers would agree that, by definition, this concept concerns the *direction* and *magnitude* of human behaviour. That is: The *choice* of a particular action; The *persistence* with it; The *effort* expended on it. In other words, motivation is responsible for: *Why* people decide to do something; *How long* they are willing to sustain the activity; *How hard* they are going to pursue it (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 4).

Second language (L2) motivation constitutes an area of research in itself due to its complexity and singularities, and has been of great interest to applied linguists, especially in education, although English-medium instruction (EMI) in higher education has largely been overlooked. In recent years, the offer of EMI courses has only grown in most European universities, and this is also the case of Spain. The desire for internationalization has led Spanish universities to offer courses in English both for their local students and to attract foreign students. At the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), where this study was carried out, we find the singularity of the coexistence of two co-official languages, Basque (the minority language) and Spanish (the majority language), to which English has now been added in the academic field. However, we find hardly any studies that analyse the motivations of university students to enrol in EMI in truly multilingual university contexts in which more than two languages are used as means of instruction (Lasagabaster, 2016).

2. THE L2 MOTIVATIONAL SELF SYSTEM

In 2005, Dörnyei launched a new approach to L2 learning motivation called the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS). Although this new approach (Dörnyei, 2009) constitutes a reformation of previous motivational thinking, it has a strong relation with previous motivation

theories focused on the *self* and the *individual* like the ones proposed by Gardner (2001), Noels (2003) or Ushioda (2001). Over the last decades, scholars have been researching about the *self* and *motivation*, but understanding their relationship in a more dynamic and active way, and from a perspective that links the *self* with action (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). In this line, Markus and Nurius (1986) proposed one of the most influential theories called *possible selves*, which states that the *self* regulates behaviour by setting goals and expectations.

Possible selves are the future-oriented aspects of the self-concept, the positive and negative selves that one expects to become or hopes to avoid becoming. [...] Individuals possess multiple positive and negative possible selves (Oyserman & James, 2009, p. 373).

A person's self-concept has had a significant presence in the literature and it has been traditionally defined as the view a person has of him/herself. In this vein, *possible selves* refer to the view a person has of him/herself in the future, that is, what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming (Markus & Nurius, 1986).

If we think of a straight line, the ideal self, that is, what the individual would like to become, would be in one extreme, and the feared self, what the individual is afraid of becoming, would be in the opposite extreme. Regarding the third type, the selves that one could become, refers to the expected or likely selves. Nevertheless, as Dörnyei (2009) pointed out, it is not the intention of Markus and Nurius (1986) to draw a strict classification of *possible selves* but to show a broad outline of the scope of the concept, as they believe in multiple future-oriented *possible selves*.

Higgins (1987; Higgins, Klein, & Strauman, 1985), who is a forerunner of self-theories, distinguished two types of *possible selves*: the ideal self and the ought self. The former refers to those attributes the individual would want to possess, while the latter concerns the attributes the individual believes she or he ought-to have because those correspond to someone else's or society's beliefs.

The major confusion for Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006) comes when we try to distinguish between the ought and the ideal selves, as the most differentiating characteristic is that the former corresponds or is influenced by other peoples' beliefs, and the latter corresponds to each person's genuine beliefs or desires. However, these researchers argue that individuals, as members of a particular society, are always influenced by others' beliefs, thus, ideal selves could be also previously influenced by others:

Parents, teachers, respected or feared authority figures, or those with whom you wish to be admired, respected, or loved become sources of one's ideal self or ought self. The dilemma is that it is often confusing, in the moment, when these forces or social pressures for role conformity are occurring. Are they things you really wish to be or accomplish, or are you compromising your deeper dreams and values to be considered a "good" member of a group? (p. 628).

For these researchers, the distinction between both terms, ought and ideal, depends on the internalisation level. In other words, if an individual internalises others' beliefs those can become part of her or his ideal self and, therefore, this leads to no conflict between the

two selves. Hence, Higgins's (1987, 1996) Self Discrepancy theory states that motivation arises when people want to bridge the gap between what they are and what they genuinely want to become, that is, the ideal or the ought selves.

Based on the preceding theories of the possible selves, in 2005 Dörnyei, after conducting a large-scale motivational survey in Hungary that lasted 12 years (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006), linked the L2 motivation with the previous possible selves theory and proposed the L2MSS. Following suit (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Higgins, 1987, 1996), Dörnyei's model also differentiates the ideal and the ought selves, in this case, the Ideal L2 Self and the Ought-to L2 Self, and he incorporates a new component; the *L2 Learning Experience*. As a result, these are the three main components of the L2MSS henceforth (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29):

1. **Ideal L2 Self:** this is the L2-specific facet of one's 'ideal self'. It refers to the vision the individual has of oneself as a proficient speaker in the L2. The ideal L2 self represents the L2 speaker the individual aspires to become in the future. The L2 ideal self may have a great impact on students' L2 motivation. Imagine for example an EMI student who, in the future, would like to work in an English-speaking country or enterprise, and besides, she or he envisions him/herself in that role. This definitely would have a positive impact on the student's L2 motivation. Therefore, if the individuals want to reduce the discrepancy between their ideal self and their actual situation, they might work for it. This dimension would correspond with what traditionally (Higgins, 1987, 1996) has been called intrinsic motivations. Besides, the concept of the Ideal L2 Self is closely related to the concept of integrativeness proposed by Gardner (2001), which refers to the genuine interest or motivation to learn an L2 to become closer to the L2 speakers' community or even become one of them. It is also related to internalised instrumental motives like aspirations or hopes.
2. **Ought-to L2 Self:** it refers to those attributes the student believes she or he ought-to possess to succeed, meet expectations, or avoid negative consequences. Unlike in the ideal L2 self, in the Ought-to L2 self it is not the individual who creates a vision of him/herself, but here we find the influence of other people's beliefs concerning the individual. Therefore, in this case, the individual might feel the "pressure" of what she or he believes other people expect from them. This dimension would be related to what traditionally (Higgins, 1987, 1996) has been labelled as extrinsic motivations.
3. **L2 Learning Experience:** this component refers to the learning context and experience where the L2 learning takes place. In this sense, the teacher, the learning environment, the classmates, etc. might influence student motivation. Dörnyei conceptualises this component at a different level from the ideal L2 self and the Ought-to L2 self. Ushioda (2014) highlights that more research is needed analysing the interaction between this component and the future selves.

Hence, in the L2MSS there are three main components that promote motivation to learn an L2/FL: the ideal L2 speaker the individual would like or desires to become; the ought-to L2 speaker, or others' beliefs of what is an ideal L2 speaker, which at the same time, may

influence the individual's conception about her or his ideal selves; and finally, the learning experience and the environment where the learning takes place. According to the L2MSS, when students envision themselves as proficient users of the L2, their motivation to learn the L2 or learn through this language increases, which at the same time, entails a positive impact on learning. After carrying out different studies, several researchers (Lasagabaster, 2016; Lamb, 2007; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009; Csizér & Lukács, 2010, to name but a few) have pointed out that the L2 ideal self is the component with the greatest impact on students' L2 motivation.

In just a decade, the number of studies that have been based on the L2MSS has steadily increased “with literally hundreds of studies appearing worldwide” (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015, p. 91), which is why it is currently the principal and predominant theoretical framework in the field of research on motivation. In fact, the metaanalysis carried out by Al-Hoorie (2018) included 32 research reports and more than 32,000 language learners. This author concluded that the three components of the L2MSS were significant predictors of intended effort.

3. WHY DO STUDENTS DECIDE TO ENROL IN EMI?

In this section, we will focus on those studies that analyse motivation from the research question of *why* students decide to enrol in EMI programmes. Most of these studies classify EMI students' motivation into two different categories: *instrumental* and *integrative* motivation. We can find decidedly varied results among the studies analysing this matter. In some studies, students' showed more instrumental reasons for enrolling in EMI. Kirkgöz (2005, p 110), for example, conducted a study in a Turkish university with the objective of analysing whether students were motivated by instrumental or integrative reasons when they chose to enrol in an EMI course. The results showed that students' motivations to study through the medium of English were more related to an instrumental orientation. The author found that these students thought of long-term life goals, as “getting a well-paid job” and “becoming broadly educated”. Other reasons students argued to study in English were “discuss subjects in my field” (also an instrumental reason) and “get on well with English speaking people” which would be the first integrative motivation to appear in the ranking.

Similar results were found in another study conducted in Turkey where Bozdoğan and Karlidağ (2013) asked university students about different questions regarding EMI, and students mentioned its instrumental benefits like improving job opportunities. Instrumental motivations were also found in Ellili-Cherif and Alkhateeb's (2015) study. In 2012 the Supreme Education Council of the State of Qatar decided to change the language of instruction of four colleges in Qatar University from EMI to Arabic MOI (Medium of Instruction). This is why Ellili-Cherif and Alkhateeb (2015, p. 211) decided to conduct a study analysing students' beliefs about EMI. The researchers found that students considered English to be important for their careers and many students selected the items “I think using Arabic to study all subjects will affect my chances for further studies after graduation from the university” and “I feel English has a higher status than Arabic in Qatar at present” as the main reasons to support EMI.

Sometimes, students also present practical reasons for choosing EMI. In Korea, Kang and Park (2005) reported that students' main reason for choosing an EMI course was that

the course was not offered in Korean, so if they wanted to study that subject the only option they had was through English. In Belhiah and Elhami's (2015) study conducted in the Arabian/Persian Gulf, students explained that they preferred to do the exams in English because they studied from materials written in English and, therefore, they would rather the language of the materials and the exam to be one and the same.

In Japan, Chapple (2015) also asked higher education students about their reasons for enrolling in an EMI programme. Results showed that the reason most mentioned by students was to "Improve English ability" (38.9%); however, in this case, it was followed by an integrative reason: "Make foreign friends" (25.7%). Similar results can be observed in Al-Masheikhi, Al-Mahrooqi and Denman's (2014, p. 108) research conducted in the Sultanate of Oman where students also agreed both with intrinsic and extrinsic statements towards EMI. For example, 75% of the students agreed with the item "Studying Science in English is necessary to continue my postgraduate studies at a foreign university", and 53.3% with the item "I believe that studying science in English will help me to understand English people and their lifestyle". However, we must clarify that students agreeing with those statements does not mean that they decided to enrol in EMI because of that. In other words, a student can consider EMI to be helpful to understand English people, and therefore give that item a high mark (on a Likert scale), but that may not be her or his reason for deciding to take EMI courses. Nevertheless, what we can actually deduce from looking at the statements mentioned above is the positive attitudes of students towards EMI, although when they are asked if "It is appropriate to use English as a medium of instruction at the College of Science" 40% of the students disagreed.

In these studies, it can be observed that both instrumental and intrinsic motivations coexist and that they seem complementary for students. In fact, there are also studies that analyse how students' motivations to enrol in EMI can move from instrumental to integrative. For instance, Gao (2008) conducted a longitudinal study, which analysed Mainland China university students' experience after going to an EMI university in Hong Kong and found that through a socialisation process mediated by some social agents, students changed from more context-mediated motivations to more self-determined ones.

Regarding the variables that can affect students' willingness or motivation to enrol in EMI courses, studies revealed that their first language (L1) has a significant influence, especially when this is a minority language. In the Basque Country, Lasagabaster (2004) and Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2013) also noted that those university students who had Basque as their L1 had less positive attitudes towards EMI than those who had Spanish as their L1, or both Basque and Spanish. L1 Basque students (Lasagabaster, 2004) confessed being aware of their need to learn English for their own benefit, however, they also felt the need to protect the minority language (Basque) from other very international and powerful languages like Spanish and English. It must be taken into account that minority languages usually have "a very high degree of ethnolinguistic vitality" (Lasagabaster, 2016, p. 320). This ethnolinguistic vitality (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977) defines how a group is likely to behave or the attitudes they may have. In so many cases the minority language is one of the most powerful symbols a community has, as this may be the case of the Basque Country. Thus, these minority language speakers may see majority languages and international and powerful foreign languages like English as a threat to their language and social identity. Nevertheless, in a study conducted more recently, Lasagabaster (2016) obtained results that

differ from those obtained in the past (Lasagabaster, 2004), as university students who had Basque as their L1 and those who had both Basque and Spanish as their L1 showed more positive attitudes towards English in general and towards EMI in particular than those students asked in the study conducted more than one decade before. Therefore, there seemed to be an attitudinal change in L1 Basque speakers as they were more motivated towards EMI than in the past. However, it has to be noted that the participants in the 2004 study were learning English in a traditional EFL approach, as EMI had not been implemented in the UPV/EHU, and those in the 2016 study were in EMI courses, which may have had an influence on Basque students' attitudes and beliefs. This hypothesis needs to be confirmed with further studies based on a larger sample of participants.

Except for the last study (Lasagabaster, 2016), none of the studies above relied on the L2MMS, a gap that we intend to fill in the present study. As Boo, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) underscore, most research has hitherto been carried out in English as a foreign language (EFL) context in primarily monolingual settings, which is why our study can provide an innovative perspective, as it was conducted in a multilingual EMI setting.

With this in mind, in this study we intend to analyse students' motivations for enrolling in an EMI course instead of BMI or a SMI course, in other words, why students choose EMI over BMI or SMI. Following the L2MSS theoretical framework presented above, we will classify students' motivations to enrol in EMI in two categories: the Ideal L2 Self and the Ought-to Self. This study poses two research questions:

RQ1. What are students' motivations to enrol in EMI courses?

RQ2. Do different variables (gender, university faculty, being local or Erasmus, the L1, and English proficiency) influence students' motivations to enrol in EMI?

4. THE STUDY

4.1. Languages at the University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU

Since its foundation in 1980, the UPV/EHU is officially bilingual with a firm commitment to the normalisation of the Basque language and its development in the academic field (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017).

Nowadays, the UPV/EHU must guarantee the opportunity to study both in Basque and Spanish as both are official languages in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC). Nevertheless, for this to have been possible it has required extraordinary financial efforts from the Basque Government, as well as new training and development designs for teachers and administrative staff. Efforts have been rewarded as each year the demand by students for studies in Basque grows, as well as the offer in Basque by the university. Nevertheless, in the last decade the UPV/EHU, like most universities in Europe, has included internationalisation among its main objectives. Thus, one of the most important measures taken to promote internationalisation was, indeed, the creation of the Plurilingualism Plan (2005), aimed at boosting the use of foreign languages as a means of instruction, especially English.

Table 1. *Number of students enrolled in the UPV/EHU in the academic year 2020-2021 by the language of instruction*

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN 2020-2021					
BMI	SMI	SOME EMI SUBJECTS	SOME FRENCH MOI* SUBJECTS	SOME GERMAN MOI SUBJECTS	SOME OTHER MOI SUBJECTS
18,545	16,531	5,556	597	259	288

*MOI=medium of instruction

In the academic year 2020-2021, 44% of the undergraduate students were studying in Basque, while 39% were studying in Spanish. Besides, 13% of the students were enrolled in EMI subjects, 1% of the students were enrolled in some French MOI subjects, and only 0.6% were enrolled in some German MOI subjects or studied some subjects in other languages. Therefore, we can see that the majority of the students study in Basque, followed by those who study in Spanish. Regarding the non-official languages, English is, by far, the language with the most presence.

4.2. Participants

The participants in this study were a total of 455 EMI students who filled out the questionnaire, 272 female, 177 male, and 6 non-binary students. The majority were undergraduate students enrolled in different faculties and studies at the UPV/EHU. The faculties where the questionnaires were distributed were located in the campuses of Gipuzkoa and Biscay. These students were both local (344) and Erasmus (111), and therefore, they had a myriad variety of L1s apart from Basque and Spanish. The mean age of the students was 20.5 and they were at different university grades, from 1st grade to 5th grade, just a few (4) being Erasmus students in Master's degrees.

4.3. Procedure and data collection instruments

A questionnaire was designed to explore EMI students' reasons for enrolling in EMI. The questionnaire was written in English and was formed of 5 parts and a total of 77 items. All the parts but the first consisted of Likert-scales where the students had to answer the items choosing from a six-point scale: 1 Strongly disagree; 2 Disagree; 3 Slightly disagree; 4 Slightly agree; 5 Agree; 6 Strongly agree. The questionnaire was designed following the guidelines provided by Dörnyei (2010) and it was meant to be completed by hand in 20 minutes.

The statistical procedure followed to analyse the data obtained from the questionnaire was the following. First, we classified our items by groups based on the relationship we saw between them. Then, the Cronbach Alpha test was performed to check these factors' internal consistency reliability. The values obtained from the Cronbach Alpha test were satisfactory, as none of the values were under 0.60 (Dörnyei, 2007) and all but one of them exceeded 0.70. Three factors were obtained in relation to motivation: Ideal L2 Self (Cronbach Alpha=0.808),

Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI (Cronbach Alpha=0.710) and, EMI interest (Cronbach Alpha=0.784).

5. RESULTS

RQ1. What are students' motivations to enrol in EMI courses?

We will present now the results related to students' motivations to enrol in EMI. In general terms, the majority of the students (77.3%) gave high scores to the items belonging to the Ideal L2 Self, and the majority of the students (83.9%) gave low scores to the items belonging to the Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI. These findings led us to conclude that students' motivations to enrol in EMI were more related to the Ideal L2 Self than to the Ought-to Self. Also, the student participants seemed quite divided regarding the factor EMI interest, as 46.3% of the students gave this factor low scores, while the remaining 53.7% gave this factor high scores. These results can be observed in more in detail in Table 2.

Table 2. Motivation: students' motivations to enrol in EMI.

FACTOR	ITEMS	LIKERT SCALE 1-3 (NEGATIVE)	LIKERT SCALE 4-6 (POSITIVE)
Ideal L2 Self	25. I am interested in taking this subject in English because in the future I would like to continue studying in English.	12.5%	87.5%
	27. I am interested in studying this subject in English in order to be able to live in an English-speaking country in the future.	27.7%	72.3%
	28. I consider that taking a subject in English will be beneficial for my future professional career (work).	2.9%	97.1%
	32. I am interested in taking this subject in English so that I can apply for a specific job in the future.	44%	64.8%
	33. I have enrolled in some subjects in English because I am personally interested.	9.5%	90.6%
	34. In the future I want to work or study abroad.	14.1%	85.9%
	35. I consider that taking a subject in English will be beneficial for my student career.	5.1%	94.9%
	41. In the near future I imagine myself using English at work.	7.5%	92.5%
	TOTAL	16.8%	77.3%

FACTOR	ITEMS	LIKERT SCALE 1-3 (NEGATIVE)	LIKERT SCALE 4-6 (POSITIVE)
Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI	26. I have enrolled in some subjects in English because the schedule suits me better.	73.9%	26.2%
	29. I feel obliged to study in English by the university.	84.6%	15.4%
	31. I have enrolled in some subjects in English because the university requires me to complete a minimum of credits in English.	88.8%	11.2%
	36. I feel obligated to study in English by my parents (guardians).	93.2%	6.8%
	38. I have enrolled in this subject in English because I think it is easier than in Basque/Spanish (because I think there will be less academic load).	80.9%	19.1%
	40. If I could enrol in subjects in Basque/Spanish instead of English I would do it.	82.4%	17.6%
	43. I have enrolled in this subject in English because there were no other options.	83.3%	16.7%
	TOTAL	83.9%	16.1%
EMI interest	37. I am more motivated to classes taught in English than to those taught in Basque or Spanish just because they are taught in English.	54.3%	45.7%
	44. I would like to enrol in more subjects in English but the schedule does not fit me.	73.8%	26.2%
	45. If I could, I would enrol in more subjects in English.	36.3%	63.7%
	46. I think there should be more offer of subjects in English in this degree.	20.7%	79.4%
	47. If there was the option of completing my degree (all the subjects) in English I would do it.	39.4%	60.7%
	49. I do not enrol in more subjects in English because there is no more offer of subjects in English in my studies.	53.6%	46.4%
TOTAL	46.3%	53.7%	

Regarding the Ideal L2 Self, the vast majority of the students believed that EMI lessons would be beneficial for both their academic (94.9%) and professional career (97.1%).

Furthermore, these beliefs were in line with students' willingness to remain in contact with English in their future careers, as 87.5% would like to continue studying in English, 85.93% wanted to work or study abroad in the near future and, 92.53% imagined themselves using English at work in a near future. All these items garnered strong support and reached very high percentages, which indicate that EMI students are well aware of and convinced about the important role that the English language will play in their future.

Moving on to the "Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI" component, Table 2 shows that the majority of the students did not feel obliged to enrol in EMI lessons either by the university (84.6%) or their guardians (93.2%). Nor did the students attribute their having enrolled in EMI to practical reasons like the schedule (73.8%) or the lack of other options (83.3%).

Finally, in relation to the "EMI interest" scale, the EMI student population seems quite divided regarding item 37. 54.3% did not agree so much to feel more motivated to EMI lessons than to Basque or Spanish lessons just because they are taught in English, whereas 45.7% agreed with that statement. Interestingly, 79.4% of EMI students considered that there should be more EMI offer in their degree, and 60.7% of them would be willing to complete their studies entirely in English.

RQ2. Do different variables (gender, university faculty, being local or Erasmus, the L1, and English proficiency) influence students' motivations to enrol in EMI?

We also analysed EMI students' opinions regarding their Motivation depending on a series of variables: gender, university faculty, being an Erasmus or Local student, students' L1 and, English proficiency.

5.1. Gender

We have seen that the vast majority of EMI students' motivations to enrol in EMI were related to the Ideal L2 Self. Table 3 shows that gender had a significant ($p=0.003^{**}$) influence regarding that factor since female students ($M=4.92$) gave higher scores to the items that belong to the Ideal L2 Self scale than male students ($M=4.70$). However, no gender influence was found in the case of the other two motivation scales, namely "Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI" and "EMI interest".

Table 3. Students' motivations depending on their gender * $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$.

FACTOR	FEMALE (M)	MALE (M)	SIGNIFICANCE
Ideal L2 Self	4.92	4.70	0.003**
Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI	1.96	2.09	0.084
EMI interest	3.66	3.20	0.212

5.2. University faculty

In this section we will present how which university faculty students belonged to affected their motivations to enrol in EMI. Table 4 shows that EMI students' opinions regarding the factor Ideal L2 Self were significantly ($p=0.001^{**}$) different depending on their university faculty. Students from the faculty of Education identified most with the Ideal L2 Self (5.05), whereas students from the faculty of Computer Sciences were the ones that gave this factor the lowest scores (4.33).

Table 4. *Students' motivations depending on their faculty. * $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$*

FACTOR	SOCIAL S. AND COMMU. (M)	ARCHI. (M)	EDUC. (M)	ECON. AND BUS. (M)	ENGIN. (M)	COMP. S. (M)	SIGNIFICANCE
Ideal L2 Self	4.76	4.78	5.05	4.91	4.83	4.33	0.001**
Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI	2.04	2.16	2.00	2.03	1.83	1.80	0.057
EMI interest	3.94	3.29	3.62	3.80	3.53	2.92	0.000**

No significance ($p=0.057$) was observed regarding the factor “Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI”.

Finally, regarding the factor “EMI interest” we did find significant ($p=0.000^{**}$) differences in students' opinions depending on their faculty. Students from the faculty of Social Science and Communication were the ones that showed more EMI interest (3.94) and students from the faculty of Computer Sciences were the ones who manifested less interest (2.92).

5.3. Erasmus vs. local students

No significance ($p=0.670$) was found regarding the factor Ideal L2 Self when we compared Local and Erasmus students' opinions. On the contrary, we found significance ($p=0.000^{**}$) regarding the factor “Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI”. Erasmus students (2.50) related their motivations more to the Ought-to Self and to practical reasons than Local students (1.85).

Finally, Table 5 shows that Local and Erasmus students' opinions regarding the factor “EMI interest” were not significantly different ($p=0.879$).

Table 5. *Local vs. Erasmus students' motivations. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$*

FACTOR	LOCAL (M)	ERASMUS (M)	SIGNIFICANCE
Ideal L2 Self	4.84	4.79	0.670
Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI	1.85	2.50	0.000**
EMI interest	3.59	3.63	0.879

5.4. Students' L1

We also wanted to know whether students' L1 (Basque, Spanish, both Basque and Spanish and, Other L1s) affected their motivations to enrol in EMI. No significant ($p=0.533$) differences were found regarding Ideal L2 Self depending on students' L1.

Table 6. *Students' mean scores depending on their L1 * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$*

FACTOR	BASQUE (M)	SPANISH (M)	BASQUE AND SPANISH (M)	OTHER L1 (M)	SIGNIFICANCE
Ideal L2 Self	4.74	4.89	4.76	4.79	0.533
Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI	1.85	1.88	1.80	2.43	0.000**
EMI interest	3.03	3.69	3.54	3.69	0.009**

We found significant ($p=0.000^*$) differences regarding the factor "Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI". In general, students with Other L1s gave higher scores to the items related to this factor, with a mean score of 2.43, in comparison to L1 Basque students (1.85), L1 Spanish (1.88) and, both Basque and Spanish L1 (1.80). However, we can see that the scores given by the L1 Basque/Spanish students do not differ so much. This is in contrast with previously conducted studies (Ytsma, 2007; Laugharne 2007; Ó Laoire, 2007; Lasagabaster, 2004; Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2013) where students with minority languages as L1 showed less positive attitudes and motivations towards English and foreign languages than students with majority L1s. However, studies whose participants were EMI students did not show any impact of the L1 either (Lasagabaster, 2016), as is the case of the current study.

Table 6 shows that the scores given to the factor "EMI interest" are significantly ($p=0.009^{**}$) different depending on students' L1. Spanish L1 and Other L1 students were the ones that manifested more interest towards EMI with an equal mean score of 3.69, while Basque L1 students' mean was significantly lower (3.03).

5.5. English proficiency

No significant ($p=0.136$) differences were found in students' responses to the Ideal L2 Self depending on their English proficiency. Nevertheless, we found significance ($p=0.001^{**}$) regarding the "Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI". Students with a lower English proficiency presented motivations more related to the Ought-to Self and to practical reasons ($M=2.08$) than students with a higher English level ($M=1.82$).

Table 7. *Students' motivations depending on their English proficiency. * $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$*

FACTOR	LOW ENGLISH LEVEL (M)	HIGH ENGLISH LEVEL (M)	SIGNIFICANCE
Ideal L2 Self	4.82	4.91	0.136
Ought-to Self and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI	2.08	1.82	0.001**
EMI interest	3.56	3.72	0.171

Finally, no significant ($p=0.171$) differences were detected regarding students' responses to the "EMI interest" scale depending on English proficiency.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we aimed to find out UPV/EHU students' motivations to enrol in EMI instead of BMI or SMI. Most of the students' motivations to enrol in EMI corresponded to the Ideal L2 Self, as found by other authors both in the Basque context (Lasagabaster, 2016) and in other settings (Kojima & Yashima, 2017). Most students did not feel pressured by other agents (the university, their parents/guardians, etc.) to study in English, but rather showed motivations more related to their personal preferences. Furthermore, these students imagined themselves using English in their near future careers like in a job or in further studies, which is in accordance with several studies in the field (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009). In this way, we can conclude that students show motivations mainly related to the Ideal L2 Self and not so much to the Ought-to L2 Self. In this regard, a clear effect of the educational context was found, as the Ought-to self plays a greater role at pre-university level than at university level, where participants are more mature and independent (Lasagabaster, 2016).

Another interesting point was that EMI students were divided between those who felt more motivated by EMI lessons than by Basque/Spanish lessons just because the former were taught in English, and those who did not. Consequently, we can conclude that a subject being taught in English becomes a motivational drive on its own for some EMI students. Once more, we identified some factors that influenced students' motivations to enrol in EMI – such as gender, university faculty, being Erasmus or local, students' L1 and their

English proficiency. Female students' motivations to learn through EMI were more related to the Ideal L2 Self than those of male students. These results contrast with those obtained by Lasagabaster (2016), who concluded that EMI seemed to help dilute gender-related differences regarding students' motivations contrary to what was previously argued in studies (Ryan, 2009) carried out in other contexts such as EFL courses. A possible explanation could lie in the fact that female students show more interest in learning different languages than their male counterparts and, thus, their motivations for studying EMI are more related to the Ideal L2 Self and not so much to external pressures. In this vein, Heras and Lasagabaster (2015) observed that male students showed significantly higher means in the Ought-to L2 Self component. In any case, this is a question that deserves further attention in future research.

Those students who manifested a motivation more linked to the Ideal L2 Self (Faculty of Education) were also the ones who presented more interest towards EMI. On the contrary, those students who did not connect that much with this kind of motivation were also the ones who showed less interest towards EMI. The latter is the case of Computer Science students, but this is a question that needs to be further researched and that would benefit from a qualitative approach. Besides, Erasmus students presented more "Ought-to Self"- and "Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI"-related motivations than local students. These results make sense since, in most cases, Erasmus students did not know either Basque or Spanish, so in a certain way, they were forced to choose EMI courses. As we can see, these results are directly related to the factor "students' L1". Students with L1s other than the official languages of the Basque Country manifested more "Ought-to Self" and Practical reasons for enrolling in EMI"-related motivations. However, we must take into account that most of the students who had a language other than Basque or Spanish as their L1 were, indeed, Erasmus students. It would be interesting, for future research, to see if this happens in the same way in other contexts with different languages.

All in all, we encourage universities to periodically ask students about the motivations that led them to enrol in a specific MOI, and their degree of satisfaction with it. This information can help policy makers to make top-down decisions more attuned with bottom-up opinions regarding the offer of studies in different languages. If EMI programmes are to be cogently implemented, all stakeholders should be given a voice.

As far as limitations are concerned, this study was not conceived as a longitudinal investigation, but it would be highly interesting to replicate the same study in the future and determine whether there are significant variations as time goes by, and how students' EMI experience affects their motivational drives. It would be very informative to examine whether students' opinions regarding their motivations to enrol in EMI change over time. A second limitation has to do with the fact that Master's students were underrepresented, which is why future studies could delve into the motivational differences between undergraduate and graduate students.

In conclusion, the rapid spread of English as a language of instruction in many non-English speaking countries requires further studies, as EMI implementation has clearly outpaced research in the field (Lasagabaster, 2022). This research should be frequently updated in order to provide recent and relevant evidence about the impact of EMI, as this would allow decision-makers to take action and implement new measures supported by empirical findings. Research should also provide help and guidance to teaching staff, because once students' motivational drives are unearthed, EMI practitioners could foster students' motivation by

trying to incorporate such drives into their courses, which would enable them to strengthen their students' Ideal L2 Selves. In this way both teachers' and students' objectives would be aligned and this would pave the way to academic success.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is part of the following research project: PID2020-117882GB-I00 (Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation).

8. REFERENCES

- Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2018). The L2 motivational self-system: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(4), 721-754. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2018.8.4.2>
- Al-Masheikhi, F., Al-Mahrooqi, R., & Denman, C. J. (2014). Investigating college of science student attitudes towards using English as a medium of instruction. In *The 2014 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings New Orleans, USA*. Retrieved from <http://www.westeastinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Eiman-Rahma-Christopher.pdf>.
- Belhiah, H., & Elhami, M. (2015). English as a medium of instruction in the Gulf: When students and teachers speak. *Language Policy*, 14(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9336-9>
- Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005-2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. *System*, 55, 145-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.10.006>
- Boyatzis, R. E., & Akrivou, K. (2006). The ideal self as the driver of intentional change. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(7), 624-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710610678454>
- Bozdoğan, N. & Karlidağ, B. (2013). Neglected productive skills in content-based classes. *Akdeniz Language Studies Conference 2012, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1152-1162.
- Chapple, J. (2015). Teaching in English Is Not Necessarily the Teaching of English. *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 1-13.
- Csizér, K., & Lukács, G. (2010). The comparative analysis of motivation, attitudes and selves: The case of English and German in Hungary. *System*, 38(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.001>
- Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' Beliefs about Translanguaging Practices. In C. M. Mazak & K.S. Carrol (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. (pp. 157-176). Multilingual Matters.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). English as L3 at a bilingual university in the Basque Country, Spain. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 84–105). *Multilingual Matters*.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 9-42). Multilingual Matters.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 421-62. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.4.421>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Motivation*. Pearson Education.
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, Language Attitudes and Globalisation: A Hungarian Perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ellili-Cherif, M., & Alkhateeb, H. (2015). College students' attitude toward the medium of instruction: Arabic versus English dilemma. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 3(3), 207-213. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2015.030306>
- Gao, X. (2008). Shifting motivational discourses among mainland Chinese students in an English medium tertiary institution in Hong Kong: A longitudinal inquiry. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(5), 599-614. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2000.38.3-4.229>
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 1-20). University of Hawaii Press.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-348). Academic Press.
- Henry, A. (2012). *L3 motivation*. Gothenburg, Sweden: University of Gothenburg Press.
- Heras, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2015). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(1), 70-88.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological review*, 94(3), 319. <https://doi.org/0033-295X/87/S00.75>
- Higgins, E. T. (1996). The "self-digest": Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(6), 1062-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.6.1062>
- Higgins, E. T., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1985). Self-concept discrepancy theory: A psychological model for distinguishing among different aspects of depression and anxiety. *Social Cognition*, 3(1), 51-76. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1985.3.1.51>
- Kang, S., & H. Park (2005). English as the medium of instruction in Korean Engineering education. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21.1, 155-174.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English-medium university. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 101-123.
- Kojima, N., & Yashima, T. (2017). Motivation in English medium instruction classrooms from the perspective of self-determination theory and the ideal self. *Jacet journal*, 61, 23-39. https://doi.org/10.32234/jacetjournal.61.0_23
- Lamb, M. (2007). The impact of school on EFL learning motivation: An Indonesian case study. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41(4), 757-780. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00102.x>
- Laugharne, J. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in Wales. In D. Lasagabaster & A. Huguët (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts: Language use and attitudes* (pp. 208-233). Multilingual Matters.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2004). Attitudes towards English in the Basque Autonomous Community. *World Englishes*, 23(1), 211-224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2004.00346.x>

- Lasagabaster, D. (2016). The relationship between motivation, gender, L1 and possible selves in English-medium instruction. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(3), 315-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1105806>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2022). *English-medium education in higher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, H. R., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954>
- Noels, K. A. (2003). Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. In Z. Dörnyei (Ed.), *Attitudes, Orientations, and Motivations in Language Learning* (pp. 97-136). Blackwell.
- Ó Laoire, M. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in Ireland. In D. Lasagabaster & A. Huguet (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts: Language use and attitudes* (pp. 164-183). Multilingual Matters.
- Oyserman, D., & James, L. (2009). Possible selves: From content to process. In K. Markman, W. M. P. Klein & J. A. Suhr (Eds.), *The Handbook of Imagination and Mental Stimulation* (pp. 373-394). Psychology Press.
- Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 120- 4). Multilingual Matters.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, 36, 66-97. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293>
- Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 91-124). University of Hawaii Press.
- Ushioda, E. (2014). Motivational perspectives on the self in SLA: A developmental view. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 127-141). Multilingual Matters.
- Ytsma, J. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in Friesland. In D. Lasagabaster & A. Huguet (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts: Language use and attitudes* (pp. 144-163). Multilingual Matters.