



INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

**ICRRD QUALITY INDEX RESEARCH JOURNAL**

ISSN: 2773-5958, <https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd>

# **Performing English, Learning Bilingually: The Institutional Promise–Practice Paradox of EMI in Bangladeshi Tertiary Education**

**Sultana Jahan**

*Department of Language and Communication, Patuakhali Science and Technology University,  
Bangladesh*

*\*Corresponding Author Email: [sjkoli10@gmail.com](mailto:sjkoli10@gmail.com)*

Received: 11 February 2026 • Accepted: 30 July 2026 • Published: 17 August 2026

## **ABSTRACT**

*English-medium instruction (EMI) has expanded across Bangladeshi higher education as a marker of academic quality, internationalisation, and graduate employability. Yet the institutional promotion of English does not necessarily translate into sustained English-medium classroom interaction or improved opportunities for students' language development. This qualitative multiple-case study examines how EMI is interpreted, negotiated, and enacted across three private universities in Bangladesh. Data were generated through semi-structured interviews with six teachers of content-oriented English-department courses and 18 final-year undergraduate students, three student focus-group discussions, and three classroom observations. The dataset was analysed using reflexive thematic analysis, supported by iterative coding, memo writing, within-case analysis, and cross-case comparison. Findings indicate that EMI functioned less as a stable English-only instructional model than as a negotiated bilingual practice shaped by uneven English proficiency, time constraints, and institutional expectations. Teachers used Bangla to clarify difficult concepts, sustain interaction, and support comprehension, while students valued English for its academic and professional benefits but often experienced English-only instruction as limiting confidence, participation, and access to disciplinary knowledge. Bilingual mediation, however, rarely formed part of a systematic approach to academic-English development. The central tension therefore lies not simply in teachers' departure from English-only instruction, but in universities' expectation that EMI will deliver both disciplinary learning and English proficiency without adequate linguistic, pedagogical, and assessment support. Conceptualising this tension as the EMI institutional promise–practice paradox, the study argues for a*

*linguistically responsive model that combines planned bilingual scaffolding, explicit disciplinary-language development, language-sensitive assessment, and sustained teacher support. By showing how bilingual mediation both sustains and complicates EMI, the study contributes to debates on multilingual pedagogy, linguistic equity, and institutional responsibility in multilingual higher education.*

**Keywords:** *English-medium instruction; institutional promise–practice paradox; bilingual pedagogy; higher education; Bangladesh*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

English-medium instruction (EMI) has expanded rapidly across higher education systems where English is not the principal language of wider society. Universities commonly adopt EMI to advance internationalisation, facilitate access to global knowledge, strengthen institutional competitiveness, and improve graduate employability (Dearden, 2014; Mitu, 2020; Macaro et al., 2018). As a result, EMI is often expected to achieve two outcomes simultaneously: enabling students to acquire disciplinary knowledge and enhancing their English proficiency. Yet neither outcome follows automatically from the formal adoption of English as the medium of instruction. EMI is generally distinguished from English language teaching because its primary purpose is the teaching of academic subjects rather than explicit language instruction (Dearden, 2014; Milon et al., 2023; Macaro, 2022). This distinction creates a structural ambiguity: teachers of linguistics, literature, TESOL, and other content-oriented subjects may understand their principal responsibility as developing disciplinary knowledge rather than providing general English-language instruction, while students are expected to learn complex subject matter through a language they are also expected—but not always explicitly supported—to develop. Research has therefore questioned the assumption that exposure to English through EMI necessarily produces meaningful linguistic gains or guarantees equitable access to disciplinary knowledge (Alam et al., 2024; Milon & Ali, 2023; Macaro et al., 2018).

Accordingly, EMI should not be treated as a self-implementing policy. Declaring English to be the medium of instruction does not resolve how difficult concepts will be made accessible, how students with uneven linguistic backgrounds will participate, or who is responsible for developing the academic English through which they are taught and assessed. EMI outcomes instead depend on the interaction of students' prior proficiency, teachers' pedagogical preparation, disciplinary demands, classroom participation, assessment practices, and the availability of academic-language support. Classroom language practices

therefore emerge not simply from individual compliance with policy, but from the negotiation of institutional expectations, teacher beliefs, student repertoires, assessment requirements, and locally available pedagogical resources.

These concerns are especially visible across Asian higher education contexts, where EMI is often promoted as a pathway to internationalisation, academic mobility, and labour-market competitiveness, while students' linguistic resources remain unevenly distributed. Studies of EMI and translanguaging practices in Asia show that English-only expectations are frequently complicated by classroom realities in which teachers and students draw on local languages to support explanation, comprehension, and participation (Tsou & Baker, 2021). This regional pattern indicates that the challenge is not simply whether English is used, but how English-medium programmes coordinate disciplinary learning, multilingual classroom practices, and students' academic-language development. The Asian EMI context therefore provides an important bridge between global debates on EMI expansion and the specific institutional and pedagogical tensions found in Bangladesh.

Within this broader Asian EMI landscape, Bangladesh offers a particularly important context because Bangla carries profound historical, cultural, and affective importance, while English is strongly associated with higher education, prestigious employment, international communication, and social mobility. Students enter university through diverse educational streams, including Bangla-medium, English-version, English-medium, and madrasa education, and consequently bring markedly unequal experiences of learning and using English. Years of formal English study do not necessarily prepare all students to understand lectures, participate in classroom discussion, read disciplinary texts, or produce assessed work in English (Milon et al., 2023; Milon & Ali, 2023; Yasmin et al., 2024). This contradiction is especially visible in Bangladesh's rapidly expanding private university sector, where English frequently forms part of institutional identity and market positioning. Although EMI is presented as providing access to international curricula and producing graduates capable of competing in professional domains, this promise may be difficult to realise when students begin with uneven proficiency and content-course teachers receive limited preparation for integrating language-sensitive support into content teaching.

Previous Bangladesh-focused research has shown that medium-of-instruction policies are neither interpreted nor enacted uniformly. Milon et al. (2023), for example, demonstrated that language practices in a private university were shaped by competing ideologies, stakeholder positions, and institutional divisions rather than by a straightforward movement from policy to implementation. Later studies have

similarly reported uncertainty over whether English, Bangla, or a combination of both can adequately serve students' disciplinary and linguistic needs (Alam et al., 2018, 2021, 2024, 2025; Milon et al., 2024, 2026). However, identifying a gap between policy and practice does not fully explain how that gap is pedagogically produced or what it means for students' access to disciplinary knowledge and opportunities for English development. In classroom interaction, teachers may use Bangla alongside English to explain technical concepts, connect new knowledge with students' prior understanding, check comprehension, and sustain participation. From a rigid English-only perspective, such practices may appear to signal failed EMI; nevertheless, they may also perform essential pedagogical work by making disciplinary content accessible. At the same time, bilingual explanation should not be romanticised, because it may support immediate comprehension without systematically helping students acquire the vocabulary, genres, and interactional practices required for later academic performance in English.

Building on this tension, the study conceptualises the unresolved relationship between institutional expectations and classroom practice as the EMI institutional promise–practice paradox. The paradox extends beyond a simple mismatch between official policy and classroom behaviour. It refers to a situation in which institutions derive symbolic, competitive, and educational value from promoting English, while effective disciplinary learning often depends on bilingual mediation that remains weakly recognised within formal EMI arrangements. Moreover, the practices that make content accessible may not be systematically connected to English-language development. Institutions therefore rely on linguistic flexibility to make EMI workable while continuing to attach its principal educational value to English. Against this background, the study investigates how EMI is interpreted, negotiated, and enacted across three purposefully selected private-university cases in Bangladesh. It addresses three questions: (1) How do institutional expectations, content-course teachers, and final-year undergraduate students understand the purposes and requirements of EMI? (2) How do teachers and students negotiate EMI through English, Bangla, and bilingual classroom practices? and (3) How do these practices shape students' access to disciplinary knowledge, classroom participation, and opportunities for academic-English development?

The study argues that the central difficulty is not teachers' or students' failure to maintain English-only interaction; rather, it lies in an institutional arrangement that expects EMI to produce both disciplinary learning and English proficiency without consistently integrating language-sensitive pedagogy, aligned assessment, teacher preparation, and academic-language support. By bringing teacher and student interviews, focus-group discussions, and classroom observations into a cross-case analysis, the study connects institutional expectations with the situated practices through which those expectations are made

workable. In doing so, it advances a linguistically responsive conception of EMI in which disciplinary access and academic-English development are treated as related but distinct responsibilities requiring sustained institutional coordination.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### *2.1 EMI's dual promise: Disciplinary learning and English development*

English-medium instruction (EMI) is commonly promoted as a means of internationalising higher education, expanding access to global knowledge, and improving graduates' employment prospects (Dearden, 2014; Macaro et al., 2018). Although EMI is conventionally defined as the teaching of academic subjects through English in contexts where English is not the first language of most of the population, institutions frequently associate it with both disciplinary learning and improved English proficiency (Macaro, 2018). This dual expectation is problematic because content learning and language development are related but distinct educational processes. Existing evidence does not support the assumption that adopting English as the instructional medium automatically improves students' proficiency or leaves disciplinary learning unaffected. Macaro et al.'s (2018) systematic review found that EMI outcomes vary according to students' prior proficiency, teachers' pedagogical preparation, disciplinary demands, classroom interaction, and institutional support. Later scholarship has similarly argued that the effectiveness of EMI cannot be inferred simply from the amount of English to which students are exposed (Macaro, 2022; Rose et al., 2020).

This distinction has important pedagogical and equity implications. Exposure may familiarise students with disciplinary terminology, but language development also requires opportunities to use academic discourse, receive feedback, and participate increasingly independently in disciplinary practices. At the same time, students enter EMI programmes with unequal access to English because of differences in schooling, socioeconomic position, and prior opportunities to use the language. Those with stronger English may be better able to understand lectures, consult academic texts, and participate publicly, while less-proficient students must process unfamiliar subject matter through a language they are still developing. EMI may therefore reproduce earlier educational inequalities when English proficiency is treated as an entry condition or an individual responsibility rather than as an area requiring sustained institutional support.

## 2.2 Bilingual mediation in EMI classrooms

Against this background, the multilingual practices of EMI classrooms complicate the representation of EMI as English-only instruction. Teachers and students often draw on familiar languages to explain difficult concepts, clarify terminology, connect new knowledge with prior understanding, check comprehension, and sustain participation (Macaro, 2018; Tsou & Baker, 2021; Alam et al., 2022a, 2022b; Al Nahar et al., 2024). Such practices suggest that disciplinary learning through English may depend partly on bilingual mediation. However, the literature describes these practices through related but distinct concepts, including code-switching, translanguaging, and bilingual pedagogy. Code-switching generally refers to alternation between socially recognised languages, whereas translanguaging foregrounds multilingual speakers' use of an integrated communicative repertoire (García & Li Wei, 2014). A translanguaging pedagogy additionally implies deliberate instructional organisation. Observable movement between English and Bangla should therefore not automatically be classified as planned translanguaging; it may be strategic, habitual, spontaneous, or prompted by immediate difficulty.

Recognising these differences helps avoid interpreting every use of Bangla as evidence of inadequate English, weak teaching, or unsuccessful EMI implementation. Such a view equates policy compliance with educational effectiveness and overlooks the epistemic work performed through students' familiar language. Understanding a disciplinary concept and expressing it exclusively in English are not identical abilities. An English-only requirement may consequently privilege students with stronger prior exposure while restricting the participation of those who possess relevant disciplinary knowledge but fewer English resources. From this perspective, bilingual mediation can serve an important pedagogical function by widening access to meaning and enabling students to participate in disciplinary interaction.

At the same time, bilingual practice should not be assumed to be inherently transformative. Bilingual explanation may improve immediate comprehension without helping students acquire the English vocabulary, genres, and forms of argumentation required for presentations, assignments, or examinations. Students may understand a concept through Bangla but remain unable to explain, analyse, or evaluate it independently in English. This problem becomes especially visible when classroom teaching is bilingual but assessment is conducted entirely in English. Unless assessment criteria distinguish disciplinary understanding from language performance, students may be judged partly on linguistic resources they have not been systematically supported to develop (Hossen et al., 2026). The value of bilingual mediation

therefore depends on whether it bridges conceptual understanding and developing participation in English-mediated academic practices, rather than repeatedly substituting for such development.

### ***2.3 Institutional responsibility for language, pedagogy, and assessment***

The relationship between bilingual practice and English development cannot be explained solely through individual teachers' language choices because those choices are shaped by wider institutional conditions. Dafouz and Smit's (2020) ROAD-MAPPING framework conceptualises English-medium education as an institutional ecology in which the roles assigned to English, academic disciplines, language management, agents, practices, and internationalisation interact. From this perspective, EMI is not simply a policy implemented by lecturers; it is continually negotiated across institutional discourse, curricula, classrooms, support services, and assessment. This institutional orientation also reveals uncertainty over responsibility for language development. Universities may publicise the linguistic benefits of EMI while expecting students to arrive already prepared for English-medium study. Language centres may provide general English courses, whereas disciplinary lecturers may understand themselves primarily as content specialists.

Nevertheless, academic language is embedded in disciplinary practice. Explaining a linguistic concept, interpreting a literary text, and evaluating a TESOL approach require different forms of terminology, reasoning, and academic expression that generic language instruction cannot fully address. Separating content from language therefore creates a structural contradiction: institutions expect EMI to improve English, while language development remains marginal to disciplinary curricula. Teachers may use Bangla to secure understanding without guidance on how to connect bilingual explanation with students' academic English, leaving students responsible for outcomes that programmes promote but do not explicitly teach. Assessment further exposes this contradiction. When bilingual teaching is followed by English-only assessment, institutions must clarify whether language, disciplinary knowledge, or both are being evaluated. Without aligned criteria and developmental feedback, English may become an unacknowledged source of penalty. Effective EMI therefore requires coordination among pedagogy, language support, and assessment rather than reliance on individual improvisation.

### ***2.4 EMI in Bangladeshi higher education and the research gap***

These concerns are particularly relevant in Bangladesh, where EMI operates within unequal but interconnected values attached to Bangla and English. Bangla has central historical, cultural, and national

significance, while English is associated with higher education, professional advancement, international communication, and social mobility. English consequently functions as valuable linguistic capital, but access to it is unevenly distributed. Students enter universities through Bangla-medium, English-version, English-medium, and madrasa streams, creating substantial variation in their readiness for English-mediated study. Research has shown that some private-university students continue to experience difficulties with spoken participation despite studying in institutions that officially promote English (Milon et al., 2023; Milon, 2016, 2020). Such difficulties cannot be reduced to individual motivation because they are also connected to prior educational opportunities and the forms of support available after university entry.

English is particularly important to the identity and market positioning of private universities. Milon et al. (2023) demonstrated that medium-of-instruction policy in a Bangladeshi private university was shaped by competing ideologies, stakeholder interests, and institutional divisions rather than implemented uniformly. This work explains why English retains strong institutional legitimacy, but it does not establish that EMI consistently produces the linguistic and disciplinary outcomes attached to it. Research on students' and graduates' experiences reveals similarly conditional benefits. Milon et al. (2026) found that graduates associated EMI with English proficiency and employment opportunities, although their accounts also highlighted the importance of individual effort and meaningful opportunities to use English. Alam et al. (2022a) further showed that willingness to communicate among Bangladeshi university students was strongly shaped by classroom conditions and prior learning experiences. These studies suggest that the perceived value of EMI may exceed the language development produced through exposure alone, particularly when classroom interaction does not create equitable opportunities for participation.

Existing scholarship therefore shows that EMI is ideologically valued, that students enter university with unequal linguistic resources, and that classroom participation and language practices vary considerably. Less attention, however, has been paid to how teachers' pedagogical reasoning, students' experiences of comprehension and participation, and observed bilingual practices interact across institutionally distinct cases. In particular, the relationship between bilingual access to disciplinary knowledge and responsibility for subsequent academic-English development remains insufficiently explained. To address this problem, the present study brings teacher and student interviews, student focus groups, and classroom observations into a comparative analysis of three private universities. It conceptualises the EMI institutional promise—practice paradox as the intersection of three conditions: the institutional value attached to English, reliance

<https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v7i2.6>

on bilingual mediation for disciplinary access, and insufficient coordination of academic-English development. This formulation shifts attention from whether teachers comply with English-only expectations to how institutional promises, classroom practices, and responsibility for language learning are negotiated together.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 *Research design*

This study employed a qualitative multiple-case study design to examine how English-medium instruction (EMI) was interpreted, negotiated, and enacted in three private universities in Bangladesh. A case study design was appropriate because EMI practices cannot be separated from the institutional expectations, disciplinary settings, and classroom relationships through which they are produced (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2018; Milon et al., 2018a, 2018b). Each university therefore constituted a bounded case, enabling the analysis to preserve institutional specificity before comparing similarities and differences across the three sites. Guided by an interpretivist orientation, the study treated EMI not as a fixed policy measurable by the quantity of English used, but as a situated practice shaped by teachers' and students' interpretations of disciplinary explanation, participation, assessment, and language development.

#### 3.2 *Site and participant selection*

The three private universities were purposefully selected as information-rich cases in which EMI was sufficiently established to permit close examination of the relationship between institutional expectations and classroom practice. Site selection followed three criteria: English was formally recognised as the principal medium of instruction; the universities offered undergraduate programmes taught by disciplinary specialists; and access could be secured for teacher and student interviews, focus-group discussions, and classroom observation. Criterion-based purposeful selection was more appropriate than random sampling because the study did not seek to estimate the prevalence of EMI practices, but to investigate how their pedagogical and institutional tensions were experienced in settings where EMI was firmly embedded (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To protect confidentiality, the identities and locations of the universities were withheld, and the sites are referred to as Universities A, B, and C.

Participant recruitment also followed criterion-based purposeful sampling. The sample comprised six content-course teachers and 18 final-year undergraduate students, with two teachers and six students

recruited from each university. Eligible teachers were specialists in English, linguistics, TESOL, or related fields who had taught content-oriented undergraduate courses through English at the participating universities for between 10 and 15 years. Although the programmes were housed within English departments, the selected courses focused on disciplinary content rather than on general English-language proficiency. Their substantial teaching experience enabled them to reflect on recurring patterns in classroom language choice, student preparedness, assessment practices, and institutional expectations surrounding EMI. The student participants were enrolled in the final year of undergraduate English programmes and had completed multiple content-oriented courses in linguistics, literature, TESOL, or related disciplinary areas through English. Their extended experience across courses, teachers, and assessment tasks allowed them to comment on sustained patterns of comprehension, participation, language use, and English development rather than on a single class or semester.

Participants were approached through departmental contacts, email invitations, and programme coordinators, and participation was entirely voluntary. The equal distribution of teachers and students across the three universities supported systematic within-case and cross-case comparison. The sample was not intended to be statistically representative of EMI teachers or students in Bangladeshi higher education. Its value lay instead in the participants' sustained experience of English-medium study and teaching, as well as in the comparative leverage offered by three bounded cases. This approach is consistent with qualitative case study principles that prioritise contextual relevance, information richness, and explanatory depth over numerical representativeness (Yin, 2018).

### **3.3 Data generation**

Data were generated through semi-structured interviews, student focus-group discussions, and classroom observations. These methods captured complementary dimensions of EMI: individual interviews elicited teachers' and students' interpretations, focus groups revealed areas of shared and contested student experience, and observations provided situated evidence of how English and Bangla were used in classroom interaction. Their combined use enabled the study to examine both participants' reported understandings and the ways in which bilingual practices were enacted in particular teaching contexts.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with all six teachers and 18 students, either face-to-face or through Zoom, depending on participant preference and practical availability. Teacher interviews explored understandings of EMI, reasons for using English and Bangla, experiences of teaching

disciplinary content, perceptions of students' linguistic needs, assessment practices, and institutional support. Student interviews focused on comprehension, participation, classroom language choices, confidence in using English, assessment experiences, and perceived opportunities for language development. Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and was conducted in English, Bangla, or a combination of both, according to participants' preferences. With consent, the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Bangla material selected for reporting was translated into English by the researcher, and translation accuracy was checked through member checking. The semi-structured format ensured a common analytical focus while allowing individual experiences and emerging concerns to be explored in depth.

Three student focus-group discussions were also conducted, one in each university, with the six participating students from that institution. The discussions enabled students to compare experiences, respond to one another's views, and reflect on differences among courses and teachers. Particular attention was given to the perceived benefits and difficulties of English-only instruction, the pedagogical use of Bangla, classroom participation, assessment, and students' expectations of EMI. Each focus group lasted approximately 50 minutes, was conducted in both English and Bangla, and was audio-recorded and transcribed using the same procedures as the individual interviews. This interactional format generated areas of agreement, disagreement, and qualification that might not have emerged as clearly in one-to-one interviews.

To connect participants' accounts with observed classroom practice, three classroom observations were undertaken, one in each university. Each observation lasted approximately one hour and ten minutes and involved a content-oriented class in linguistics, TESOL, or a related area within an undergraduate English programme. The researcher adopted a non-participant observer role and used structured field notes to record language choice, interactional sequences, patterns of participation, teacher-student exchanges, classroom management, and contextual details. Particular attention was paid to how teachers moved between English and Bangla during explanation, questioning, clarification, and responses to apparent comprehension difficulties. Because only one class was observed in each institution, the observation data were treated as situated illustrations rather than as representative accounts of teaching across the three universities.

### **3.4 Data analysis**

The interview, focus-group, and observation data were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis, which treats analysis as an interpretive process shaped by sustained engagement with the dataset rather than as a mechanical extraction of themes (Braun & Clarke, 2021, 2022). Analysis began with repeated reading of interview and focus-group transcripts and observation notes. Initial coding attended to institutional expectations as described by participants, purposes attributed to EMI, language choices, disciplinary explanation, comprehension, participation, assessment, English development, and responsibility for linguistic support. At the same time, coding remained open to issues that extended beyond the research questions, and analytical memos were used to record interpretive decisions, emerging relationships, and evidence that complicated the developing analysis.

Each university was first examined as an individual case so that participant accounts and observed classroom practices remained connected to their institutional setting. Cross-case comparison then identified recurring patterns, contrasts, and exceptions across Universities A, B, and C. The research questions and the emerging idea of the EMI institutional promise–practice paradox sensitised the analysis, but they were not imposed as predetermined themes. Instead, themes were refined according to their internal coherence, distinction from one another, and explanatory power in relation to bilingual mediation, participation, assessment, and English-language development.

### **3.5 Reflexivity and research quality**

Research quality was pursued through methodological transparency, reflexive engagement, contextual depth, and meaningful coherence rather than through the expectation that another researcher would reproduce identical interpretations. Analysis involved comparison across teacher interviews, student interviews, focus-group discussions, and classroom observations, together with within-case and cross-case examination. Particular attention was given to evidence that qualified or challenged dominant patterns. The different sources were not treated as independent routes to a single objective truth; instead, they enabled examination of convergences and tensions between participants' reported experiences and observed classroom practice.

Reflexivity was maintained throughout the research process because interpretation was shaped by the researcher. The researcher is a Bangla–English bilingual university teacher with professional experience in English-medium higher education in Bangladesh. This positioning provided valuable contextual

<https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v7i2.6>

familiarity, while also requiring sustained attention to assumptions about English, Bangla, and educational quality. Reflexive notes and analytical memos documented methodological decisions, responses to participants, changes in interpretation, and the ways in which the researcher's positioning may have influenced interview interactions, coding choices, and theme development. These practices supported rigor, sincerity, credibility, ethics, resonance, and meaningful coherence in line with qualitative quality principles (Milon et al., 2017; Tracy, 2010).

### **3.6 Ethical considerations**

Ethical procedures were integrated throughout the study. The universities and participants were assigned pseudonyms, while identifying institutional details, including geographical location, were withheld. Participants were informed about the purpose of the research, the voluntary nature of participation, and the intended use of the data, and informed consent was obtained before interviews, focus-group discussions, and classroom observations. Focus-group participants were also reminded that, although the researcher would anonymise all reported material, confidentiality among group members could not be guaranteed in the same way as in individual interviews. Research materials were managed confidentially, and extracts selected for publication were anonymised to minimise the possibility of identifying individuals or institutions.

## **4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

Analysis across teacher interviews, student interviews, focus-group discussions, and classroom observations generated four interrelated themes: English as an institutional and pedagogical expectation; bilingual mediation as a condition of disciplinary access; unequal participation under EMI; and the weak coordination of language development and assessment. These themes trace an analytical progression from participants' understandings of EMI to its classroom enactment and educational consequences. Across the three cases, English retained academic, professional, and symbolic authority, whereas teachers and students frequently relied on Bangla to secure comprehension and participation. The central tension therefore lay not in bilingual practice itself, but in the limited institutional support available for connecting bilingual access with sustained academic-English development. The final subsection draws the themes together through the concept of the EMI institutional promise–practice paradox.

#### 4.1 English as institutional promise and pedagogical expectation

Teachers and students consistently described English as central to the identity and perceived value of private higher education. Teachers associated EMI with institutional reputation, student and parental expectations, graduate employability, and a wider image of modernity, while simultaneously questioning whether English could be sustained as the sole language of disciplinary explanation:

*“The university wants us to teach in English because students and guardians expect that from a private university. English shows that the institution is modern and internationally oriented. But inside the classroom, the situation is not always so simple.” (T-A1)*

The teacher’s reference to students and guardians suggests that English is understood partly as an educational commodity. EMI distinguishes private higher education within a competitive market and functions as a visible sign of institutional quality. Yet the contrast introduced by *‘not always so simple’* separates this public promise from its pedagogical feasibility. The account echoes Milon et al.’s (2023) finding that medium-of-instruction practices in a Bangladeshi private university were shaped by competing ideologies and institutional interests. The present analysis extends that argument by showing how the symbolic value of English generates an unequal distribution of responsibility: institutions benefit reputationally from EMI, while teachers undertake the practical work of making English-medium teaching comprehensible. In this account, English can be understood as a form of *institutional capital* as well as a pedagogical demand that teachers must negotiate.

Students likewise endorsed English for its perceived professional value, although their support was conditional on whether it facilitated rather than obstructed learning:

*“I chose a private university partly because everything would be in English. For jobs, interviews, presentations, English is necessary. But when a teacher explains a difficult topic only in English, sometimes I understand the words but not the main idea.” (S-B3)*

A focus-group exchange further revealed that students judged successful EMI through different criteria:

*S-A2: “If teachers use Bangla, then what is the difference between this university and a Bangla-medium institution?”*

*S-A5: “But if we do not understand the lesson, only hearing English has no benefit.”*

*S-A6: “Maybe both are needed. The concept can be explained in Bangla, but the terms and discussion should return to English.” (FGD-A)*

The interview extract distinguishes lexical recognition from disciplinary understanding. English is valued prospectively as a resource for employment, yet it becomes an immediate barrier when exposure is treated as equivalent to comprehension. The focus-group exchange similarly frames EMI as institutional distinctiveness, access to meaning, and planned movement between languages. The third position is especially significant because it rejects both rigid English-only instruction and unrestricted language alternation. It proposes an implicit pedagogical sequence from Bangla-supported understanding to English disciplinary expression. This represents a form of ‘*conditional endorsement*’ of EMI: students value English, but only when it is organised in ways that preserve access to disciplinary learning. The exchange therefore anticipates the wider finding that participants recognised the need to connect comprehension and English development, although this connection remained largely dependent on individual teachers.

#### **4.2 Bilingual mediation as a condition of disciplinary access**

Teacher accounts indicated that Bangla was commonly introduced when English-only explanation failed to produce visible comprehension or interaction:

*“I begin with English because the slides, textbooks, and examinations are in English. If students look confused, I explain the difficult point in Bangla and then return to the English terminology. Otherwise, I may complete the lecture, but I cannot say that learning has happened.” (T-C2)*

The distinction between completing a lecture and enabling learning is central to the teacher’s reasoning. English permits formal curriculum delivery, but the teacher does not treat delivery as sufficient evidence of comprehension. The phrase ‘*learning has happened*’ reveals that the teacher evaluates EMI through students’ access to meaning rather than through surface compliance with an English-only expectation. The reported sequence—English introduction, Bangla explanation, and return to English terminology—also shows that the two languages performed different but complementary functions. Bangla carried explanatory and interpretive work, whereas English retained terminological and evaluative authority because it remained the language of textbooks and examinations. This relationship was therefore not symmetrical: Bangla facilitated access to knowledge, while English continued to determine how that knowledge would be formally recognised and demonstrated.

A classroom observation illustrated how such mediation emerged through interaction rather than from a predetermined language plan:

*The lecturer introduced the concept of “learner-centred teaching” in English and asked students to define it. No student responded. The lecturer then explained the idea in Bangla through a familiar classroom example in which students worked collaboratively while the teacher acted as a facilitator. Several students responded in Bangla. The lecturer reformulated their answers in English, wrote the English definition on the board, and asked students to repeat the key phrase. (OBS-B)*

Two students offered contrasting evaluations of comparable practices:

*“When the teacher explains the difficult part in Bangla, the English slide becomes meaningful. Before that, I can read the slide, but I do not know why the point is important.” (S-A5)*

*“Bangla is helpful for difficult topics, but some teachers continue in Bangla for almost the whole class. Then the slide is in English, the examination is in English, but we do not practise explaining the answer in English.” (S-C1)*

The observation complicates the equation of English quantity with EMI quality. Before the language shift, English dominated but participation was absent; after the shift, students entered the discussion and their ideas were reformulated in English. Bilingual mediation therefore increased rather than displaced meaningful engagement with English. Alam et al. (2022a) similarly found that Bangladeshi university students’ willingness to communicate is shaped by classroom conditions and prior learning experiences. The present evidence adds that language mediation can alter those conditions by opening access to interaction. However, the two student extracts also expose an important distinction between ‘*mediation for access*’ and ‘*scaffolding for development*’. The former resolves immediate comprehension, whereas the latter deliberately links that understanding to the terminology, genres, and interactional practices required for later English-medium performance. Across the cases, teachers frequently enabled the first but only inconsistently organised the second.

#### ***4.3 Unequal participation and the linguistic production of competence***

Teachers and students reported that EMI influenced who participated, how quickly they could respond, and whose disciplinary knowledge became publicly visible: *“The students from English-medium or*

*English-version backgrounds usually speak first. Some Bangla-medium students know the answer, but they hesitate because they are afraid of making grammatical mistakes in front of others.” (T-B1)*

*“Sometimes I know what I want to say, but I need time to make the sentence in English. Before I am ready, another student answers. After that, I remain quiet.” (S-B6)*

The teacher distinguishes disciplinary knowledge from its English expression, although classroom interaction may not preserve that distinction. Students who respond fluently can appear more knowledgeable because their understanding is immediately accessible to teachers and peers, while students requiring additional processing time risk being interpreted as less prepared or less engaged. The student’s account shows that participation is governed not only by knowledge but also by speed. The need to formulate an idea and then convert it into acceptable English creates an ‘*interactional cost*’ for students with fewer linguistic resources. Their silence is therefore not transparent evidence of misunderstanding; it may instead reflect a classroom rhythm that privileges ‘*linguistic immediacy*’. In this way, EMI can transform differences in prior English exposure into differences in classroom visibility and recognition.

A focus-group exchange showed that these pressures were also socially reinforced:

*S-C2: “If I speak Bangla, the teacher may think my English is weak.”*

*S-C4: “And if you speak English with mistakes, some classmates laugh.”*

*S-C5: “So many students avoid speaking. They only write notes.” (FGD-C)*

The same pattern was visible during classroom observation:

*During English-only questioning, four students seated near the front answered repeatedly. After the lecturer restated one question in Bangla, several students from the middle and back rows responded. The lecturer acknowledged their answers but moved on without asking them to reformulate their ideas in English. (OBS-A)*

Students were caught between two risks: speaking Bangla could mark them as unsuitable for EMI, while speaking imperfect English could expose them to peer judgement. Silence consequently became a ‘*protective strategy*’. The paradox is that an environment intended to develop English may discourage the participation through which development could occur. English thus operated not merely as a channel of communication but as a measure of student legitimacy. The observation confirms that earlier silence could

not be attributed solely to lack of disciplinary knowledge, since Bangla widened participation immediately. Yet the teacher did not build from Bangla participation towards English expression. The episode therefore captures both the enabling and limiting effects of bilingual mediation: it redistributed access to discussion but did not extend that access into sustained English-language practice. This finding sharpens Macaro et al.'s (2018) argument that EMI outcomes depend on proficiency and contextual support by showing that students with fewer English resources may receive fewer opportunities to test ideas, obtain feedback, and be recognised as competent.

#### **4.4 Language development and assessment as unallocated responsibilities**

Teachers and students expressed different assumptions about who should support English development:

*“My responsibility is to teach linguistics. I can clarify technical terms or correct an important language problem, but I cannot provide general grammar instruction in every class. If I spend too much time on language correction, I may not be able to complete the syllabus.” (T-A2)*

*“We pay for an English-medium education, so after four years we should be able to speak and write professionally. But teachers mainly correct the subject answer. They do not always explain how to improve the English.” (S-C4)*

The teacher frames content and language as competing curricular responsibilities. This position is understandable because teachers of content-oriented courses may regard their primary responsibility as developing disciplinary knowledge rather than providing general English-language instruction. Nevertheless, the account also reveals the limitations of equating language support with grammar correction. Disciplinary language development involves learning how to define, compare, evaluate, justify, and construct arguments in field-specific ways; it cannot be reduced to remedial instruction. The concern about syllabus completion further exposes an institutional hierarchy in which content coverage is formally scheduled and assessed, while academic-language development remains optional and dependent on individual judgement.

By contrast, the student treats English development as part of the institutional promise associated with private higher education. Because the participants were enrolled in English programmes, this expectation was likely shaped both by the universities' English-medium orientation and by the explicit linguistic identity of their degree. The account nevertheless remains analytically significant because it shows that

students expected professional English development across the programme, while responsibility for providing such development was not clearly allocated within content-oriented courses. The mismatch does not mean that either the teacher or the student was necessarily mistaken; rather, it reveals an unresolved institutional responsibility for connecting disciplinary learning with sustained academic-English development.

The same uncertainty appeared in assessment:

*“If the content is correct but the English is weak, I usually give marks for the content. But in presentations, language affects the impression. We do not have a common guideline about how much English should count.” (T-C1)*

*S-B1: “In class, the teacher explains in Bangla, but in the exam we must write everything in English.”*

*S-B3: “Sometimes I know the answer in Bangla, but I cannot organise it properly in English.”*

*S-B5: “Then the mark does not show only subject knowledge. It also shows who can write better English.” (FGD-B)*

The phrase *‘affects the impression’* exposes a form of implicit language assessment. Fluency, grammatical control, and rhetorical confidence may shape teachers’ judgements even when they are absent from formal criteria, leaving students uncertain about how language influences grades. The focus-group exchange similarly distinguishes conceptual knowledge from the linguistic means through which it is evaluated. Students do not argue that English should be removed from assessment; rather, they identify the absence of a planned transition from bilingual learning to English-only performance. Dafouz and Smit’s (2020) institutional perspective helps explain this problem: EMI is produced through relationships among policy, disciplinary practice, language management, institutional actors, and internationalisation. The issue cannot therefore be addressed merely by asking teachers to use more English. It requires coordination across assessment design, curriculum, teacher development, and academic-language provision. English is central when institutions define the medium and regulate assessment, yet it becomes peripheral when responsibility for its development is assigned.

#### **4.5 The EMI institutional promise–practice paradox across the three cases**

Comparison of participant accounts and the observed lessons suggested differences in how bilingual practice was organised across the three cases. In University A, participants described stronger

expectations for English during formal teaching, although the observed teacher used Bangla to widen participation. Evidence from University B indicated a more structured movement from Bangla-supported explanation towards English reformulation, whereas participants in University C reported more extensive reliance on Bangla, with English remaining prominent in slides, terminology, and assessment. These variations suggest that bilingual practice was not uniform: in one setting, it functioned as temporary scaffolding, while in another, it became the principal language of explanation and English remained predominantly textual and evaluative. Given that only one lesson was observed in each university, these patterns should be interpreted as case-based tendencies rather than comprehensive representations of institutional teaching practice. Despite these differences, three conditions recurred across the cases: English carried strong symbolic, academic, and professional value; classroom access frequently depended on Bangla-supported explanation and interaction; and responsibility for converting bilingual comprehension into academic-English development remained dispersed and weakly coordinated.

Whereas a policy–practice gap identifies non-correspondence between formal expectations and classroom behaviour, the institutional promise–practice paradox captures a relationship of functional dependence. Bilingual mediation helps sustain EMI pedagogically, even though it remains weakly recognised and may not fulfil the English-development promise attached to EMI. Institutions and participants associate English with educational quality, professional mobility, and institutional reputation, yet effective disciplinary learning often depends on Bangla for explanation, clarification, and participation. Bangla therefore performs much of the pedagogical work required to make EMI viable, while English retains institutional, terminological, and evaluative authority. The relationship is thus not one of simple opposition between policy and practice; rather, EMI depends on bilingual practices that it does not fully acknowledge or systematically organise.

This interpretation also prevents an unqualified celebration of multilingual practice. Bilingual mediation can widen access to disciplinary knowledge, but its developmental value depends on whether teachers reconnect Bangla-supported understanding with English terminology, disciplinary genres, classroom participation, and assessment preparation. Without such progression, bilingual practice may resolve immediate comprehension while leaving the broader promise of English development unfulfilled. A linguistically responsive EMI model would therefore legitimise Bangla as a resource for conceptual learning while organising a gradual movement towards English disciplinary performance. It would also distribute responsibility for this progression across curriculum design, teacher preparation, academic-language support, and assessment. The central problem is not that teachers and students fail to maintain

<https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v7i2.6>

English-only interaction, but that they are required to negotiate, largely on their own, the relationship among English as institutional capital, Bangla as pedagogical access, and English as evaluative authority. The institutional promise–practice paradox names this structural relationship and explains why neither stricter English-only enforcement nor informal bilingual accommodation is sufficient.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This study examined how English-medium instruction was interpreted, negotiated, and enacted across three private universities in Bangladesh. Guided by three research questions, it investigated how content-course teachers and final-year undergraduate students understood EMI, how they negotiated English and Bangla in classroom practice, and how these practices shaped students' access to disciplinary knowledge, participation, and opportunities for academic-English development. The findings show that EMI did not function as a stable English-only arrangement; rather, it operated as a negotiated bilingual practice shaped by institutional expectations, uneven English proficiency, time constraints, and the practical demands of teaching and learning content-oriented courses.

In relation to the first research question, the study found that teachers and students understood EMI as a marker of institutional quality, academic value, professional mobility, and graduate employability. English was associated with prestige and future opportunity, but participants also recognised that English alone did not always provide sufficient access to disciplinary understanding. This finding shows that EMI carried a strong institutional promise, while its classroom success depended on conditions that were not always systematically supported.

In relation to the second research question, the findings showed that teachers and students negotiated EMI through flexible bilingual practices. Bangla was used to clarify difficult concepts, support comprehension, encourage participation, and connect abstract disciplinary ideas with students' existing knowledge. In some cases, teachers moved from English terminology to Bangla explanation and then back to English reformulation; in others, Bangla became the main language of explanation while English remained visible in slides, terminology, textbooks, and assessment. This variation indicates that bilingual mediation was not a simple departure from EMI, but one of the ways through which EMI was made pedagogically workable.

In relation to the third research question, the study found that bilingual mediation widened immediate access to disciplinary knowledge and enabled some students to participate more confidently. However, it

did not consistently support students' gradual development of academic English. Students could understand concepts through Bangla but still struggle to explain, write, or present those ideas in English for assessment. The study therefore conceptualises this tension as the EMI institutional promise–practice paradox: English retains institutional, terminological, and evaluative authority, while Bangla frequently performs the explanatory and participatory work required to sustain learning. This paradox shows why neither stricter English-only enforcement nor informal bilingual accommodation is sufficient without planned coordination among pedagogy, academic-language development, and assessment.

The first institutional implication therefore concerns the organisation of language use. Where English-only expectations are formally stated or informally enforced, universities should move towards linguistically responsive EMI guidance. Such guidance should recognise selective Bangla use as a legitimate pedagogical resource rather than as automatic evidence of failure. At the same time, it should support teachers in connecting Bangla-supported understanding with English disciplinary expression through reformulation, guided practice, and gradual progression towards independent language use.

Professional development should support this progression. Rather than focusing narrowly on maximising the quantity of English used in class, teacher development should address the relationship between language and disciplinary learning. Teachers need support in identifying when students' silence reflects linguistic difficulty rather than lack of knowledge, explaining specialised concepts bilingually, reformulating student responses in disciplinary English, and designing activities that move from comprehension to production. Such preparation would allow bilingual practice to function as planned scaffolding rather than as an improvised response to immediate classroom difficulty.

A second implication concerns responsibility for academic-English development. Teachers of linguistics, literature, TESOL, and other content-oriented subjects should not be expected to turn every course into general English-language instruction; nevertheless, academic language cannot be separated entirely from disciplinary teaching. Programme leaders, language specialists, and disciplinary staff should therefore collaborate to identify the vocabulary, genres, oral tasks, and rhetorical practices embedded in particular fields. Integrating such support into the curriculum would reduce dependence on generic language courses and align English development more closely with the academic work students are expected to perform.

Third, assessment practices require closer alignment with classroom pedagogy. Where students develop understanding through bilingual interaction but are assessed entirely in English, institutions should state

clearly whether disciplinary knowledge, language performance, or both are being evaluated. If English is an intended learning outcome, assessment criteria should make its weighting transparent and provide developmental feedback. Without such clarity, English may function as an implicit source of advantage or penalty, particularly for students whose conceptual knowledge exceeds their ability to express that knowledge fluently.

The study is limited by its small, purposefully selected sample, its focus on private universities, its reliance on participant self-report, and the inclusion of only one classroom observation in each institution. The findings should therefore not be interpreted as representative of all private universities or of Bangladeshi higher education more broadly. Their value lies in the analytical account they provide of how institutional expectations, teacher reasoning, student experience, and classroom language practices can interact within particular EMI settings. Further research should examine disciplinary differences, public and private institutions, institutional guidelines and policy documents, longitudinal language development, and the relationship between bilingual teaching practices and assessed performance.

Ultimately, the challenge facing EMI cannot be resolved by choosing between English and Bangla, nor can it be addressed by leaving individual teachers to negotiate that relationship informally. A viable EMI model requires institutions to coordinate three responsibilities that are often treated separately: access to disciplinary knowledge, development of academic English, and fair assessment of student learning. Without such coordination, English may remain institutionally prominent while the pedagogical conditions required to fulfil its educational promise remain underdeveloped.

**AI Use Statement:** The author used AI-assisted writing tools, such as ChatGPT and Grammarly, during manuscript preparation for language editing, clarity improvement, and organisation of ideas. The conceptual framing, research design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of findings, and final scholarly decisions were undertaken by the author. All AI-assisted text was critically reviewed, revised, and approved by the author, who takes full responsibility for the content of the manuscript.

**Acknowledgement:** The author extends sincere appreciation to the editor and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback, which greatly enhanced the clarity and quality of this paper.

**Funding:** This research was conducted without any financial support from funding agencies, institutions, or organizations.

**Author's Contribution:** The author solely conceptualized, designed, conducted, and wrote the manuscript, and takes full responsibility for its content and accuracy.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest related to this study.

**Declaration of Originality:** This manuscript has not been submitted to, nor is under consideration by, any other journal or conference.

**Data Availability:** All data generated or analysed during this study are retained by the author and are available upon reasonable request.

## REFERENCES

- Al Nahar, A., Hira, F. K., & Milon, M. R. K. (2024). From policy to practice: Evaluating the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in Bangladeshi primary schools. *ICRRD Journal*, 5(3), 125–138.
- Alam, M. R., Ansarey, D., Halim, H. A., Rana, M. M., Milon, M. R. K., & Mitu, R. K. (2022a). Exploring Bangladeshi university students' willingness to communicate (WTC) in English classes through a qualitative study. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(2), 1–17.
- Alam, M. R., Islam, M. S., Ansarey, D., Rana, M. M., Milon, M. R. K., Halim, H. A., ... & Rashid, A. (2024). Unveiling the professional identity construction of in-service university English language teachers: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Ampersand*, 12, 100178.
- Alam, M. R., Jahan, S., Milon, M. R. K., Ansarey, D., & Faruque, A. S. U. (2021). Accelerating learners' self-confidence level in second language acquisition: A qualitative study. *ICRRD Quality Index Research Journal*, 2(3), 141–153.
- Alam, M. R., Milon, M. R. K., & Sharmin, M. (2018). Hindrances to use and prepare the lesson plan of secondary school teachers in Bangladesh and some recommendations. *Australasian Journal of Business, Social Science and Information Technology*, 4(4), 189–197.
- Alam, M. R., Milon, M. R. K., & Rahman, M. K., & Hassan, A. (2022b). Technology application in tourism event, education and training for making a nation's image. In A. Hassan (Ed.), *Technology application in tourism fairs, festivals and events in Asia* (pp. 149–163). Singapore: Springer.
- Alam, M. R., Sulaiman, M., Bhuiyan, M. M. R., Islam, M. S., Imam, M. H., Hossen, M. S., & Milon, <https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v7i2.6>

- M. R. K. (2025). Online corrective feedback and self-regulated writing: Exploring student perceptions and challenges in higher education. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(6), 139–150.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2020). *ROAD-MAPPING English medium education in the internationalised university*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction—A growing global phenomenon*. British Council.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction*. Oxford University Press.
- Macaro, E. (2022). English medium instruction: What do we know so far and what do we still need to find out? *Language Teaching*, 55(4), 533–546.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Milon, M. R. K. (2016). Challenges of teaching English at the rural primary schools in Bangladesh: Some recommendations. *ELK Asia Pacific Journal of Social Science*, 2(3), 1–17.
- Milon, M. R. K. (2020). A close investigation of the interaction between the individual and the society in *The American Scholar*. *Port City International University Journal*, 7(1–2), 71–79.
- Milon, M. R. K., & Ali, T. M. (2023). From language movement to language policy: A critical examination of English in Bangladeshi tertiary education. *ICRRD Journal*, 4(4), 101–115.
- Milon, M. R. K., Alam, M. R., & Hossain, M. R. (2018a). A comparative study on the methods and practices of English language teaching in Bangla and English medium schools in Bangladesh. *Australasian Journal of Business, Social Science and Information Technology*, 4(3), 118–126.
- Milon, M. R. K., Chakraborty, K., & Yasmin, A. (2026). Transforming Academic Writing Literacy: The Role of Facebook as a Digital Learning Platform in Bangladeshi Higher Education. *Iris Journal of Educational Research (IJER)*, 6(1), 1-15
- Milon, M. R. K., Hossain, M. R., & Alam, M. R. (2018b). Factors influencing dropouts at

- undergraduate level in private universities of Bangladesh: A case study. *Australasian Journal of Business, Social Science and Information Technology*, 4(4), 177–188.
- Milon, M. R. K., Hossain, M. R., & Begum, R. (2017). Women's revolution against the male-dominated society in R. K. Narayan's novels. *ELK Asia Pacific Journal of Social Science*, 3(2), 1–14.
- Milon, M. R. K., Imam, M. H., & Muhury, P. (2024). Transforming the landscape of higher education in Bangladesh: Teachers' perspectives on implementing outcome-based education (OBE). *ICRRD Journal*, 5(2), 117–135.
- Milon, M. R. K., Ishtiaq, M., Ali, T. M., & Imam, M. S. (2023). Unlocking fluency: Task-based language teaching (TBLT) in tertiary speaking classes—Insights from Bangladeshi teachers and students. *ICRRD Journal*, 4(4), 218–230.
- Mitu, R. K. (2020). Using social media to promote EFL learners' speaking skill: Perceptions from both teachers and learners. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and Society*, 2(1), 74-84.
- Rose, H., Curle, S., Aizawa, I., & Thompson, G. (2020). What drives success in English medium taught courses? The interplay between language proficiency, academic skills, and motivation. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(11), 2149–2161.
- Hossen, M. S., Hoque, M. N., Riyadh, M., & Ullah, N. (2026). Determinants of Wellbeing in Later Life: The Mediating Role of Social Support and Community Participation Among Seniors. *Journal of Content Validation*, 2(2), 166-178.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851.
- Tsou, W., & Baker, W. (Eds.). (2021). *English-medium instruction translanguaging practices in Asia: Theories, frameworks and implementation in higher education*. Springer.
- Yasmin, A., Milon, M. R. K., & Imam, M. H. (2024). An examination of practices and perspectives of task-based language teaching (TBLT) in tertiary literary classes: Insights from Bangladesh. *ICRRD Journal*, 5(2), 101–116.



**This is an Open Access** article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium upon the work for non-commercial, provided the original work is properly cited.