

Teacher Satisfaction Concerning the Implementation of Bilingual Programmes¹ in a Spanish University*

ALBERTO FERNÁNDEZ-COSTALES

XOSE ANTÓN GONZÁLEZ-RIAÑO

Universidad de Oviedo

Received: 26 September 2013 / Accepted: 25 March 2014

ISSN: 1697-7467

ABSTRACT: This paper analyses teacher satisfaction in the case of lecturers engaged in the so-called “bilingual programmes” at the University of Oviedo, an institution which offers subjects taught entirely in English in several study plans. The research relies on quantitative and descriptive methodology covering 74 lecturers (almost the entire population being studied) and establishes the strengths and weaknesses of this approach based on their experiences teaching through the medium of English. The conclusions of the study provide lines of optimization and propose improvements for the implementation of bilingual programmes in similar contexts.

Keywords: bilingual programmes, higher education, teacher satisfaction, multilingualism, Spanish universities

Satisfacción del profesorado en la implementación de programas bilingües en una universidad española

RESUMEN: Este artículo analiza el grado de satisfacción de los docentes que participan en los llamados “programas bilingües” de la Universidad de Oviedo mediante los que se ofrecen asignaturas de diferentes titulaciones en inglés. El estudio se basa en una metodología cuantitativa y descriptiva que vincula a 74 profesores (prácticamente la población de referencia), y plantea los puntos fuertes y débiles que se derivan de su experiencia en la impartición de docencia en inglés. Las conclusiones de esta investigación proporcionan líneas de optimización así como propuestas de mejora en lo referente a la implantación de programas bilingües en contextos similares.

Palabras clave: programas bilingües, educación superior, satisfacción del profesorado, multilingüismo, universidades españolas

1. INTRODUCTION

The adaptation to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in Spain has led many universities to develop so-called “bilingual programmes” in which students take a minimum

¹ In this paper, we use the term “bilingual programme” as this has been officially adopted within the University of Oviedo, although we are fully aware that this term may not be suitable with regards to the development of bilingualism or bilingual education.

* This study has been supported by the research project EDU2009-08669EDUC, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, General Directorate for Research.

number of courses in English (see Ramos, 2013). However, there are no homogeneous strategies for the implementation of these initiatives and most universities currently offer courses “entirely taught in English” by their own lecturers and researchers, resulting in a diversified and heterogeneous panorama (Cenoz, 2010; Halbach, Lázaro and Pérez, 2013). Leaving aside the suitability of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) at university level and the potential differences between Spanish and other European institutions, Spanish universities aim to increase their international visibility, attract foreign students and lecturers and improve their position in international rankings (Lasagabaster, 2012). Besides, using English as the medium of instruction can contribute to promoting international mobility and improve the language competence of both lecturers and students (Cenoz, 2009:14).

Arguably, the introduction of using English to teach content subjects in Spanish institutions of higher education is of paramount importance (Cenoz, 2010). However, thus far at least, few researchers have investigated the perception and attitudes of university lecturers towards bilingual programmes (Aguilar and Rodríguez, 2012; Fortanet, 2011; Halbach, Lázaro and Pérez, 2013). Moreover, the issue of teacher satisfaction when using English as the medium of instruction remains relatively unexplored. In addition to this, there is a lack of empirical research which could contribute towards supporting (or indeed advise against) the application of specific linguistic, academic or political decisions at a tertiary level.

This paper is primarily concerned with the perceptions and degree of satisfaction of lecturers engaged in the bilingual programme at a Spanish institution: the University of Oviedo. The research objectives are as follows:

- 1) Establish and assess the satisfaction levels of lecturers teaching non-language related subjects in English at the University of Oviedo.
- 2) Explain the differences according to several personal and academic variables.
- 3) Establish, on the basis of the conclusions obtained, proposals for improving the field under investigation.

Finally, we believe this paper can contribute to the opening up of new lines of research in this field, although we are fully aware that this is an exploratory study restricted to the particular case of a university in northern Spain which has no tradition of multilingualism.

2. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: ENGLISH MEDIUM INSTRUCTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND TEACHER SATISFACTION

In this section we intend to present an overall panorama of the two most relevant areas approached in this research: the implementation of English medium instruction (EMI) at university level and the concept of teacher satisfaction. Both fields are intimately linked in this article, since our research question is to investigate lecturers’ perceptions concerning the design, organization and development of bilingual programmes in a Spanish university and their experience in teaching through the medium of English.

Particularly with regards to primary and secondary education, the field of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has already been sufficiently approached by many

authors (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Dafouz and Guerrini, 2009; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Lasagabaster and Zarobe, 2010; Lorenzo, Casal and Moore, 2010; Lorenzo, Trujillo and Vez, 2011; Madrid and Hughes, 2011; Zarobe and Catalán, 2009). Therefore, due to space constraints, here we focus on the most relevant works in the field of EMI in Spanish (and European) universities.

The internationalization of higher education in countries where English is not the national language seems to be a synonym for the use of English as the medium of instruction (Coleman, 2006; Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011; Lasagabaster, 2012). English has become the international *lingua franca* and also the main communication tool within higher education (Seidlhofer, 2004; Van Leeuwen and Wilkinson, 2003; Wilkinson, 2004). Leaving aside the possible implications of this trend -i.e. the “Englishization” and “marketization” of European higher education (Coleman, 2006; Phillipson, 2003:47)-, offering courses in a foreign language necessarily requires efforts at an institutional level as well as adjustments regarding teaching models.

The northern European countries were the first to introduce bilingual programmes at university with highly positive results (Cenoz, 2010; Lasagabaster, 2012). There is an important corpus of research devoted to the development of multilingual universities in the north of Europe (Airey, 2011; Hellekjaer, 2010; Jensen and Thøgersen, 2011; Van Leeuwen and Wilkinson, 2003; Wilkinson, 2004) which shows the benefits of teaching in several languages and also the heterogeneous approaches that can be observed depending on particular contexts. This diversity is due to sociocultural settings and educational policies: the context in which multilingualism should be placed is a European Union founded on “unity in diversity” (Vez, 2009: 12) - diversity of cultures, customs, beliefs, and of languages.

Countries in southern Europe have approached multilingualism at a tertiary level far more recently and their universities are a step behind their Nordic partners in this field. However, in recent years a significant number of articles have appeared in response to the growing interest of institutions in teaching through English. This is the case in Spain, where in the last five years papers relevant to the scope of this study have been published; in fact, common areas of research, themes and patterns can be identified within the context of bilingual education and CLIL in higher education.

The implementation of bilingual programmes and Content and Language Integrated Learning has gained momentum in the last decade in Spanish universities, with more and more institutions currently offering modules or study tracks in which students can take content subjects taught through English (Ramos and Villoria, 2012; Ramos, 2013); in fact, using English as a medium of instruction can be understood as a key element within the internationalization strategy of non-English speaking universities (Lasagabaster, 2012).

In the context of Spain, particular attention has been paid to the implementation of bilingual programmes in multilingual settings (i.e., Autonomous Communities where more than one language is spoken); research has been devoted to analyse plans intended to promote multilingualism at tertiary level and assess the use of English as a medium of instruction in order to achieve the objectives of multilingualism and multilingual competence (Cenoz, 2010; Lasagabaster, 2012; Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2013).

Research has also been conducted on the structure and organizational issues of bilingual education at university level. In this context, Fortanet (2011) studies the implementation, organization and curricular issues within bilingual programmes in Spanish universities and

offers interesting results based on the opinions of 38 lecturers concerning teaching through English at the University Jaume I. A recent study (Fortanet, 2013) carried out at the same university with 1,003 respondents (including lecturers, students, and administrative staff) analyses not only the characteristics of the university community and their relationship with languages, but also the historic evolution of language policies within this institution as well as the prospective strategies to be adopted in the coming years.

The perception of the university community on the implementation of bilingual programmes has also been addressed: Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2011) analyse the opinions of teaching staff involved in English medium instruction by focusing on three particular dimensions (pedagogical, ecology of language and personal viewpoints). On the other hand, Toledo, Rubio and Hermosín (2011) investigate the attitudes of university students towards bilingual programmes and the potential impact on their motivation and academic output. Finally, Aguilar and Rodríguez (2012) analyse the perception of lecturers and students engaged in CLIL at university. Regarding teacher satisfaction, the information collected shows that lecturers are interested in improving their spoken English fluency. In addition, they do not believe that the quality of their teaching has decreased and they are reluctant to receive methodological training in CLIL.

Quite recently, research has been devoted to underline the plural approaches observed in the implementation of bilingual programmes at university level. In this vein, Halbach, Lázaro and Pérez (2013) explore the heterogeneity amongst Spanish universities in relation to multilingualism and provide data from institution representatives to explain the diverse treatment afforded to English at tertiary level. They recommend reviewing the language requirements for students and lecturers engaging in bilingual education and the setting of homogeneous criteria, objectives and procedures leading to the creation of a common language policy amongst universities in order to meet the needs of bilingual degrees in Spain. On the one hand, Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2013) present several experiences concerning the introduction of EMI in several Spanish, European and Asian universities, underlining the heterogeneity of “multilingual education”. This research also collates some interesting insights with reference to the institutional policies that have been (and should be) adopted by universities in the promotion of multilingualism. The final remarks underline the issue of the lack of sufficient language competence possessed by students in order that they might successfully pursue English study programmes at university, and the need for more pedagogical and team-work strategies to effectively integrate content and language in higher education.

As stated in the section introduction, teaching satisfaction is the second element to be approached in our study, precisely because very few prior works analyse this aspect, or if they do, they do so in a different manner than is conducted herein. Besides defining job satisfaction, we need to specifically address the concept of teacher satisfaction and consider its possible scopes and significance.

The concept of job satisfaction is widely used in job psychology (Caballero, 2002). Robbins and Coulter (1996) understand this as being the attitude of an employee towards his or her job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction has more positive attitudes towards their work, whilst someone who is dissatisfied shows negative attitudes towards their employment. According to Weiss (2002), job satisfaction is an attitude which generates emotions, beliefs and behaviours. Hence, job satisfaction stands for an affective reaction

towards the labour context that is conditioned by several variables such as, among others, the organization, the economic conditions, and the relationships amongst peers.

Regarding teaching satisfaction, Veeman (1988) highlights the importance of several factors (such as the number of teaching hours, teaching materials, coordination with other lecturers, student motivation, promotion opportunities and so on), while Marrero (1993) points to the importance of teachers' conception of education, the appropriateness and suitability of the syllabus and the perception of their labour conditions in order to interpret and analyse their levels of satisfaction. When certain expectations are not met, teaching satisfaction turns into "teachers' stress" or "teaching burnout" (Caballero, 2002); in the case of university lecturers, Guerrero (2003) associates the burnout syndrome with the failure to meet the expectations of the job.

Focusing on language teachers, Dörnyei (2001) links self-esteem and teaching commitment with student motivation, and Praver and Oga-Baldwin (2008) conclude that the satisfaction of second language teachers correlates with external factors (such as professional autonomy, institutional support, their relationships with other lecturers, etc.) rather than internal issues (i.e. language competence, methodological training, etc.).

González-Riaño and Armesto (2012) synthesise the potential scopes of teaching satisfaction. Among others, they comment on the following elements: a) general satisfaction; b) labour conditions; c) academic and curricular issues; d) professional elements; e) student performance.

In the context of this paper, we understand teaching satisfaction has to be understood as being the result of the contrast between reality and prior expectations.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Context, sample and research scope

The Campus of International Excellence of the University of Oviedo was intended to promote the implementation of bilingualism as part of the bilingual programme started in 2009. The Asturian academic institution currently operates ten degree programmes with bilingual study plans: Business Administration, Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Industrial and Automatic Electronic Engineering, Software Computing Engineering, Business, Accountancy and Finance, Commerce and Marketing, Tourism, and Industrial Chemical Engineering.

In total, 296 courses are taught in English, involving 437 students and 76 lecturers. Within the bilingual programme, specific courses on methodology, pronunciation and writing skills have been designed for lecturers. This far, 32 such courses have been offered. These courses have been useful not only for training those lecturers who required extra coaching but also for improving the skills of those who already have the level of English required for teaching in bilingual programmes.

As has been mentioned, in the academic year 2012 / 2013, the number of lecturers in the bilingual programme was 76. It is worth mentioning that the sample of this study consists of 74 lecturers (only 2 declined to participate), so this research covers almost the entire population being analysed.

On the other hand, we need to mention that prior to this present initiative, the University of Oviedo did not have any policy concerning the field of teaching content through an additional language. The *Ley de Uso del Asturiano* of 1998 sets out that Spanish and Asturian are the two languages of the Principality of Asturias. Despite the presence of Asturian as a local language that can be learnt at the university, our institution cannot be compared to multilingual contexts such as the universities of the Basque Country, Catalonia or Galicia.

3.2. Research tool and data collection

The research tool used in this investigation was a survey designed to provide reliable data on lecturer satisfaction levels concerning their experience when lecturing through the medium of English. The questionnaire (included at the end of the paper) was administered individually (via e-mail) to the 76 lecturers engaged in the bilingual programme of the University of Oviedo in 2013.

In the context of this study, using a questionnaire seemed to be the best option in order to analyse the influence of several variables that might be related to the satisfaction levels of lecturers teaching in English (Muñiz and Fonseca-Pedrero, 2008).

To verify content validity and the applicability of the questionnaire, five experts were asked to analyse the adequacy of the items, using interjudge agreement to eliminate questions that caused confusion due to their formulation or lack of clarity. The five experts consulted are lecturers from the University of Oviedo who have been engaged in the internationalization process and work in areas such as statistics, methodology, and the planning and organization of bilingual programmes. This expert validation stage was highly successful, as the five consultants confirmed the validity of the research tool with minor comments that were utilized to optimise the questionnaire.

The final version of the survey included 30 items as well as a section intended to provide us with relevant information concerning the subjects of the study (who answered anonymously). The survey was sent to the lecturers in April and they all returned the completed document within one month (by the end of May 2013). The survey was structured in 5 sections:

- A) Characteristics and details of the respondents: this section includes the variables of the study, namely 1) Age; 2) Gender; 3) Area of knowledge; 4) Experience teaching through English; 5) Stays in English speaking countries; 6) Self-estimated level of English; 7) Motivation to lecture in English.
- B) General satisfaction with the implementation of the programme: this section includes items 1 to 8 and deals with the overall satisfaction and the perception of lecturers' efficiency in teaching through the medium of English.
- C) Specific training received at the University of Oviedo: this section includes items 9 to 15 and focuses on the training received from the methodological and linguistic standpoints.
- D) Organizational and academic issues: this section includes items 16 to 22 and deals with the organization and the structure of the bilingual programme.
- E) Expected results: this section includes items 23 to 30 and focuses on the improvement in teaching using the medium of English.

Respondents answered the survey according to a Likert Scale in the following format: 1 – Strongly Disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Agree; 4 – Strongly Agree. We intentionally used an even number of possible answers (4) in order to avoid subjects neglecting to answer the questions directly by selecting the “neutral” or “indefinite” answer to some of the items in the survey (Morales, Urosa and Blanco, 2005).

Data were processed using SPSS 21. Reliability analysis showed that the internal consistency of the questionnaire was appropriate for research purposes. The validation of the scale revealed a Cronbach’ alpha result of .870, showing a good level of homogeneity in the items. Finally analysis of descriptive statistics, analysis of differences according to respondents’ features and non-parametric tests² (Pearson’s chi-squared) were conducted.

4. RESULTS

Next, we present the most relevant results according to the variables and methodology explained in section 4.

4.1. Characteristics and features of the sample

The sample of this research (n=74) is distributed in the following way according to the seven variables included in the questionnaire.

With regards to the age of the participants, the greatest percentage of lecturers is located in the range of 41-50 years (48.6%), followed by the group between 20 and 40 (36.5%), the group of more than 50 (13.5%) and the teachers younger than 30 (1.45). This is not surprising considering that the average age of the lecturers of the University of Oviedo is 54 years old.

Regarding gender, the majority of respondents are men (64.9%), which can be explained by the fact that most lecturers in the bilingual programme belong to technical fields in which the percentage of women is significantly lower. In relation to this, the majority of respondents belong to Technical Sciences (44.6%), followed by lecturers of and Health and Experimental Sciences (31.1%) and Social and Legal Sciences (24.3%).

As for the experience in teaching through the medium of English, 54.1% of lecturers enrolled in the bilingual programme have been doing so for less than one year; 14.9% have been engaged in the bilingual programme between 1 and 2 years, and 31.1% have been teaching through the medium of English for more than 2 years.

A rather positive fact to note is that the majority of lecturers (56.8%) have experienced a stay of over one month in an English speaking country. Connected to this, lecturers’ self-perception concerning their level of English shows a relatively positive set of results, as the greatest proportion of them (47.3%) estimate that they have a B2 according to the European Framework of Reference for the Languages; 36.5% report having a C1, 13.5% estimate they have a B1, and only 2.7% of participants state their level corresponds to a C2.

Finally, regarding their motivation towards teaching through English, most lecturers are interested in improving their international projection (45.9%); 21.6% report their main inter-

² The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test run for normality testing showed the sample did not have a normal distribution ($p < 0,05$).

est is teaching reduced groups of students; 5.4% ascertain they want to teach fewer hours, and 2.7% are intended to improve their professional prestige; finally, 24.3% of respondents selected 'other reasons' to teach through English (with most lecturers in this group reporting that teaching in English is a personal challenge for them).

4.2. General satisfaction with the implementation of the bilingual programme

The results show that, broadly speaking, lecturers are generally satisfied with the implementation of the bilingual programme (see Table 1). However, we need to point out two exceptions in which the mean is clearly lower than for the rest of the items: questions 3 ("Taking part in the bilingual programme has improved my international projection") and 4 ("The participation in the programme has improved my academic and professional progression") have respective values of 2,07 and 1,95 (with 2 being "Disagree" on our scale).

The results of the chi-squared test are statistically significant showing differences in some of the variables set in our study with regards to the general satisfaction with the implementation of the programme: differences concerning the variable "Age" were found when analysing the results of item 7 ("My competence in English has improved since I have been teaching through English" $p < 0,000$, chi-square value = 80,246), with younger lecturers taking a more pessimistic view than their older counterparts: the contingency table shows that 44,4% of respondents younger than 40 agree with that statement and 25,9% fully agree, while in the case of lecturers between 40 and 50 the percentages increase to 58,3% and 26,7%, respectively, and in the case of lecturers over 50, the percentages increase to 60% and 30%). Statistically significant differences were found when analysing the variable "Experience" in relation to items 2 ("My results teaching in English are positive" $p < 0,034$, chi-square value = 13,77), and 8 ("Teaching in English is a positive experience from the academic point of view for both lecturers and students" $p < 0,004$, chi-square value = 16,049); results confirm that lecturers with longer experience teaching through English show higher levels of satisfaction and have a better perception concerning the quality of their teaching in a foreign language: the percentages of the contingency table show that 85% of lecturers with less than one year experience agree or strongly agree with item 2 (with 15% of lecturers showing disagreement), while 100% of lecturers with more experience (between 1 and 2 years, and with more than 2 years) agree or strongly agree to that statement; likewise, regarding item 8, 70,5% of lecturers with less than 1 year experience agree to that statement, while this percentage increases to 100% for lecturers who have between 1 and 2 years experience and to 84% in the case of lecturers who have been teaching through English for more than 2 years.

Finally, the level of English seems to be related to items 1 ("The implementation of the bilingual programme is satisfactory" $p < 0,021$, chi-square value = 19,020, with 80% of lecturers with a B1 reporting they agree or strongly agree, being this percentage of 81%, 82% and 100% for lecturers with B2, C1 and C2) and 2 ("My results teaching in English are positive" $p < 0,025$, chi-square value = 17,768, with 80% of lecturers with a B1 level reporting they agree or strongly agree, being this percentage 84%, 97% and 100% for lecturers with a B2, C1 and a C2, respectively). Generally speaking, lecturers reporting a higher standard of English show a better perception of and a higher level of satisfaction concerning the quality of their teaching through English.

Table 1: Mean scores and standard deviation values

	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Q1	1	4	2,96	,650
Q2	2	4	3,32	,622
Q3	1	4	2,07	,833
Q4	0	4	1,95	,774
Q5	1	4	2,38	,789
Q6	0	4	3,05	,842
Q7	0	4	2,97	,844
Q8	2	4	2,96	,607
Q9	0	4	2,62	,823
Q10	1	4	2,22	,798
Q11	1	4	3,05	,546
Q12	1	4	3,16	,642
Q13	1	4	2,39	,773
Q14	1	4	3,12	,701
Q15	0	4	2,24	,888
Q16	0	4	2,82	,800
Q17	0	4	2,69	,920
Q18	1	4	2,92	,807
Q19	0	4	2,05	,890
Q20	0	4	2,18	,927
Q21	1	4	2,35	,898
Q22	0	4	1,92	1,017
Q23	1	4	2,84	,550
Q24	2	4	3,27	,477
Q25	1	4	2,82	,627
Q26	1	4	2,93	,669
Q27	1	4	3,16	,597
Q28	0	4	3,43	,877
Q29	0	4	2,88	,739
Q30	1	4	3,27	,604

4.3. Specific training received at the University of Oviedo

As in the previous case, the general degree of lecturer satisfaction concerning the training courses received at the university is rather positive, especially with regards to items 11 (“The contents and syllabi of training courses for lecturers meet expectations” which has a mean value of 3,05), 12 (“Class materials and resources are suitable, updated and operational” with a mean score of 3,16) and 14 (“The courses have contributed to improving my competence in English at an academic level” with a mean value of 3,12). There are three negative values: lecturers do not consider the range of training courses offered by the university to be sufficient (item 10 with a mean value of 2,22) and they do not think that the training received has provided them with additional methodological tools (item 15: mean value of 2,24). We need to point out here that lecturers consider that the structure and planning of the training programme might not be suitable to qualify them to lecture in English (item 13: mean value of 2,12). The tests show statistically significant differences with several variables: the age of the participants shows significant differences in item 10 (“The specific training for lecturers teaching in English is sufficient” $p < 0,004$, chi-square value = 24,447), with older lecturers showing lower levels of satisfaction (100% of lecturers with less than 1 year experience agree to the statement, 33% of lecturers between 30 and 40 agree, 35,8% of lecturers between 40 and 50 agree or strongly agree, and 30% of lecturers over 50 agree or strongly agree). The same item (10) shows differences as regards the variable “Gender”, $p < 0,030$, chi-square value = 16,032, meaning that female lecturers in the study are generally less satisfied with the range of training courses offered for teaching staff (39,7% of male lecturers think it is sufficient while 23% of female lecturers agree to that statement).

4.4. Organizational and academic issues

As for the third area scale of the questionnaire, only three items render positive results: item 16 (“The planning of academic contents in bilingual degrees is appropriate” with a mean value of 2,82), item 17 (“The coordination with other lecturers is suitable” with a mean score of 2,69), and item 18 (“There are enough teaching materials and resources to teach my subject in English” with a result of 2,92). Items 19 to 22 show negative values with lecturers perceiving that there are not enough possibilities regarding international mobility (item 22: mean value = 1,92), the incentives in terms of teaching fewer hours seem to be insufficient (item 21: mean value = 2,35), as well as the monitoring of the quality of teaching in the bilingual degrees (item 20: mean value = 2,18) and the institutional support for developing classroom materials and resources (item 19: mean value = 2,05).

The chi-squared tests show significant differences with regards to “Age”, $p < 0,000$, chi-square value = 51,831 in item 19 (“There is an appropriate institutional support for designing, preparing and developing teaching materials”), suggesting that younger lecturers are more critical of the support provided by the university: the contingency table shows that 18,5% of lecturers younger than 40 agree or strongly agree with the question included in item 19, while this percentage increases to 26,8% in the case of lecturers between 40 and 50, and to 40% for lecturers over 50.

4.5. Expected results in teaching university courses in English

Clearly, the last section of the survey shows the most positive results with all the items either exceeding, or coming very close to, 3 (“Agree”). These results suggest that lecturers consider their language and methodological competences are appropriate in order to teach non-language courses in English at the university. In addition, the highest values in this section are related to the fact that no problems are reported in the evaluation of students and their academic performance is positive.

In the case of the results of teaching through the medium of English, we found statistically significant differences in several of the variables in the study: namely, differences were found with “Age” in items 28 (“The results as regards students’ performance are worse than in the groups taught in Spanish” $p < 0,001$, chi-square value = 39,096) and 29 (“My teaching technique can be adapted to the communicative use of English in a lecture” $p < 0,000$, chi-square value = 95,906), with older lecturers showing more negative levels of satisfaction: 90% of lecturers over 50 report they disagree or strongly disagree to the statement of item 28, (being this percentage 97,2% for lecturers between 40 and 50, 89% for lecturers between 30 and 40, and 0% for lecturers younger than 30 -only 1 lecturer, who agreed to the statement included in item 28-; with regard to item 29, 30% of lecturers over 50 disagree or strongly disagree, being this percentage 30,6% for lecturers between 40 and 50, and 14,8% for lecturers younger than 40. The gender of participants also shows differences regarding their perception in item 28, $p < 0,0280$, chi-square value = 10,919, with female lecturers exhibiting a more sceptical view concerning the results of student performance in the bilingual programme (95,9% of male respondents disagree with item 28, while 80,8% of female lecturers respond in a negative way). The amount of experience in teaching in English seems to be relevant to item 23 (“My pronunciation and intonation are appropriate

for lecturing in English" $p < 0,012$, chi-square value = 22,259), with teachers who have greater experience exhibiting more positive perceptions concerning their teaching quality in a foreign language (the contingency table shows that 75% of lecturers with 1 year experience agree to that statement, while 100% of lecturers with 1 or 2 years experience, and 78,2% of lecturers teaching through English for more than 2 years respond positively). In the same vein, the level of English is relevant with regards to item 27 ("My level of English is appropriate to handle questions and interact with the students" $p < 0,035$, chi-square value = 18,093), where lecturers reporting a higher standard of English exhibit higher satisfaction levels in relation to their teaching quality when lecturing in English (70% of lecturers reporting a B1 agree or strongly agree, while this percentage rises to 91,4% for lecturers with a B2 level of English, and 100% for respondents with C1 or C2).

5. DISCUSSION: STUDY IMPLICATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The analysis of the data from this research leads us to draw several conclusions related to the field of study. It can be stated that teacher satisfaction concerning the bilingual programme is globally positive. The same is the case in terms of the specific training received at the university, organizational issues and (especially) concerning the perception of the results of their teaching through the medium of English. It is worth mentioning that the study shows that there are statistically significant differences according to 4 of the 7 set variables - teacher satisfaction level is related to "Age", "Gender", their "Self-estimated level of English" and their "Experience" in English medium instruction. In addition, our research also establishes some weaknesses in reference to the following elements:

A) The internationalisation and the career advancement of teaching staff is insufficient: according to the lecturers, the bilingual programme has not contributed to promoting their international projection nor their teaching and research career. This is not a minor issue, as these elements were two of the key reasons identified by the university for implementing the programme. As has also been suggested by Jensen and Thøgersen (2011), we conclude that these short-comings are perceived as particularly significant in the case of older lecturers teaching through English.

B) The specific training received by lecturers should be optimised: although the training received is universally valued, there are three points that draw attention: according to the lecturers, the number of courses is insufficient and the training provided has not improved their teaching methodology. Moreover, it is the opinion of lecturers that the training received does not qualify them to teach through English. Broadly speaking, our study concludes that both older and female lecturers have slightly lower levels of satisfaction with regards to the training received. Teachers' opinion on training and methodological issues is in line with previous studies, such as those by Airey (2011), Jensen and Thøgersen (2011) and Fortanet (2011). It seems clear that specific training courses should be offered for teachers, as suggested by Vez (2009), although this recommendation should in this case be extended to higher education.

C) More institutional support and a monitoring process are both required: lecturers demand more explicit institutional support to encourage them to participate in the bilingual programme: there should be more aids to developing teaching materials in English;

the compensation of a reduction in teaching hours is insufficient and, more importantly, lecturers consider that there should be a monitoring process to control the quality of the bilingual programme. In this case, not only do age and gender show significant results, but also the lecturers' level of experience in teaching in English and their self-perception as to their language competence, as teachers with higher language competence seem to be more critical of the institutional support received.

As suggested by other scholars (Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2011; Lasagabaster, 2012), interdepartmental collaboration might be the key to optimizing the introduction of EMI at the university: it is essential that lecturers in several fields work in teams. In this sense, we need to underline the need to develop standardized university policies towards languages and multilingualism in order that initiatives such as the bilingual programmes do not turn into isolated measures, but that instead there is a coherent and long-term strategy – a conclusion also drawn by Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2011) and Halbach, Lázaro and Pérez (2013).

Logically, proposals for improvement must be aligned with the issues observed in our research. In this sense, they are required to meet the demands and professional expectations of lecturers participating in the study. Specific training is needed and this should include more systematic and consistent syllabi. In addition, more involvement from university representatives when planning and monitoring the programme (and its results) would be welcome.

On the basis of the results presented herein, we would like to include some suggestions for future lines of research. We consider that it might be relevant to design methodological strategies and elaborate teaching materials that could be corroborated for general use. Likewise, it is necessary to conduct quantitative and qualitative research into multilingualism in higher education that covers the perspectives of lecturers, students and university representatives, with a particular focus on techniques such as documental analysis, in-depth interviews, participant observation, discussion groups, etc. Within this framework, our research team is currently working on several projects to be developed in the medium-term.

Finally, we believe this study to be of importance in the context of teacher satisfaction, multilingualism and English as a medium of instruction in higher education. Besides the conclusions of this research, which has addressed the particular case of a Spanish university with no tradition in the field of multilingualism, we need to emphasise here that this study has the added value of providing a research tool (in the form of the survey) which can measure the level of satisfaction of lecturers teaching through English in different formal contexts within higher education.

7. REFERENCES

- Aguilar, M. and Rodríguez, R. (2012). "Lecturer and Student Perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish University", in *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15, 2: 183-197.
- Airey, J. (2011). "Talking About Teaching in English: Swedish University Lecturers' Experiences of Changing Teaching Language", in *Ibérica*, 22: 35-54.
- Caballero, K. (2002). "El Concepto de 'Satisfacción en el Trabajo' y su Proyección en la Enseñanza", in *Profesorado, Revista de Currículum y Formación del Profesorado*, 6, 1-2: 1-10.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards Multilingual Education: Basque Educational Research in International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Cenoz, J. (2010). "El Inglés como Lengua de Instrucción en la Universidad: Nuevas Tecnologías y Multimodalidad", in *Ikastaria*, 17: 25-38.
- Coleman, J. (2006). "English-medium Teaching in European Higher Education", in *Language Teaching*, 39, 1: 1-14.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. and Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dafouz, E. and Guerrini, M. (eds.) (2009). *CLIL Across Educational Levels: Experiences from Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Contexts*. Madrid: Santillana.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). "Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles", in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31: 182-204.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J. (2011). "Internationalisation, Multilingualism and English-medium Instruction", in *World Englishes*, 30, 3: 345-359.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J. (2013). *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fortanet, I. (2011). "Critical Components of Integrating Content and Language in Spanish Higher Education", in *Across the Disciplines*, 8, 3: 1-16.
- Fortanet, I. (2013). *CLIL in Higher Education: Towards a Multilingual Language Policy (Bilingual Education and Bilingualism)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- González-Riño, X. and Armesto Fernández, X. (2012). "Enseñanza de la Lengua Minoritaria y Satisfacción del Profesorado: el Caso de Asturias", in *Cultura y Educación*, 24, 2: 219-241.
- Guerrero, E. (2003). "Análisis Pormenorizado de los Grados de *Burnout* y Técnicas de Afrontamiento del *Stress* Docente en Profesorado Universitario", in *Anales de Psicología*, 19, 1: 145-158.
- Halbach, A., Lázaro Lafuente, A. and Pérez Guerra, J. (2013). "La Lengua Inglesa en la Nueva Universidad Española del EEES", in *Revista de Educación*, 362, in press.
- Hellekjaer, G. (2010). "Language Matters: Assessing Lecture Comprehension in Norwegian English-medium Higher Education", in C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula and U. Smit (eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. AILA Applied Linguistics Series, Vol. 8. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233-258.
- Jensen, C. and Thøgersen, J. (2011). "Danish University Lecturers' Attitudes towards English as the Medium of Instruction", in *Ibérica*, 22: 13-34.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2012). "El Papel del Inglés en el Fomento del Multilingüismo en la Universidad", in *Estudios de Lingüística Aplicada*, 12: 13-44.
- Lasagabaster, D. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.) (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Lorenzo, F., Casal, S. and Moore, P. (2010). "The Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning in European Education: Key Findings from the Andalusian Bilingual Sections Evaluation Project", in *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 3: 418-442.
- Lorenzo, F., Trujillo, F. and Vez, J. (2011). *Educación Bilingüe: Integración de Contenidos y Segundas Lenguas*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Marrero, J. (1993). "Las Teorías Implícitas del Profesorado: Vínculo entre la Cultura y la Práctica de Enseñanza", in M. Rodrigo, A. Rodríguez and J. Marrero (eds.), *Las teorías implícitas. Una aproximación al conocimiento cotidiano*. Madrid: Aprendizaje Visor, 243-276.
- Madrid, D. and Hughes, S. (eds.) (2011). *Studies in Bilingual Education*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Morales, P., Urosa, B. and Blanco, A. (2005). *Construcción de Escalas de Actitudes Tipo Likert: una Guía Práctica*. Madrid: La Muralla.
- Muñiz, J. and Fonseca-Pedrero, E. (2008). "Construcción de Instrumentos de Medida para la Evaluación Universitaria", in *Revista de Investigación en Educación*, 5: 13-26.

- Phillipson, R. (2003). *English-only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Praver, M. and Oga-Baldwin, W. (2008). "What Motivates Language Teachers: Investigation Work Satisfaction and Second Language Pedagogy", in *Polyglossia*, 14: 137-150.
- Ramos, A. (2013). "Higher Education Bilingual Programmes in Spain", in *Porta Linguarum*, 19: 101-111, available from: <http://www.ugr.es/local/portalin>, accessed 11 September, 2013.
- Ramos, A. and Villoria, J. (2012). "La Enseñanza Bilingüe en la Educación Superior", in M. Fernández Fraile and J. Villoria (eds.), *Enseñanza de la Lengua y la Literatura en la Universidad: Innovación y Calidad*. Granada: Comares, 19-28.
- Robbins, S. and Coulter, M. (1996). *Administración*. Mexico: Prentice-Hall Hispanoamericana.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. and Jiménez Catalán, R. (eds.) (2009). *Content and Language Integrated Learning. Evidence from Research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). "Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca", in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24: 209-239.
- Toledo, I., Rubio, F. and Hermosín, M. (2011). "Creencias, Rendimiento Académico y Actitudes de Alumnos Universitarios Principiantes en un Programa Plurilingual", in *Porta Linguarum* 18: 213-229, available from: <http://www.ugr.es/local/portalin>, accessed 11 September, 2013.
- Van Leeuwen, C. and Wilkinson, R. (eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Approaches in University Education*. Maastricht: Universiteit Maastricht.
- Veeman, S. (1988). "El Proceso de Llegar a Ser Profesor: Un Análisis de la Formación Inicial", in A. Villa (ed.), *Perspectivas y Problemas de la Función Docente: II Congreso Mundial Vasco*. Madrid: Narcea., 39-68.
- Vez, J. (2009). "Multilingual Education in Europe: Policy Developments", in *Porta Linguarum*, 12: 7-24, available from: <http://www.ugr.es/local/portalin>, accessed 11 September, 2013.
- Weiss, H. (2002). "Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluations, Beliefs and Affective Experiences", in *Human Resource Management Review*, 12: 173-194
- Wilkinson, R. (ed.) (2004). *Integrating Content and Language. Meeting the Challenge of Multilingual Higher Education*. Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht.

ANNEX: QUESTIONNAIRE

Level of satisfaction of lecturers teaching in English in the University of Oviedo

General information

- 1) Age:
- 2) Gender:
- 3) Area of knowledge:
- 4) Experience (in months) teaching in English:
- 5) Stays in English speaking countries (more than 1 month):
- 6) Estimated level of English (A1 - A2 - B1 - B2 - C1 - C2)
- 7) Motivation to lecture in English (choose only one)
 - a. Improve my international projection
 - b. Teach reduced groups of students
 - c. Teach fewer hours / credits
 - d. Improve my professional prestige
 - e. Other (specify)

SATISFACTION INDICATORS

On the basis of the following statements, specify your level of agreement or disagreement according to the following scale:

1	2	3	4
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

A) Overall satisfaction

1) The implementation of the bilingual programme is satisfactory Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
2) My results teaching in English are positive Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
3) Taking part in the programme has improved my international projection Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
4) The bilingual programme has improved my academic and professional progression Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
5) My efforts have been acknowledged by my department / faculty Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
6) Teaching subjects in English generates additional paperwork and does not render positive academic results Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
7) My competence in English has improved since I have been teaching through English Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
8) Teaching in English is a positive experience from the academic point of view for both lecturers and students Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

B) Specific training received at the University of Oviedo

9) The specific training received in order to teach in English is suitable and meets the teaching needs Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
10) The specific training for lecturers teaching in English is sufficient (regarding the number and variety of courses) Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
11) The contents and syllabi of training courses for lecturers teaching in English meet expectations

	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
12) Class materials and resources are suitable, updated and operational	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
13) The structure and planning of the training programme failed to qualify lecturers to teach in English	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
14) The training courses have contributed to improving my language competence in English at an academic level	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
15) The training received has provided new insights regarding teaching techniques and strategies to be used in my lectures	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

C) Organization, academic and curricular issues	
16) The planning of bilingual degrees is appropriate	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
17) The coordination with other lecturers of the bilingual programme is suitable	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
18) There are enough teaching materials and resources to teach my subject in English	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
19) There is an appropriate institutional support for designing, preparing and developing teaching materials.	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
20) The monitoring and control system to guarantee the quality in the bilingual programme is insufficient	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
21) The reduction in hours / teaching credits awarded by teaching in English is enough in order to prepare my lectures	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
22) Mobility opportunities and international exchanges within the bilingual programme are effective	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

D) Results perceived concerning teaching in English	
23) My pronunciation and intonation are appropriate for lecturing in English	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
24) My technical vocabulary in English is appropriate for the subject I teach	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
25) My general vocabulary, formulaic speech, colloquialisms, etc., are appropriate	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
26) My level of English allows me to explain complex concepts	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
27) My level of English is appropriate to handle questions and interact with the students	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
28) The results as regards students' performance are worse than in the groups taught in Spanish	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
29) My teaching technique can be adapted to the communicative use of English in a lecture	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
30) The evaluation of students' activities (tests, written tasks, etc.) has been carried out without problems	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

Thank you very much for your cooperation.