Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,
2026, sayı 67, ss.476-500

Araştırma Makalesi

The Journal of Buca Faculty of
Education, 2026, issue 67, pp.476-500

Research Article

Inclusive Student-Centred Pedagogy in Higher Education: Exploring Faculty Members' Teaching Skills and Pedagogical Training from English Medium Instruction Students' Perspectives

Yükseköğretimde Kapsayıcı Öğrenci Merkezli Pedagoji: Eğitim Dili İngilizce Olan Öğrencilerinin Bakış Açılarıyla Öğretim Üyelerinin Öğretim Becerileri ve Pedagojik Eğitimlerinin İncelenmesi

Serhat Başar [1]

[1]*Corresponding Author, Dr., Dicle University, serhat.basar@dicle.edu.tr, (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9716-4308)*

Geliş Tarihi: *01.11.2025* ***Kabul Tarihi:*** *22.01.2026*

ABSTRACT

This study explores the faculty members' teaching skills and pedagogical training from English-Medium Instruction (EMI) students' perspectives at a Turkish EMI university with a focus on the interplay between instructional practices and inclusive student-centred pedagogy. Despite the priority given to research and institutional rankings, ineffective pedagogy and a lack of pedagogical training for faculty members impede inclusive student-centred practices. Through a qualitative case design, semi-structured interviews were conducted with EMI students from the architecture, engineering, and science faculties. The data analysis followed an abductive thematic approach through which emerging patterns were interpreted in relation to three pedagogical perspectives associated with inclusive student-centred pedagogy: Universal Design for Learning, sociocultural pedagogy, and humanizing pedagogy. The findings reveal a significant need for more interactive, flexible, and multimodal course designs. Along with preferring more collaborative learning environments and faculty feedback, students emphasize the essence of inclusive and transformative relationships with the faculty, addressing the importance of inclusive student-centred pedagogical practices that foster safe learning environments in EMI contexts. By foregrounding EMI students' voices and positioning faculty pedagogical training as a fundamental prerequisite for developing inclusive EMI teaching competencies, the study provides pedagogically grounded insights to inform future EMI faculty development initiatives in higher education.

Keywords: Inclusive student-centred pedagogy, higher education pedagogy, English medium instruction (EMI), faculty pedagogical training, student perspective.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de eğitim dili İngilizce olan bir üniversitedeki öğrencilerin (English Medium Instruction – EMI) bakış açısından öğretim üyelerinin öğretim becerilerini ve pedagojik eğitimlerini incelemekte; öğretim uygulamalarının kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli öğrenme ile ilişkisine odaklanmaktadır. Araştırma ve kurumsal sıralamalara verilen önceliğe rağmen, etkisiz pedagojik yaklaşımlar ve öğretim üyelerinin pedagojik eğitim eksiklikleri kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli uygulamaları sınırlamaktadır. Nitel durum çalışması deseninin benimsendiği bu araştırmada; mimarlık, mühendislik ve fen fakültelerinden EMI öğrencileriyle yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler gerçekleştirildi. Veriler, ortaya çıkan örüntülerin kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli öğrenme ile uyumlu pedagojik yapılar çerçevesinde yorumlandığı abductive tematik analiz yaklaşımıyla çözümlenmiş; üç pedagojik perspektiften yararlanılmıştır: Evrensel Tasarım

(UDL), Sosyokültürel Pedagoji ve İnsancıllaştırıcı Pedagoji. Bulgular, daha etkileşimli, esnek ve çok modlu ders tasarımlarına yönelik güçlü bir gereksinimi ortaya koymaktadır. Öğrenciler daha işbirlikçi öğrenme ortamlarını ve öğretim üyelerinden daha fazla geri bildirim almayı tercih etmelerinin yanı sıra, öğretim üyeleriyle kapsayıcı ve dönüştürücü ilişkilerin önemini vurgulamaktadır; bu durum EMI bağlamlarında güvenli öğrenme ortamlarını destekleyen kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagojik uygulamaların gerekliliğine işaret etmektedir. EMI öğrencilerinin seslerini merkeze alan ve kapsayıcı EMI öğretim yetkinliklerinin geliştirilmesi için öğretim üyelerine yönelik pedagojik eğitimi temel bir ön koşul olarak konumlandıran bu çalışma, yükseköğretimde gelecekteki EMI öğretim üyesi gelişim girişimlerine yön verebilecek pedagojik olarak temellendirilmiş içgörüler sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagoji, yükseköğretim pedagojisi, İngilizce eğitim dili (EMI), öğretim üyelerinin pedagojik eğitimi, öğrenci bakış açısı.

INTRODUCTION

The interactional dynamics of higher education (HE) institutions have a significant impact on the educational practices of faculty and students (Eka Putri et al., 2023) since the instructional approaches offered by a university can significantly promote student competencies and self-actualization (Bogomaz et al., 2015). A participatory university learning culture that values students' voices in policy and decision-making practices can lead to more emancipatory and adaptive educational approaches, which can foster the pedagogical quality of students' learning trajectories. However, being exposed to a rigid HE culture that positions students as empty vessels to be filled with information may not provide enough opportunities for active participation in educational decisions (Freire, 1970), which also impedes students' creative agentic actions that could contribute to the learning culture of universities.

Therefore, there is an emerging need for a departure from conventional HE pedagogies that are merely based on content delivery. Adopting more innovative and inclusive student-centred HE pedagogies can lead to more inclusive learning environments where students' diverse needs are met, and they are encouraged to become active agents of learning (Marin & Katsampoxaki-Hodgetts, 2024). In this regard, an inclusive student-centred pedagogical approach drawing on humanizing, critical, and sociocultural learning principles can emancipate learners by liberating them from alienating learning practices, which can transform the relationship between students and society and equip students with new perspectives on the 21st-century challenges and opportunities (Dignath et al., 2022; Fataar, 2016; Hämäläinen, 2015). Hence, inclusive and student-centred pedagogies encourage teachers to recognize learners as active stakeholders with diverse backgrounds, needs/expectations, and skills. With this awareness, teachers should acknowledge and respond to the diversity of learner needs and varied learning preferences, which is vital to foster engagement, equity, and academic achievement (Dignath et al., 2022; Sousa & Tomlinson, 2018).

Another significant reality regarding HE contexts is the global spread of English-medium instruction (EMI), particularly in contexts where English is not the first language of the majority population (Macaro et al., 2018). Since EMI continues to expand globally in non-Anglophone higher education in recent years, discussions of inclusive student-centred pedagogy cannot be separated from this shift. Universities adopt EMI to enhance internationalization and attract diverse student groups from varying backgrounds; however, the expansion of EMI has also generated pedagogical challenges stemming from unequal access to content due to varying English proficiency levels and faculty members' lack of adequate preparation for teaching in linguistically diverse classrooms (Macaro et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2025). In addition, lack of student-centred pedagogies fostering faculty-student or student-student interactions (Ismailov et al., 2021) and lack of professional development opportunities for faculty growth (Macaro et al., 2018; 2020) emerge as other critical challenges hindering inclusivity in EMI teaching contexts.

EMI teaching requires faculty members to develop essential skills, including linguistic, pedagogic, and socio-emotional competences (Ismailov et al., 2025). However, EMI faculty have limited access to either formal or voluntary pedagogical training programs across various EMI contexts to develop these competences, which obliges faculty members to teach in EMI programs without a pedagogical background (Macaro et al., 2020). Concerning this problem, there is an increase in EMI professional development (PD) activities initiated by some institutes and researchers. While some of these PD initiatives provide training on pedagogical skills and intercultural communication, most of them primarily prioritize linguistic skills and aim to help EMI faculty invest in their linguistic competence (Deroey, 2023; Wang et al., 2025). Even though EMI students value the linguistic skills of faculty members, they also expect them to be pedagogically and socio-emotionally competent in providing student-centred teaching practices (Ismailov et al., 2025). Inclusive student-centred pedagogy is crucial for faculty members to stay responsive to students' needs and build safe learning environments (Van der Rijst & Fernández Díaz, 2025). Nevertheless, faculty have limited opportunities to develop inclusive student-centred EMI practices, and the existing literature demonstrates that PD for inclusive practices is generally confined to the development of translanguaging skills for dynamic and flexible use of other languages in addition to English in EMI classrooms (Ngo, 2024; Tai, 2022).

In the Turkish EMI context, faculty members are not expected to have pedagogical training to be able to teach at universities (Taneri & Özbek, 2023), and they are not offered enough PD opportunities despite their pedagogical needs (Arslan, 2023). Prior EMI research in Türkiye has focused largely on academic effectiveness of EMI and linguistic affordances and challenges (Turhan & Kırkgöz, 2018; Yuksel et al., 2023). Despite some research addressing EMI pedagogical training needs in Türkiye (Arslan, 2023; Başar, 2025; Ozer, 2020a; 2020b), studies exploring EMI faculty members' pedagogical effectiveness and training from EMI students' perspectives remain limited. Furthermore, little is known about EMI students' expectations from faculty members with regard to inclusive student-centred pedagogy. In this sense, considering the emerging significance and needs for inclusive student-centred HE pedagogies and equitable learning opportunities, this study aims to explore university EMI students' perspectives on how faculty members' teaching practices and training impact inclusive student-centred pedagogy and what students need and expect from HE in Türkiye, a context where there is limited research focusing on students' views (Taneri & Özbek, 2023; Yürekli-Kaynardağ, 2019). Foregrounding EMI students' voices, the findings are expected to contribute to the development of inclusive student-centred pedagogies in HE by highlighting current practices and pedagogies, EMI students' expectations, faculty development needs, and possible actions to take for EMI pedagogical training in Türkiye and beyond. Thus, the current study is guided by the following research question:

- How do EMI students at a Turkish university perceive faculty members' teaching practices and pedagogical training in relation to inclusive student-centred pedagogy, and what do they expect for more inclusive learning experiences?

1.1. The State of The Art in Higher Education Pedagogy

From a traditional perspective, faculty members have historically been respected because of their expertise and subject matter knowledge in their own discipline (Postareff et al., 2007). In addition to subject matter knowledge, faculty members have prioritized their research competence and productivity over teaching because of their career progression (Stensaker et al., 2017). However, HE is constantly evolving, and faculty members are required to take up new instructional practices, teaching roles, and PD activities (Stevens et al., 2024). Hence, disciplinary knowledge or research competence alone can no longer make faculty expert educators because they also need to develop their expertise in pedagogical practices. Faculty expertise is highly related to how they employ teaching strategies relevant to their field

(Ericsson et al., 2018), how they synthesize their subject matter knowledge with pedagogical knowledge and generate appropriate pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), and how they employ interpersonal competency and skills for learners (Toom, 2017).

In this regard, a systematic review synthesizing the frameworks for expertise in HE (Van Dijk et al., 2020) suggests that faculty members' expertise in teaching depends on better task performance to teach well, competence to conduct a variety of tasks, and potential to impact learners, colleagues, curricular policies within institutional and international spheres. Considering the current status of HE and the new skills and instructional task requirements expected from faculty members, pedagogical training and professional learning are becoming more important to be able to appropriate personal teaching theories to the emerging needs, which is the reason why many countries such as Norway, the UK, and Sri Lanka have decided on compulsory pedagogical training for faculty members (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Postareff et al., 2007).

The experiences of students in HE underline the need for pedagogical actions to be taken. A study in Germany by Trautwein and Bosse (2017) revealed that first-year students suffered from anonymity and a lack of opportunities to build collaborative relationships with peers and professors. In the US, students also emphasized the need for faculty openness to communication, being known by name, faculty respect for their views, and faculty feedback and support for their academic development needs (Spencer & Schemelkin, 2002). Another study conducted in the UK showed that university students expect more dialogic feedback opportunities from their professors since they find their interactions very hierarchical and transfer-based (Blair & McGinty, 2013). Similarly, in Türkiye, students in HE complained about inadequate content delivery, lack of communication, and ineffective assessment practices, which is attributed to the lack of formal pedagogical training of faculty members (Taneri & Özbek, 2023; Yürekli-Kaynardağ, 2019).

The pressure to be more productive in research and contribute to university rankings in HE institutions across the world should not necessitate downgrading the role of educational quality (Altbach & Hazelkorn, 2017; Stensaker et al., 2017). Institutional efforts to make universities quantitatively prestigious in global rankings might create a tension between what students pedagogically expect and what is offered in the classroom by faculty members. The gap between learner expectations and current practices may bring about pedagogical dissatisfaction since connectedness and integration with peers and professors are essential elements of student satisfaction and academic success (Jorgenson et al., 2018). Students need more opportunities to interact with their peers and professors to feel part of the interconnected world and to diversify their perspectives by learning from others and voicing their minds dialogically (Trinidad et al., 2023). Therefore, what makes a HE pedagogy effective cannot be adequately understood without making students' perspectives more visible because the effectiveness of HE pedagogy inherently depends on the systematic inclusion of students' perspectives.

1.2. The Role of Inclusive Student-Centred Pedagogy in HE

The existing literature shows that learners have varying needs and higher expectations from their HE trajectories, which need to be heard. University EMI contexts, which are becoming a more significant component of the HE ecosystem because of increasing globalization efforts of universities to have more international students and better ranking rates (Macaro et al., 2018), are not free of the above-mentioned pedagogical challenges. Therefore, the mobilization of HE students across the world and the increase in EMI programs has led to more culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms (Lasagabaster, 2022). These new realities in HE required considering linguistically more inclusive practices to foster intercultural communication in EMI classrooms through translanguaging practices, which are helpful to

create linguistically and culturally inclusive EMI learning environments (Ngo, 2024; Tai, 2022). However, diversity in EMI classrooms does not only come from cultural and linguistic backgrounds but also from diverse personal needs (Wang et al., 2025). EMI learners may heterogeneously differ from each other regarding their varying pedagogical needs, emotional states, and confidence (Ismailov et al., 2025), which further complicates the problem and necessitates considering alternative pedagogies.

In this sense, this study draws on the inclusive student-centred pedagogy to address the challenges of EMI students and their expectations for inclusive and equitable learning opportunities. An inclusive student-centred approach to higher education pedagogy could offer new pathways to adopt an educational vision, ensuring the student perspective is integral to designing and sustaining an effective HE pedagogy. Thus, inclusive practices can enable faculty members to develop better student-faculty member relationships by giving them a voice and addressing their needs, expectations, and ambitions through diversified teaching practices (Trinidad, 2019). In this sense, by acknowledging all students' potentialities and fostering their sense of belonging, an inclusive student-centred pedagogy could function as a theoretical and practical lens to establish a safe learning environment. Being part of such an environment can make students feel supported and valued to sustain their academic and personal growth (Kravale-Paulina et al., 2025). Hence, an inclusive student-centred approach in HE requires faculty members to promote students' participation and involvement through personally relevant content, critical thinking, self/peer assessment, and students' voice and choice regarding the materials and course design (Kravale-Paulina et al., 2025). Also, it is essential to offer a safe and supportive environment through universal design procedures that address learner variability and diversity against a one-size-fits-all perspective (Goodall et al., 2024). Besides, tailoring the course, materials, and assessment methods and differentiating the instruction according to learners' profiles, readiness, and interest (Sousa & Tomlinson, 2018), and offering student-centred opportunities encouraging collaboration and interaction is crucial to ensure inclusive practices in EMI contexts (Ismailov et al., 2021).

However, the implementation of an inclusive student-centred approach could bring several challenges because of the lack of inclusive student-centred pedagogies in HE and the lack of faculty training guiding and encouraging faculty members to employ inclusive approaches, empowering learners as equal partners of HE processes (Trinidad, 2019; Van der Rijst et al., 2019). For example, Universal Design for Learning offers a robust framework for addressing inclusive student-centred pedagogy by prioritizing multimodal and flexible learning environments that are responsive to varying learner needs (Meyer et al., 2014). However, detrimental factors stemming from faculty members' lack of a pedagogical training background and institutional constraints such as excessive teaching hours and research-oriented workloads might challenge the implementation of such inclusive practices in EMI settings and constrain faculty members' willingness to engage in PD trajectories to adopt these practices (Park et al., 2022).

Previous studies across HE contexts also address the challenge of implementing inclusive practices. While faculty members could be willing to employ inclusive approaches, they fail to conceptualize the foundational aspects of inclusivity regarding how to transform assessment practices and faculty-student power distance (Trinidad, 2019). Similar findings in Europe reveal limited awareness of possible pedagogical options and a definite need for faculty development (Marin & Katsampoxaki-Hodgetts, 2024). Likewise, the lack of pedagogical background might prevent faculty members from utilizing interactive learning environments, instructional diversity in course design, and effective assessment practices in EMI settings in Türkiye (Arslan, 2023; Başar, 2025). This gap evidently shows that faculty training and development for inclusive student-centred pedagogies is a substantial need in HE. In this regard, Marin and Van der Rijst (2025) propose a multi-dimensional faculty competence framework that addresses the affordances of online and face-to-face activities, faculty beliefs and willingness, pedagogical

and assessment design competency, and student engagement management competency. These dimensions emphasize that flexible course designs, collaborative learning, learner autonomy, and feedback-rich interaction can pave the way for inclusive practices, but faculty willingness and pedagogical training are prerequisites for developing these competencies. (Marin & Van der Rijst, 2025).

1.3. The Current Study

Despite the increasing awareness of strengths provided by inclusive student-centred pedagogies, the lack of professional development opportunities for faculty members may impede student-centred educational practices in EMI settings in HE (Lasagabaster, 2018; Macaro et al., 2020). Hence, there is an emerging need for training prioritizing student-centred approaches to orchestrate dialogic interactions, scaffold learning, and engage learners through inclusive practices in EMI (Ismailov et al., 2021). Without pedagogical support and professional development, faculty members might have difficulty developing linguistic, pedagogic, and socio-emotional competences, which are central to effective EMI (Ismailov et al., 2025). In Türkiye, limited voluntary professional development opportunities and not having to complete an obligatory in-service/pre-service HE training (Taneri & Özbek, 2023; Yürekli-Kaynardağ, 2019) or an EMI-specific training program might pose significant challenges to students' learning trajectories (Soruç & Griffiths, 2018). Reported student experiences also resonate with these concerns since they generally report difficulties with lecture comprehension and faculty-student interactions, which makes them strive for pedagogical support from faculty members (Ekoç, 2020; Sahan & Rose, 2021). However, how teaching practices and faculty training impact inclusive student-centred pedagogy has remained underexplored in the Turkish context.

Existing research has primarily focused on academic experiences and language-related affordances or challenges (Turhan & Kırkgöz, 2018; Yuksel et al., 2023). Several studies present faculty-reported pedagogical needs for institutional PD support in developing better EMI practices for classroom interaction, material design, and assessment (Arslan, 2023; Başar, 2025; Ozer, 2020a; 2020b). However, less attention has been paid to pedagogical inclusivity in EMI classrooms in HE contexts, particularly from the perspectives of EMI students. Addressing this gap and acknowledging the dearth of research that gives voice to EMI students' perspectives as active agents in HE, the current study aims to explore EMI students' perspectives on faculty members' teaching competence and pedagogical approaches in a Turkish HE context through the lens of inclusive student-centred pedagogy.

METHOD

2.1. Research Design

A qualitative case study design was adopted in order to "lay the groundwork for future studies by providing basic information about the realms in which little research has been conducted" (Heigham & Croker, 2009, p.70), that is, university students' perspectives about HE pedagogy in Türkiye. In this study, the university was defined as an HE case where students, faculty members, and their academic/pedagogical practices constitute a bounded system including multiple realities and case-specific boundaries that cannot be generalized but can be compared to other cases (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). To pave the way for further studies and more pluralistic explorations of HE contexts, the researcher conducted an in-depth exploration of how students perceive the pedagogical competence of their professors.

2.2. Research Context and Participants

This study was conducted at a public university in Türkiye where English is the sole medium of instruction across all departments and programs. This university employs around

600 faculty members and offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in fields such as engineering, architecture, and natural sciences. In addition to providing education to students, the university carries out intensive and long-term research practices supported by financial incentives and grants from the Council of Higher Education.

While the university occasionally organizes professional development workshops for faculty members, these workshops are not tailored to the needs of the faculty and are not systematically organized. In these workshops, guest speakers from other HE institutions present on a topic in which they specialize and then answer questions from participants. This university's only other pedagogical development initiative is that faculty members receive student course evaluations through the end-of-course surveys automatically administered each semester. The lack of systematic PD opportunities for faculty members within this context, which was previously reported by the researcher (Başar, 2025), also informed the study design because an alternative perspective (students' lived experiences) on pedagogical practices within an EMI context, where such practices are not systematically supported or improved, was needed to generate new insights into existing pedagogical realities.

In the spring 2024 term, the researcher explained the details and purposes of the research and called for volunteers in a compulsory service course by using convenience sampling since the participants constituted an accessible student group and were willing to participate. The students were informed that participation in this study was voluntary and would have no impact on course grading. Considering the risk that the participants might feel coerced to participate since the researcher was teaching that compulsory service course, the interviews started after the final grades were officially announced. To further mitigate the risk, students were informed that they could withdraw at any stage with no consequences. Besides, to minimize the potential power relations between the researcher and students, participants were reminded that the research would be based on their personal experiences of disciplinary courses rather than the service course the researcher was teaching, and their evaluations would be anonymized and confidential. 13 students volunteered to participate (see Table 1). All participants were undergraduate students, with their year of study ranging from two to four years. All volunteering students were accepted for the interviews. The service course was open to students from multiple faculties, so students from different faculties volunteered to participate. Hence, there was no need to use any intentional sampling for disciplinary balance. Also, as similar patterns began to recur across the interviews and there were no longer new insights across different faculties, the researcher did not make a second call for additional volunteers. All participants gave written consent for the interviews and voice recording. The researcher also received approval from the university IRB (Date: 31/05/2024; No: 05/03) and gave numbers to participants as a confidentiality measure.

Table 1

Information about Participants

No	Faculty	Gender	Class	Age
P1	Engineering	Male	Freshman	20
P2	Architecture	Male	Sophomore	21
P3	Engineering	Male	Freshman	19
P4	Science	Female	Sophomore	20
P5	Engineering	Female	Sophomore	21
P6	Architecture	Female	Sophomore	21
P7	Architecture	Male	Sophomore	21
P8	Science	Male	Junior	22
P9	Science	Female	Freshman	20

P10	Engineering	Female	Freshman	20
P11	Architecture	Female	Junior	22
P12	Engineering	Male	Junior	22
P13	Science	Female	Sophomore	21

2.3. Data Collection Instruments

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to gain insights into the participants' perspectives about HE pedagogy, which provided the flexibility to explore particular areas of interest by generating new questions to reconsider while maintaining a consistent framework for all interviews (Leavy, 2017). In 30-minute interviews conducted in available classrooms on campus, participants responded to questions about their HE experiences regarding course content, instructional design, opportunities for feedback, communication with faculty members, and their needs and expectations (e.g., "How do your professors in your department teach their courses?", How do you receive feedback for your assignments, exams, and class participation?", "how do you reflect on your interactions with your professors?", "Regarding your current HE experiences, what do you need to improve your learning?"). These questions were developed based on the relevant literature on HE pedagogy, and they were reviewed and approved by a qualitative research expert, who also reviewed the data analysis through peer debriefing. Depending on learners' answers, the researcher also used follow-up questions for more elaboration and clarification.

The interviews were conducted in the language the students preferred. While two interviewees wanted to speak English, eight preferred to be interviewed in Turkish. The interviews were voice-recorded, transcribed, and translated into English. As the researcher translated the Turkish transcripts into English, for member checking, the participants were invited on a voluntary basis to check the accuracy of transcribed and translated versions of their interview data. Two participants, who were interviewed in Turkish, volunteered to read the transcriptions and ensure they could voice their ideas during the interviews and that their ideas were accurately transcribed and translated (Barkhuizen, 2018). Also, the researcher kept revisiting the original Turkish transcripts while analyzing translated versions to minimize meaning loss and conceptual irrelevance in excerpts.

2.4. Data Analysis

All transcripts were coded manually through an iterative process. First, a descriptive coding strategy was used by assigning single words or short phrases to the data in order to capture the main topics (Saldaña, 2014). Throughout the analysis, the researcher kept analytical memos to document emerging patterns, coding decisions, uncertain points to be raised during peer debriefing (Saldaña, 2009). This process functioned as an audit trail process guiding theme-building process. Thus, based on notes from analytical memos (emerging categories and potential themes after the first cycle of analysis), a peer-debriefing session was conducted with an expert in in-service and pre-service language teacher education and qualitative research (Nowell et al., 2017). This session particularly helped the researcher refine pedagogical lenses and clarify how emerging categories aligned with these pedagogical frameworks. Data units converged with the pedagogical constructs of three extant frameworks: Universal Design for Learning (UDL), sociocultural theory, and humanizing pedagogy, which is also aligned with inclusive student-centred pedagogies. These three pedagogical lenses were adopted since they provided a more holistic interpretation of students' insights by addressing instructional design, social interaction with peers and faculty members, and socio-emotional dimensions of learning. As these patterns consistently emerged from the data and were supported by relevant sub-categories such as overdependence on PPT slides, one-way delivery of content knowledge, and learner anxiety, frameworks focusing more exclusively on feedback literacy or assessment for

learning might have addressed only specific constructs rather than broader pedagogical experiences.

In light of these pedagogical lenses, the codes were analyzed again through an abductive thematic analysis, which is neither data-driven nor hypothesis-driven (Thompson, 2022). Employing an abductive data analysis helped to approach the data both deductively and inductively because the researcher could create an interplay between inductive coding/theme-building and theoretical constructs offered by the extant frameworks. In this sense, the emerging patterns among codes and how these patterns interconnected with one another were identified in a cyclical and iterative way in relation to the theoretical lenses (see Table 2). For instance, the initial codes `overdependence on PPT slides` and `monotonous lecturing` guided the researcher to the category 'lack of instructional variety', which was then associated with UDL (multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression).

Table 2

Illustrative Examples of the Coding and Theme-Building Process

Initial codes (samples)	Categories	Final Themes	Pedagogical Lenses
Overdependence on PPT slides, monotonous lecturing, limited practice-oriented tasks	Lack of instructional variety	Need for multifaceted and engaging EMI instruction	Universal Design for Learning
Preference for group and pair work, expert mediation	Collaborative and interactive learning	Learning as a social and dialogic process	Sociocultural Pedagogy
Lack of feedback clarity, delayed or absent feedback, not knowing faculty expectations	Feedback as a mediation tool	Need for dialogic and supportive feedback practices	Sociocultural Pedagogy
Feeling ignored, lack of acknowledgment/recognition, homogenization	Dehumanizing interactions with faculty members	Need to be seen as a whole person	Humanizing Pedagogy

2.5. Positionality

Throughout this study, the researcher considered the participants active and critical research stakeholders and valued their perspectives (Leavy, 2017). While conducting the interviews, the researcher took particular care in approaching the participants non-hierarchically. To mitigate the power relations and sustain the non-hierarchical nature of the interviews, the researcher informed the participants that the researcher, adopting an outsider perspective, would try to understand their experiences of departmental courses. By reminding the participants of the independence of the unit course from their departmental courses and assuring them that no interview data would be shared with those departments, the researcher ensured a stress-free interview atmosphere. The researcher kept a reflective-analytical memo to attune himself and his questions during and after each interview (Saldaña, 2009). During data analysis, the researcher read the transcriptions several times to familiarise himself with the data and make sense of the participants' experiences. By collaborating with students through member checking, the researcher had the chance to assess how his interpretations converged with the participants' expressions. Besides, while listening to them and analyzing their transcribed responses, the researcher meticulously analyzed their statements to depict a comprehensive view of their voices without objectifying their answers and passivizing their roles.

FINDINGS

The findings revealed that emerging themes inform three theories that can be related to an inclusive student-centred perspective. Therefore, in this section, each theme built upon student data will be presented in relation to the theory it is aligned with. In this sense, for the first theme, students' need for a multifaceted teaching approach that foregrounds instructional variety and learner engagement resonates with the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (Meyer et al., 2014). Secondly, students regard learning and feedback practices as a social process necessitating a collaborative space incorporating more dialogic and joint practices. This notion aligns with sociocultural pedagogy's tenets, as Lave and Wenger articulated (2008). Finally, the students' negative experiences of being ignored, passivized, and homogenized in the educational process are presented in the last theme through the lenses of dehumanizing pedagogies (Devis-Rozental, 2018). No divergent cases were identified during the analysis. Participants mostly reported their needs and negative experiences. However, some incidents reported as good practices (e.g., practice-based tasks, interaction with guest speakers) converged with emerging themes to present a broader understanding of various experiences.

Each theme is presented below with references to the related theoretical frameworks and student excerpts, which is followed by a more comprehensive discussion concerning inclusive student-centred pedagogies in the discussion section.

3.1. We Want the Professor to Provide Multifaceted Instruction!

Participants in the study seem tired of the traditional teaching models used by their professors, such as lecturing and/or reading presentation slides, and strongly express their need for a more interactive, flexible, multimodal course design that considers their needs and learning styles. P1 shared how his first project helped him understand new information in different ways and through different media (Meyer et al., 2014):

> We did a project named Life Museum. I realized that when I designed something, I started feeling very functional. At that time, I told myself that even though I wasn't aware of it, I had somehow acquired this knowledge without realizing it. I had never experienced anything like this until then. It was always about memorizing formulas, memorizing grammar rules, memorizing, and memorizing…

Similarly, P3 explained, "*The faculty members should be able to help us with the topics we want. Lessons should be more active. Students should be engaged*". P5 and P10 joined their peers by saying, "*Reading from slides should be changed. We can read the slides ourselves. Instructors should aim to truly teach and engage with students, not just deliver a lecture*,".

In terms of assessment practices, participants also expect their professors to be more flexible and varied in the types of assessment they provide, considering students' "baseline knowledge, skills, and needs" (Coffman & Draper, 2022, p.40), as the following excerpts show:

> We don't exactly learn the content; we memorize everything and then go into the midterms, which are more challenging than they should be. I failed one of the courses and will probably fail another one, too. Moreover, I don't believe that it is my fault. Most professors just solve the question, and then they move on. However, it should integrate students into the program more, and they should be open to more office hours (P4).

Participants clearly expressed a desire for multiple means of engagement, multiple means of representation, and multiple means of expression and action. For example, P11 addresses a good practice influencing her positively; "*I learn best through visualisation and creation. A professor asked us to redesign a public space and reflect on our choice through a video. That was the only time I was applying what I knew through my own voice*".

These include the structural attributes of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) proposed by Meyer et al. (2014). Participants' views, needs, and expectations indicate that professors need to (re)design courses in line with the functional characteristics of UDL to "meet all students' needs and to support diverse learning" (Coffman & Draper, 2022, p.40). Students' insights show that how they learn and engage might vary, and merely being exposed to conventional lecturing practices creates a pedagogical gap in EMI teaching. Thus, the findings point to the need for faculty training to develop pedagogic competence in enacting inclusive pedagogies like UDL, particularly in EMI classrooms where learners have diverse learning needs.

3.2. We Want the Professor to Help Us Learn Collaboratively!

Participants indicated they learn much better when collaborating with peers during joint activities like pair or group work. Apparently, 'inter-thinking' as a concept that helps individuals understand their experiences more deeply through collaboration in joint activities leads to more significant insights than they could achieve alone, as sociocultural pedagogy supports (Littleton & Mercer, 2013). Participants explained with examples that they understand the course content better when they participate in a community of practice where "learning, thinking, and knowing are relations among people in activity in, with, and arising from the socially and culturally structured world" (Lave & Wenger, 2008, p.51), as P3 described; "*I think experiments are effective. For example, we did an experiment related to materials, and it was both fun and an activity where we could socialize with our friends. It is an activity, and we really see it*".

Other participants also acknowledged that "learning is a process that takes place in a participation framework, not in an individual mind" and wanted their professors to design courses where "learning is, as it were, distributed among co-participants, not a one-person act" (Lave & Wenger, 2008, p.15). For instance, P12 addressed the significance of collaboration for learning by referring to a professional reality; "*In engineering, we will eventually work in teams, however we are expected to figure everything out on our own. I need to see different ways of thinking*". Likewise, one participant said, "*Some subjects can be difficult to grasp even if you attend the lectures. You need help to understand a topic.*" (P5). P9 supported her peer by saying, "*Having the chance to discuss and critique questions with friends during class is very educational and beneficial*".

P4 narrated a course experience where she met experienced engineers, "*The professor brought people from different backgrounds to the class. They were all engineers. I saw that people from various backgrounds could actually do the job we would do, which was a motivating factor for me*". Through the lens of sociocultural pedagogy (Lave & Wenger, 2008), this collaboration with experts in a community of engineers mediated her professional learning path and increased her motivation as a university student.

It is clear from these excerpts that peer mediation and responsive mediation provided by experts can make a sound contribution to learning within an HE EMI context. The integration of pair and group work activities to foster peer mediation and the inclusion of culturally relevant and contextually responsive practices can promote a social learning environment in which learners develop a space for mutual development by engaging in inter-thinking practices in a dialogic and mutually constructive way (Mercer, 2000). However, student data show that EMI faculty lack pedagogic competence to responsively recognize what students need for better learning practices and how to integrate more inclusive practices that can foster collaborative learning.

3.3. We Want the Professor to Give Us Feedback!

Participants, particularly first-year students, seemed to desire more specific, detailed, and individualized feedback and guidance because they have always been positioned as 'knowledge

recipients' with little agency over their learning in the traditional Turkish education system. For example, a freshman complained that she felt lost in her studies due to the lack of specific and detailed feedback and guidance:

> My biggest obstacle is that I don't know what to study; sometimes, they give out the names of the topics and just a book. You don't know what to focus on more or how to study more. It may be a problem for me. They don't really specify the subject. It can confuse students, especially first-year students like me (P10).

For these students who have never seen themselves as `agents of their own change` throughout their education journey, it seems very difficult to agentically navigate their learning without "being taught" by their professors in HE (Boud & Molloy, 2013). To illustrate, a third-year student remembers his initial difficulty in decoding professors' feedback and his need for more concrete feedback from them:

> I couldn't adapt to how I was supposed to understand the faculty members' words. The faculty member would say, "Wouldn't it be better if you did this differently?" I thought my work was good enough. However, when my grades were low, I realized they wanted me to change these things. The difficulty was adapting at first. (P3)

Faculty members also seem to have acknowledged students' passive positioning, which requires "little volition, limited agency and dependence on faculty members or a teaching system" (Boud & Molloy, 2013, p.703). This lack of interaction between professors and students about feedback processes is an issue that needs to be addressed through open dialogue and increased transparency in grading so that professors and students co-construct knowledge and understanding in line with social constructivism (Carless, 2006; Jonsson, 2012). In addition to the lack of concrete feedback needed in the first year, sophomores and juniors also expressed dissatisfaction with the feedback-free nature of their departments, as P5 explained, "*Honestly, I haven't encountered much meaningful feedback from instructors*". Likewise, P13 reported, "*I couldn't hear anything back except for a grade after most of the assignments I submitted. Even a few comments or a quick dialogue would make a big difference*".

It seems to be the case with these students that their professors either do not provide feedback or the feedback they provide is not useful for their learning, as P3 summarised, "*It is bad if they only talk about the negative things we do and make fun of stuff while doing this. When they compare our work to something, it is funny at first. However, then it upsets you*".

These excerpts show that it is essential for the HE system to recognize and address the communication and power imbalances between students and professors. Feedback must be viewed as a shared process rather than a monologue about student performance (Carless, 2020). As reported by the students, meaningful feedback relying on dialogic interactions between faculty members and teachers is an essential component of co-constructed learning trajectories in the EMI context. Therefore, from an inclusive student-centred pedagogy perspective, a reconstructed pedagogical lens is needed for EMI faculty members to perceive feedback as a mediation tool that they should use in diverse forms depending on varying learner needs (Jonsson, 2012).

3.4. We Want the Professor to See Us as a Whole Person!

Participants in the study complained that their professors do not have enough pedagogical knowledge and skills to see them as *a whole person* with the mind, body, and spirit (Devis-Rozental, 2018). The humanizing framework in HE proposed by Todres et al. (2009) and further developed by Devis-Rozental (2018) includes dehumanization forms corresponding to the participants' experiences. These are objectification, passivity, and homogenization.

Objectification, "the notion that we have no value as we must fit into a given statistic or system without regard to how we feel and express and what matters to us" (Devis-Rozental &

Clarke, 2020, p.7), could be seen in the following excerpt where a participant explains how her feelings and needs as a human being are neglected in the school environment:

> P5: Professors should also receive training on effective communication with students, not just excelling in their field of expertise. They might have already received such training, but if they did, it doesn't seem very effective. Some professors have been teaching for over 30 years, but do not know how to communicate with us. We are humans and social beings; they must know how to approach us.
>
> Interviewer: They don't receive pedagogical training. It is not compulsory to be a faculty member.
>
> P5: Really? I didn't know that. It is surprising to me. Universities should ensure that instructors receive training on engaging with students and addressing systemic issues in education.

This exchange between the researcher and the student illustrates that the student naturally assumed faculty members already had a pedagogical training background, and they needed more training to improve their communication skills. However, surprisingly realizing that faculty training was not required to teach in HE, P5 underlined the role of pedagogical training in addressing systemic problems in education. This brief exchange also shows that lack of pedagogical training is not only a policy-level structural issue but also a problem influencing students' everyday learning practices.

Passivity, "the lack of control in an environment where we don't have any say and we are merely subjected to what happen" (Devis-Rozental & Clarke, 2020, p.7), shows itself in the excerpt below where a participant points to the power imbalance between professors and students:

> If people feel welcome in a classroom, they will be more interested because they know they can ask questions and get the answers without being judged. However, when a professor thinks they are higher than the students, it makes the students feel like they will never be enough for the professor. Moreover, it is just based on psychology that students fail most classes (P4).

Another freshman complained about the way one of his professors ignored his views simply because they conflicted, "*One of our faculty members seemed very indifferent to me. I had conflicting ideas with their ideas. My morale and motivation dropped a lot*" (P1).

Signs of *homogenization*, a form of dehumanization which includes "too much focus on standardization and having to fit into labels, groups or situations" (Devis-Rozental & Clarke, 2020, p.7), are also evident in participant excerpts. A participant, for example, states his need for recognition as follows, "*I don't think any professor recognizes any student. However, it feels good to be recognized when I ask a question, for example, even when you address me by my name*" (P7). Similarly, P13 complains about only being seen as a name on the list; "*Some professors treat us like we are only names on a list or numbers in the course system, but we have lives, struggles, and emotions too*".

Overall, the final theme reveals that inclusive student-centred pedagogy in EMI contexts depends not only on faculty members' pedagogic competence but also on their socio-emotional competence (Ismailov et al., 2025), which is crucial for recognizing students as whole persons within everyday classroom interactions. Students' experiences of objectification, passivity, and homogenization show how the power distance between faculty and students is reproduced through dehumanizing practices. Thus, faculty pedagogical training initiatives that also prioritize a humanizing perspective seem to be essential for inclusive EMI learning environments (Devis-Rozental, 2018).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The initial data analysis process was guided by three theoretical frameworks, which provided a structured lens for interpreting EMI students' experiences of HE. At the same time, student-reported insights offered an opportunity to reconsider and reassess these frameworks in the light of how HE pedagogy is enacted and experienced within a particular EMI case. Accordingly, each theme is discussed through the lens of the theoretical framework with which it overlaps. Then, by synthesizing the themes, the discussion foregrounds students' insights into inclusive student-centred pedagogy and the potential of these pedagogical frameworks to create a more inclusive, engaging, and supportive learning environment that values and respects students' diverse needs and expectations. In light of these insights and potentialities, the discussion also focuses on the need for pedagogical training and how these pedagogical frameworks can inform PD trajectories for EMI faculty members.

First, the analysis of EMI students' insights into the current HE practices revealed that their instructional needs and expectations intersect with the notions of UDL. As UDL is an inclusive pedagogy requiring educators to take a proactive role in planning and designing their courses by considering all the potential needs and diversities of students, a conventional curriculum or a course syllabus designed to serve merely a small group of students in a homogenized way may not guarantee an inclusive and socially just pedagogy (Capp, 2017). UDL is based on three principles, pointing out the need for providing multiple ways through which faculty members can represent knowledge, students can show their understanding, and faculty members can engage students with instructional practices (Capp, 2017; Meyer et al., 2014). The participants' perspectives on their learning trajectories uncovered that even a single change differing from the conventional representation of knowledge could create a new dimension to extend the scope of learning, as can be seen in the cases of P1 and P7. The students' experiences with the conventional instructional actions and classroom realities, such as passivity of students (P3), the faculty members' dependence on slides (P5 and P10), ineffective teaching practices resulting in learning failures (P4) and ineffective mode and tools of assessment (P9), indicates the need for redesigned EMI courses in line with the functional characteristics of UDL to offer diverse learning opportunities for students' needs (Coffman & Draper, 2022).

Considering the gap between what students need and what they are offered (Jorgenson et al., 2018; Trinidad et al., 2023), UDL highlights the role of faculty members in designing their courses proactively rather than evaluating the curriculum retrospectively based on their prescribed assumptions or homogenized expectations (Courey et al., 2012). In this sense, Courey et al. (2012) suggest that integrating a UDL perspective into HE pedagogy enables faculty members to evaluate students' learning dynamically throughout the EMI teaching process. This dynamic and proactive approach requires EMI faculty members' mindful scaffolding to know how the students experience learning and what is needed to simplify the tasks or diversify teaching to ensure a more accessible learning environment (Coyne et al., 2012).

Secondly, considering the role of social interactions, cultural contexts, and collaborative learning experiences in students' cognitive development (Kahu, 2013), participants' perspectives on HE pedagogy resonate with sociocultural pedagogy. According to the sociocultural theory, human cognitive development is fundamentally social, and it arises from social interactions and the internalization process of what is learned in these social interactions. This learning shift from external to internal cognition occurs through mediation, which can result from dialogic interactions with experts, peers, or objects (Vygotsky, 1978). Similarly, participants (P8 and P9) in the study openly stated that they learned better when they interactively co-constructed knowledge and understanding with their peers (P3, P5, P8, P9) in a community of practice (Roth & Lee, 2007) and expected their professors to create more space for pair and group work

in courses. Participants, for instance, P10, also wanted more dialogue with their professors to receive useful feedback based on their perspectives and agency. However, they complained that it was not always easy to overcome communication barriers in their feedback-seeking processes (P3, P5, P8) due to the power imbalance between students and EMI faculty, as supported by Carless (2020).

The last theme concerns how the EMI students want to be perceived and approached as a whole person by their professors, as they are subject to several forms of dehumanization in the current HE practices (Devis-Rozental, 2018; Todres et al., 2009). P5 highlights their needs for communication and interaction with faculty members, which points to the lack of an affect-driven humanizing pedagogy in their context, where they are fitted into pre-regulated and pre-assumed systems without having the chance to express what matters to them (Devis-Rozental & Clarke, 2020; Kim et al., 2023). In addition to the pressure on HE institutions to focus too much on standardization, higher ranking, and publication scores (Altbach & Hazelkorn, 2017; Stensaker et al., 2017), professors' relying solely on subject matter knowledge in their academic disciplines (Ericsson et al., 2018) and not developing competence in interpersonal skills (Toom, 2017) might lead to a homogenizing perspective on students. However, such homogenized and presumptive approaches to students, as P3 and P7 described, considerably influence their emotional and cognitive engagement, achievement, and sense of belonging (Kahu, 2013). Hence, participants' insights demonstrate that adopting a humanizing pedagogy can function as an affect-driven framework to utilize human cognitive capacity and optimize humanity through individual and social self-actualization (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010). It can also help faculty members stay more attuned to students' emotions and personal histories and contribute to their emancipation and engagement in learning (Kim et al., 2023).

As the analysis progressed, an overlap became evident between the principles of the UDL framework, sociocultural pedagogy, and humanizing pedagogies in light of inclusive student-centred pedagogies. From a social constructivist perspective, the principles of UDL highlight the role of EMI educators' scaffolding with students to understand their needs better and diversify teaching in light of these needs (Coyne et al., 2012). Likewise, sociocultural pedagogy positions students as co-participants of pedagogical acts (Lave & Wenger, 2008) and prioritizes educators' mediation to stay responsive to student needs (Johnson & Golombek, 2016), which aligns with the use of an affect-driven approach in humanizing pedagogies to make students' emotional needs heard and met in HE institutions (Kim et al., 2023).

Therefore, from a more holistic perspective, these three perspectives are closely aligned with the dimensions of inclusive student-centred pedagogy, which offers significant insights into EMI pedagogical training needs. Considering this particular EMI case in Türkiye, EMI faculty PD programs that prioritize inclusive student-centred pedagogy by particularly focusing on developing EMI teaching skills in light of these pedagogical frameworks can make unique contributions to inclusive EMI practices in differing ways. A recent study by Marin and Van der Rijst (2025) further supports this alignment between these pedagogical frameworks and inclusive student-centred pedagogy, and underlines the need for faculty pedagogical training to develop competencies for more inclusive practices in HE. In this sense, they conceptualize inclusive faculty competence as a multidimensional concept that includes pedagogical and assessment design, student engagement management, faculty beliefs/willingness, and effective use of learning environments. EMI PD initiatives based on a UDL perspective can enable the faculty to develop pedagogical and assessment design competencies for flexible and multimodal approaches to EMI instruction and assessment, which can meet learners' diverse pedagogical and linguistic needs and expectations (Goodall et al., 2024; Kravale-Paulina et al., 2025). Likewise, a sociocultural focus on EMI PD can equip faculty members with student engagement competence, which can raise faculty awareness about the role of collaborative learning, mediation, and meaningful interaction in facilitating pedagogic and linguistic challenges of EMI students (Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Mercer, 2000). Finally, focusing on humanizing

pedagogy through faculty pedagogical training programs can lead to new thinking pathways for EMI faculty to reconsider their beliefs and willingness for inclusive student-centred pedagogy, as they might have a better understanding of socio-emotional aspects of learners' EMI experiences. Adopting an emancipatory perspective prioritizing humanity, varying personal histories, and emotions, EMI faculty can effectively use learning environments against dehumanizing acts (Devis-Rozental, 2018; Freire, 1970).

Reported student needs show that faculty literacy in these pedagogical perspectives and development of inclusive student-centred practices seems to be a prerequisite for faculty members teaching in this EMI context because non-inclusive and teacher-centred approaches detrimentally impact student learning. Students' expectations to have a more inclusive student-centred EMI learning environment for their pedagogical and socio-emotional needs (Ismailov et al., 2025) contradict existing EMI pedagogical training initiatives that primarily focus on linguistic competence of EMI faculty members (Deroey, 2023; Wang et al., 2025). The existing literature highlights the need for faculty members' involvement in pedagogical training and continuous professional development practices, considering the evolving dynamics of HE and students' expectations in terms of task variety, heterogeneous treatment for feedback, and open communication (Jorgenson et al., 2018; Postareff et al., 2007; Stevens et al., 2024; Trinidad et al., 2023). Likewise, studies on EMI-specific training also address the need for developing core EMI competences to invest in linguistic, pedagogic, and socio-emotional skills for more effective EMI practices (Ismailov et al., 2025). However, these opportunities are limited in many countries (Macaro et al., 2020). It is obligatory to receive a pedagogical qualification through a training program in some countries, such as Norway, the Netherlands, Sri Lanka, and the UK (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Kusters et al., 2023; Yürekli Kaynardağ, 2019). Likewise, Finland provides voluntary training programs for faculty members to enhance teaching quality in HE (Postareff et al., 2007). However, in many countries, such as Türkiye, EMI faculty do not have enough opportunities for professional growth (Arslan, 2023; Başar, 2025; Ozer, 2020a; 2020b), which impedes the opportunities that could conscientize them to employ pedagogically inclusive EMI practices.

Therefore, both general pedagogical training for HE and EMI-specific programs have a significant role in creating a university teaching culture and inclusive student-centred pedagogies, enabling faculty members to engage with collaborative communities to exchange their insights and reflect on teaching experiences without feeling academically isolated (Farrell, 2020; Remmik et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2025). However, considering the contextual needs reported from this Turkish EMI university, existing EMI PD ideas might lack contextualized and needs-oriented focus since they are mainly delivered as formal, top-down courses/seminars and primarily focus on linguistic competence (Deroey, 2023; Wang et al., 2025). In this sense, this study offers significant insights into EMI faculty development based on students' perspectives. Experiences of EMI students in this Turkish context show that institutional faculty PD initiatives foregrounding inclusive student-centred pedagogy through UDL, sociocultural pedagogy, and humanizing pedagogy can offer potentialities to meet learners' expectations. As this contextual evaluation cannot be generalized to other EMI contexts and as standardized and top-down PD designs may not suffice to meet contextual expectations of faculty and students in a sustained way (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), EMI contexts might differ from one another in terms of challenges, needs, and expectations regarding inclusivity. Thus, the current research addresses the significance of contextualized and needs-oriented EMI pedagogical training that could be designed and implemented through reflective, collaborative, and inquiry-oriented faculty practices (Deroey, 2023; Wang et al., 2025). Students' perspectives and faculty insights have a substantial role in informing the design of institutional pedagogical training initiatives in a bottom-up way.

However, the current state of HE pedagogy in Türkiye and the insights from participants address the contextual gap in this particular EMI context regarding the unmet pedagogical needs and expectations of students, as well as the lack of pedagogical training opportunities for faculty members (Taneri & Özbek, 2023; Yürekli-Kaynardağ, 2019). Therefore, it is critical to equip faculty with pedagogical awareness to create a more inclusive learning environment that supports students' academic and personal growth in HE EMI programs. Thus, there is an urgent need for a more fundamental change in HE policies that will position students as active stakeholders in decision-making processes. Supporting student perspectives with faculty-reported needs and encouraging institutional PD initiatives that are needs-oriented and responsive to contextual EMI needs can pave the way for more inclusive student-centred EMI practices in HE.

The study shows that there is a discrepancy between what the students at a Turkish EMI university need and what is pedagogically offered by faculty members. EMI students emphasize their demand for pedagogical approaches that are not solely confined to content delivery. In this sense, they expect their professors to diversify their instructional approaches, which is seen as key to accommodating varied learning preferences. The students also address the need for collaborative and dialogic learning and constructive faculty feedback by highlighting the role of peer and faculty member mediation in their learning. Also, the need for recognition and acknowledgement for their efforts emerges as an important concern since students think they are not valued as a person during their learning trajectories. These expectations resonate with a more inclusive, interactive, and humanizing approach that positions students at the centre of the learning process. Interpretation of students' insights through UDL, sociocultural pedagogy, and humanizing pedagogy demonstrates the emerging need for EMI faculty to transform their lecture-based and homogenizing practices to create more flexible, dialogic, and supportive learning spaces. These needs also align with the key dimensions of Marin and Van der Rijst's (2025) inclusive student-centred pedagogy framework and demonstrate the need for faculty pedagogical training to conscientize EMI faculty to reconsider their teaching approaches. In this sense, UDL can offer affordances for supporting pedagogical and assessment design competencies; a sociocultural perspective can provide collaborative and dialogic learning opportunities to contribute to engagement management competency; and adopting a humanizing approach can facilitate an inclusive learning trajectory. Thus, contextualized EMI pedagogical training addressing these pedagogical frameworks in light of institutional needs and expectations can contribute to developing inclusive student-centred practices in this EMI case.

This study suggests several implications for promoting inclusive student-centred HE pedagogy in EMI programs. First, faculty professional development emerges as a crucial need since EMI students expect their professors to be better equipped pedagogically. Hence, it is vital for HE institutes to design professional development programs to provide pedagogical support for instructional practices (Cilliers & Herman, 2010; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004). As a one-size-fits-all perspective may hinder developing contextually sensitive, inclusive EMI practices, institutional support and guidance can be provided for EMI faculty to encourage them to engage with more reflective and collaborative PD practices (Farrell, 2020). In this sense, reflection on EMI teaching through collegial dialogues for peer learning, peer observation, and writing reflective teaching narratives/diaries can lead to more inclusive and student-centred approaches by helping EMI faculty to revisit their existing practices, identify growth points, and transform their teaching (Farrell, 2020).

Moreover, recognizing student voices can become a systematic priority rather than an occasional or symbolic requirement. As Verrill (2007, p.79) suggests, the student voice should be "the motor that drives reflective staff development". Therefore, creating participatory mechanisms, such as action research, can make EMI faculty stay responsive to students' voices and take action to transform their approaches accordingly (Burns et al., 2022). If EMI faculty members are guided and supported to use action research as a continuous participatory

mechanism, it can create a dialogic learning partnership between students and EMI faculty, which can continuously inform the EMI pedagogies enacted in the classroom and improve them, as faculty members can become more aware of what students need.

Finally, encouraging faculty to become more responsive to students' voices through formative/alternative assessment practices can also enable the faculty to refine teaching strategies according to learner needs (Spencer & Schemelkin, 2002). The exam-oriented learning culture can often undermine student agency and motivation, which restricts the effectiveness of pedagogically sound practices (Kitchen et al., 2019). Institutional PD support to help EMI faculty shift away from product-oriented assessment systems toward approaches that value formative student evaluations/feedback can be more effective to create humanizing learning environments, both in EMI and non-EMI HE contexts.

This study focused on a single EMI university in Türkiye, and specifically on student perspectives. Future research could benefit from triangulating student insights with faculty perspectives and classroom observations, which could yield a more holistic interpretation. As the researcher did not design an implicational study relying on inclusive practices, future studies could also focus on designing and evaluating professional development programs based on an inclusive student-centred pedagogy framework and competencies. Focusing on professional growth, this kind of study can offer practical insights into how faculty members engage with inclusive teaching practices. Besides, implementing these professional development programs across diverse EMI programs would help identify how inclusive student-centred pedagogy is perceived and experienced in varied contexts.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G., & Hazelkorn, E. (2017). Pursuing rankings in the age of massification: For most—forget about it. *International Higher Education*, (89), 8-10. https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.89.9834

Arslan, S. (2023). A narrative enquiry into EMI instructors' linguistic and pedagogical needs. In S. M. Curle & J. K. H. Pun (Eds.), *Qualitative research methods in English medium instruction for emerging researchers* (pp. 94-114). Routledge.

Barkhuizen, G. (2018). Ten qualitative research dilemmas and what to do about them. *Learner Development Journal*, *1*(2), 117-127.

Başar, S. (2025). The pedagogical realities of English medium instruction: Faculty members' experiences of teaching and professional development. *European Educational Research Journal*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041251377120

Blair, A., & McGinty, S. (2013). Feedback-dialogues: Exploring the student perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(4), 466-476. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.649244

Bogomaz, S., Kozlova, N., & Atamanova, I. (2015). University students' personal and professional development: The sociocultural environment effect. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *214*, 552-558. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.759

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(6), 698-712. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462

Burns, A., Edwards, E., & Ellis, N. J. (2022). *Sustaining action research: A practical guide for institutional engagement*. Routledge.

Capp, M. J. (2017). The effectiveness of universal design for learning: A meta-analysis of literature between 2013 and 2016. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *21*(8), 791-807. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1325074

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 219-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132

Carless, D. (2020). Longitudinal perspectives on students' experiences of feedback: A need for teacher–student partnerships. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(3), 425-438. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1684455

Cilliers, F. J., & Herman, N. (2010). Impact of an educational development programme on teaching practice of academics at a research-intensive university. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *15*(3), 253-267. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2010.497698

Coffman, S., & Draper, C. (2022). Universal design for learning in higher education: A concept analysis. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, *17*(1), 36-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2021.07.009

Courey, S. J., Tappe, P., Siker, J., & LePage, P. (2012). Improved lesson planning with universal design for learning (UDL). *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *36*(1), 7-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406412446178

Coyne, P., Pisha, B., Dalton, B., Zeph, L. A., & Smith, N. C. (2012). Literacy by design: A universal design for learning approach for students with significant intellectual disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, *33*(3), 162-172. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510381651

Dale, J., & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2010). Pedagogy of humanism. In J. Dale & E. J. Hyslop-Margison (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: Teaching for freedom and transformation* (pp. 71-104). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9100-0_3

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Deroey, K. L. (2023). English medium instruction lecturer training programmes: Content, delivery, ways forward. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *62*, 101223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2023.101223

Devis-Rozental, C. (2018). *Developing socio-emotional intelligence in higher education scholars*. Palgrave.

Devis-Rozental, C., & Clarke, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Humanizing higher education: A positive approach to enhancing wellbeing*. Springer Nature.

Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R., & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about inclusive education and insights on what contributes to those beliefs: A meta-analytical study. *Educational Psychology Review*, *34*(4), 2609-2660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0

Eka Putri, I. G. A. P., Widdop Quinton, H., & Selkrig, M. (2023). Reshaping teaching in higher education through a mandala of creative pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2193665

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

Ericsson, K. A., Hoffman, R. R., Kozbelt, A., & Williams, A. M. (2018). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Farrell, T. S. (2020). Professional development through reflective practice for English-medium instruction (EMI) teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(3), 277-286. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1612840

Fataar, A. (2016). Towards a humanizing pedagogy through an engagement with the social-subjective in educational theorizing in South Africa. *Educational Research for Social Change*, *5*(1), 10-21. https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2016/v5i1a1

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Seabury Press.

Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *5*(1), 87-100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787404040463

Goodall, G., Mjøen, O. M., Witsø, A. E., Horghagen, S., Hardonk, S., & Kvam, L. (2024). Attitudes towards students with disabilities achieving their educational and work-related goals: A factorial survey experiment among higher education institution employees in Norway. *Higher Education*, *88*(2), 419-465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01123-8

Hämäläinen, J. (2015). Defining social pedagogy: Historical, theoretical and practical considerations. *The British Journal of Social Work*, *45*(3), 1022-1038. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bct174

Heigham, J., & Croker, R. (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Springer.

Ismailov, M., Chiu, T. K., Dearden, J., Yamamoto, Y., & Djalilova, N. (2021). Challenges to internationalisation of university programmes: A systematic thematic synthesis of qualitative research on learner-centred English Medium Instruction (EMI) pedagogy. *Sustainability*, *13*(22), 12642. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212642

Ismailov, M., Chiu, T. K., Aizawa, I., Yamamoto, Y., Djalilova, N., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2025). Essential lecturer competencies in English medium instruction: A study across student proficiency levels. *RELC Journal*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882241312427

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2016). *Mindful L2 teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on cultivating teachers' professional development*. Routledge.

Jonsson, A. (2012). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 63-76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467125

Jorgenson, D. A., Farrell, L. C., Fudge, J. L., & Pritchard, A. (2018). College connectedness: The student perspective. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *18*(1), 75-95. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v18i1.22371

Kahu, E. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*(5), 758-773. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505

Kim, H. J., Kong, Y., Hernandez, C., & Soban, M. (2023). Student Emotions and Engagement: Enacting Humanizing Pedagogy in Higher Education. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *11*(3), 185-206. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.11.3

Kitchen, H., Bethell, G., Fordham, E., Henderson, K., & Li, R. R. (2019), "The Turkish education system", in OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Student Assessment in Turkey, OECD Publishing, https://doi.org/10.1787/71ee93b4-en.

Kusters, M., Van der Rijst, R., de Vetten, A., & Admiraal, W. (2023). University lecturers as change agents: How do they perceive their professional agency?. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *127*, 104097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104097

Kravale-Paulina, M., Briede, L., Micule Fjodorova, I., & Romanovska, A. (2025). Inclusive student-centred pedagogies. In R. M. Van der Rijst & E. M. Fernández-Díaz (Eds.), *Innovative faculty development towards inclusive student-centred pedagogy: A reflective and transformative approach* (pp. 1-10). Disigma Publications. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15212171

Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Fostering team teaching: Mapping out a research agenda for English-medium instruction at university level. *Language Teaching*, *51*(3), 400-416. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000113

Lasagabaster, D. (2022). Teacher preparedness for English-medium instruction. *Journal of English-Medium Instruction*, *1*(1), 48-64. https://doi.org/10.1075/jemi.21011.las

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (2008). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. Guilford Press.

Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. Routledge.

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. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350

Macaro, E., Akincioglu, M., & Han, S. (2020). English medium instruction in higher education: Teacher perspectives on professional development and certification. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *30*(1), 144-157. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12272

Marin, E., & Katsampoxaki-Hodgetts, K. (2024). University teachers' willingness to support inclusive and effective student-centred learning. In A. Curaj, C. M. Hâj, & R. Pricopie (Eds.), *European higher education area 2030: Bridging realities for tomorrow's higher education* (pp. 699-712). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75140-0_35

Marin, E., & Van der Rijst, R. (2025). A framework for inclusive student-centred higher education. In R. M. Van der Rijst & E. M. Fernández-Díaz (Eds.), *Innovative faculty development towards inclusive student-centred pedagogy: A reflective and transformative approach* (pp. 1-8). Disigma Publications. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15212410

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words & minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge.

Meyer, A., Rose, D., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal design for learning: Theory and practice*. Cast Professional Publishing.

Ngo, P. L. H. (2024). EMI programmes in Vietnamese higher education: A case study of translanguaging practices for inclusive education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *13*(1), 163-184. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2024-2008

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917733847. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Ozer, O. (2020a). English medium instruction at tertiary level in Turkey: A study of academics' needs and perceptions. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, *10*(1), 88-95. https://doi.org/10.5961/jhes.2020.370

Ozer, O. (2020b). Lecturers' experiences with English-medium instruction in a state university in Turkey: Practices and challenges. *Issues in Educational Research*, *30*(2), 612-634.

Park, S., Kim, S. Y., Lee, H., & Kim, E. G. (2022). Professional development for English-medium instruction professors at Korean universities. *System*, *109*, 102862. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102862

Postareff, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Nevgi, A. (2007). The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*(5), 557-571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.013

Remmik, M., Karm, M., Haamer, A., & Lepp, L. (2011). Early-career academics' learning in academic communities. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *16*(3), 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.596702

Roth, W., & Lee, Y. (2007). "Vygotsky's neglected legacy": Cultural-historical activity theory. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(2), 186-232. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654306298273

Sahan, K., & Rose, H. (2021). Problematizing the E in EMI: Translanguaging as a pedagogic alternative to English-only hegemony in university contexts. In B. Paulsrud, Z. Tian, & J. Toth (Eds.), *English-medium instruction and translanguaging* (pp. 1-14). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927338-005

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Saldaña, J. (2014). *Thinking qualitatively: Methods of mind*. Sage.

Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Sage.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(2), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

Soruç, A., & Griffiths, C. (2018). English as a medium of instruction: Students' strategies. *ELT Journal*, *72*(1), 38-48. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx017

Sousa, D. A., & Tomlinson, C. A. (2018). Differentiation and the brain: *How neuroscience supports the learner-friendly classroom*. Solution Tree Press.

Spencer, K. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2002). Student perspectives on teaching and its evaluation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(5), 397-409. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293022000009285

Stensaker, B., Bilbow, G. T., Breslow, L., & Van der Vaart, R. (2017). *Strengthening teaching and learning in research universities: Strategies and initiatives for institutional change*. Springer.

Stevens, T. M., Day, I. N. Z., den Brok, P. J., Prins, F. J., Assen, H. J. H. E., ter Beek, M., Bombaerts, G., Coppoolse, R., Creemers, P. H. M., Engbers, R., Hulsen, M., Kamp, R. J. A., Koksma, J. J., Mittendorff, K., Riezebos, J., van der Rijst, R. M., van de Wiel, M. W. J., & Vermunt, J. D. (2024). Teacher professional learning and development in the

context of educational innovations in higher education: A typology of practices. *Higher Education Research & Development, 43*(2), 437-454. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2246412

Tai, K. W. (2022). Translanguaging as inclusive pedagogical practices in English-medium instruction science and mathematics classrooms for linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Research in Science Education, 52*(3), 975-1012. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-021-10018-6

Taneri, P. O., & Özbek, Ö. Y. (2023). Promoting diversity and culturally responsive pedagogy in higher education. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2023*(21), 765-813. https://doi.org/10.46778/goputeb.1333036

Thompson, J. (2022). A guide to abductive thematic analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 27*(5), 1410-1421. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5340

Todres, L., Galvin, K. T., & Holloway, I. (2009). The humanization of healthcare: A value framework for qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and well-being, 4*(2), 68-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/17482620802646204

Toom, A. (2017). Teachers' professional and pedagogical competencies: A complex divide between teacher work, teacher knowledge and teacher education. In D. J. Clandinin & J. Husu (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research on teacher education* (Vol. 2, pp. 803-819). SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402042.n46

Trautwein, C., & Bosse, E. (2017). The first year in higher education—critical requirements from the student perspective. *Higher Education, 73*, 371-387. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0098-5

Trinidad, J. E. (2019). Understanding student-centred learning in higher education: students' and teachers' perceptions, challenges, and cognitive gaps. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 44*(8), 1013-1023. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1636214

Trinidad, J. E., Raz, M. D., & Magsalin, I. M. (2023). "More than professional skills:" Student perspectives on higher education's purpose. *Teaching in Higher Education, 28*(6), 1380-1394. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1891043

Turhan, B., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2018). Motivation of engineering students and lecturers toward English medium instruction at tertiary level in Turkey. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(1), 261-277.

Van der Rijst, R., Baggen, Y., & Sjoer, E. (2019). University teachers' learning paths during technological innovation in education. *International Journal for Academic Development, 24*(1), 7-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2018.1500916

Van der Rijst, R. M., & Fernández Díaz, E. M. (Eds.) (2025). *Innovative faculty development towards inclusive student-centred pedagogy: A reflective and transformative approach*. Heraklion: Disigma Publications.

Van Dijk, E. E., van Tartwijk, J., Van der Schaaf, M. F., & Kluijtmans, M. (2020). What makes an expert university teacher? A systematic review and synthesis of frameworks for teacher expertise in higher education. *Educational Research Review, 31*, 100365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100365

Verrill, P. (2007). Voices off? Using student voice for reflective staff development. In F. Campbell, L. Beasley, J. Eland, & A. Rumpus (Eds.), *Hearing the student voice: Promoting and encouraging the effective use of the student voice to enhance professional*

development in learning, teaching and assessment within higher education (pp. 77-84). Project Report for Escalate.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Yuksel, D., Soruç, A., Altay, M., & Curle, S. (2023). A longitudinal study at an English medium instruction university in Turkey: The interplay between English language improvement and academic success. Applied Linguistics Review, *14*(3), 533-552. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0097

Yürekli Kaynardağ, A. (2019). Pedagogy in HE: Does it matter?. *Studies in Higher Education*, *44*(1), 111-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1340444

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZ

Giriş

Yükseköğretim (YÖ) kurumları yalnızca bilgi aktarımı yapılan ortamlar değil, aynı zamanda öğrencilerin akademik, sosyal ve kişisel gelişimlerinin şekillendiği çok boyutlu öğrenme bağlamlarıdır. Bu bağlamda, öğrencilerin öğrenme deneyimlerini doğrudan etkileyen temel unsurlardan biri, öğretim üyelerinin pedagojik yeterlikleri ve öğretim yaklaşımlarıdır. Geleneksel bilgi aktarımına dayalı pedagojilerin öğrencileri çoğunlukla edilgen konuma yerleştirdiği ve onların öğrenme süreçlerine katılımlarını sınırladığı bilinmektedir. Buna karşılık, kapsayıcı ve öğrenci merkezli pedagojiler, farklı öğrenen profillerine, ihtiyaçlarına ve öğrenme tercihlerindeki çeşitliklerine duyarlı, esnek, etkileşimli ve güvenli öğrenme ortamları oluşturarak öğrencilerin derse katılımını, aidiyet duygusunu ve başarılarını artırabilir.

Son yıllarda dünya genelinde İngilizce eğitim dili (English Medium Instruction – EMI) giderek yaygınlaşmış, Türkiye'de de birçok üniversite uluslararasılaşma hedefleri doğrultusunda İngilizce eğitim sunmaya başlamıştır. Ancak, öğrencilerin İngilizce yeterliklerindeki farklılıklar, öğretim üyelerinin pedagojik ve sosyo-duygusal yeterliliklere yönelik hazırlık eksiklikleri ve sınırlı ve sistematik olmayan mesleki gelişim fırsatları, EMI bağlamlarında kapsayıcı ve öğrenci merkezli öğrenmeyi zorlaştırmaktadır. Türkiye'deki araştırmalar çoğunlukla EMI'nin dilsel boyuttaki zorluklarına odaklanmış, öğretim üyelerinin öğretim uygulamaları ve pedagojik yeterliliklerinin kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagojiyle ilişkisi, özellikle öğrenci bakışı açısından, görece sınırlı biçimde ele alınmıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye'deki bir EMI üniversitesinde öğrencilerin öğretim üyelerinin öğretim becerileri ve pedagojik yaklaşımlarına ilişkin görüşlerini ortaya koymak ve kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagoji bağlamında öğrencilerin ihtiyaç ve beklentilerini ortaya koymaktır.

Yöntem

Bu araştırmada nitel durum çalışması deseni benimsenmiştir. Çalışma, İngilizcenin tüm fakülte ve bölümlerde eğitim dili olarak kullanıldığı bir devlet üniversitesinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcılar mühendislik, mimarlık ve fen fakültelerinden gönüllü olarak araştırmaya katılan 13 lisans öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Veri toplama aracı olarak yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler kullanılmış; öğrencilerin ders içeriği, öğretim tasarımı, geri bildirim fırsatları, öğretim üyeleriyle etkileşimi ve pedagojik ihtiyaç ve beklentilerine ilişkin deneyimleri ayrıntılı bir biçimde incelenmiştir. Görüşmeler yaklaşık 30 dakika sürmüş, ses kaydı alınarak kayıt altına alınıp yazıya aktarılmış ve analiz süreci için İngilizceye çevrilmiştir.

Elde edilen veriler önce betimsel kodlama ile çözümlenmiş, ardından ortaya çıkan kodlar kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagojiyle ilişkili üç pedagojik perspektif çerçevesinde ilişkilendirilerek yorumlanmıştır: Evrensel Tasarım (UDL), Sosyokültürel Pedagoji ve

İnsancıllaştırıcı Pedagoji. Bu süreçte abductive tematik analiz yaklaşımı benimsenerek hem veriye dayalı bulgular ile kuramsal çerçeveler arasında çift yönlü bir ilişki kurulmuş hem de öğrenci deneyimleri bağlamsal ve kuramsal odaklı olarak bütüncül bir biçimde ele alınmıştır.

Bulgular

Veri analizi EMI öğrencilerinin yükseköğretim deneyimlerine ilişkin dört temel beklenti alanı ortaya koymuştur. İlk olarak, öğrenciler, öğretim üyelerinin geleneksel slayt odaklı anlatımlar yerine daha etkileşimli, esnek ve çok modlu ders tasarımları yapmalarını istemektedir. Bu beklenti çoklu temsil, etkileşim ve ifade yollarını merkeze alan Evrensel Tasarım (UDL) ilkeleriyle örtüşmektedir. İkinci olarak, öğrenciler, grup çalışmaları, ortak projeler ve akran etkileşimleri sayesinde daha derin ve anlamlı öğrenme yaşadıklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, sosyokültürel pedagojinin öğrenmenin sosyal ve etkileşimli bir süreç olduğuna vurgulayan yaklaşımıyla uyumludur. Öğrenciler ayrıca öğretim üyelerinden ayrıntılı, yapıcı ve kişiselleştirilmiş geri bildirim beklemekte, yalnızca not temelli değerlendirmelerin yetersiz olduğunu vurgulamaktadır. Bu durum, öğrencilerin öğrenme sürecinde aktif özne olarak görülme ihtiyacını ortaya koymaktadır. Son olarak, öğrenciler, öğretim üyelerinin kendilerini yalnızca "isim veya numara" olarak değil, duygu ve yaşam öyküleriyle birlikte bütüncül bireyler olarak tanımalarını istemektedir. Bu beklenti, insanileştirici ve ilişki temelli öğrenme ortamlarını önceleyen insancıllaştırıcı pedagoji yaklaşımıyla doğrudan ilişkilidir.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Elde edilen bulgular, öğrencilerin öğretim üyelerinden beklentilerinin geleneksel içerik aktarımını aşan, esnek, diyalojik ve insancıl uygulamalar olduğunu göstermektedir. Öğrencilerin dile getirdiği bu ihtiyaçlar, kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagojinin temel bileşenleriyle doğrudan örtüşmektedir. Bu bağlamda, UDL yaklaşımı, öğrenme ortamlarını farklı öğrenci profillerine ve öğrenme tercihlerine uygun biçimde çeşitlendirme ve esneklik kazandırma imkânı sunmaktadır. Sosyokültürel pedagoji, öğrenmeyi sosyal etkileşim, akran işbirliği ve uzman aracılığıyla ortak bilgi inşası süreci olarak ele alarak kapsayıcı ve katılımcı öğrenme ortamlarının oluşturulmasına katkı sağlamaktadır. İnsancıllaştırıcı pedagoji ise öğrencilerin duygusal ve öznel ihtiyaçlarını dikkate alarak aidiyet duygusunu güçlendirmekte ve onları aktif ve değerli özne konumuna getirmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, öğrencilerin görüşleri Türkiye'deki EMI bağlamında öğretim üyelerinin pedagojik çeşitlilik, işbirlikçi öğrenme, anlamlı geri bildirim ve insancıllaştırıcı öğretim yaklaşımları konularında daha donanımlı olmaları gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu bulgular, kapsayıcı öğrenci merkezli pedagojilere dayalı pedagojik eğitimin ve mesleki gelişim programlarının EMI bağlamında öğretim yetkinliğinin ayrılmaz bir önkoşulu olarak ele alınması gerektiğine işaret etmektedir. Bu doğrultuda tasarlanacak mesleki gelişim programları, öğretim üyelerinin pedagojik farkındalıklarını ve uygulama repertuarlarını geliştirmesinin yanı sıra, öğrencilerim öğrenme motivasyonlarını, etkileşim düzeylerini ve akademik başarılarını da artırma potansiyeline sahiptir.