حوليات جامعة قالمة للعلوم الاجتماعية والإنسانية
Annals of Guelma University for Social and Human Sciences
ISSN:1112-7880 EISSN: 2602-5361
dpu@univ-guelma.dz - الناشر: مديرية النشر الجامعي

Training the Teaching Staff in EMI between ESP and GE with Focus on Phonological Errors: Case Study of English Trainers at 8 Mai 1945 Guelma University

CHETTIBI Mohammed Walid [1*], GRINE Nadia [2]

[1] Department of English Letters and Language, Laboratory of LIPED, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Badji Mokhtar - Annaba University (Algeria), 12, P.O.Box, 23000 Annaba, Algeria, mohammed-walid.chettibi@univ-annaba.dz, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0922-7266

[2] Department of English Letters and Language, Laboratory of LIPED, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Badji Mokhtar - Annaba University (Algeria), 12, P.O.Box, 23000 Annaba, Algeria, nadia.grine-lakhouametnani@univ-annaba.dz, https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4048-4094

Received: 20/02/2026 *Accepted: 31/05/2026* *Published: 18/06/2026*

Abstract:

This article reveals the essence of training the teaching staff in using English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) in 8 Mai 1945 Guelma University during 2022-2023, regarding whether this EMI training was based on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or General English (GE). By adopting an exploratory approach and quantitative method based on a questionnaire, the research explores trainers' experiences, challenges, and beliefs regarding teaching staff's training. The findings indicate that the training's tasks, lessons, syllabus and test were GE-oriented and neglected incorporating ESP knowledge and principles, and that the vocalic and suprasegmental systems were the most erroneous/difficult for the trainees. Thus, the study underscores the necessity of creating EMI trainings consistent with the trainees' specialties, needs revolving around teaching pronunciation.

***Keywords**: EMI; Errors; ESP; GE; Phonology.*

[*] ***Corresponding author***

- INTRODUCTION

With the reforms set by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research from 2022 to 2024 (Gouvernement algérien, 2020), which complement the Algerian government's strategy to replace progressively French with English in many disciplines since 2019 (Arroyo-Barrigüete et al., 2022), many Algerian universities have conformed to the new direction towards the integration of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) at their levels. The University of 8 Mai 1945 Guelma was one of the first universities to initiate the training of all its teaching staff, –excluding language specialties- starting from the beginning of the academic year 2022-2023 until its end, with the training of all newly recruited teachers for the years to follow, in order to pursue with the English adoption project in higher education (Dekhakhna, 2025, p. 451-452).

This study attempts to shed light on various procedures, obstacles and circumstances behind the scenes via-à-vis this training experience with an emphasis on English pronunciation. By thoroughly examining this experience from the perspective of the trainers, this research seeks to provide valuable data on the best ways to maintain the upgrade of such training, if proven successful; alternatively or it aims to impart worthwhile recommendations for perfecting it, if the experience is found to be less fruitful.

In order to obtain insights regarding this training, a questionnaire was adopted to collect as much information as possible about the positive and negative sides of this first experience at the University of 8 Mai 1945 Guelma.

1. Purpose of the study

This research aspires to gather sufficient data regarding the experience of training, during the academic year 2022-2023, all the teaching staff who - after taking an online test (Designed by *Centre d'Enseignement Intensif des Langues* "*CEIL*" [Intensive Language Teaching Center] in 08 Mai 1945 Guelma University) and failing to reach a C1 or C2 level - were required to take courses in EMI, in order to improve their proficiency and start teaching their specialties in English the following academic year. Naturally, official

and foreign languages teaching specialties were excluded from this training, as it would have been counterproductive to the acquisition/learning of those languages.

This survey revolves around these major research questions: (1) *Was this EMI purely ESP, GE, or a hybrid of the two?;* (2) *Was the training based on ESP principles or not?;* (3) *What were the conditions, circumstances and measures under which the training took place?;* (4) *Which communicative tasks were most intensively used during the training?; (5)What were the difficulties and challenges encountered by the trainers?; (6)At which linguistic level did the trainees face significant difficulties and commit numerous errors?; (7) Was there any kind of progress or regression by the end of the training?; (8) Was this experience worth the effort, time, energy, and budget consumed, or does it require further enhancement?*

Certainly, it must be borne in mind that this research does not investigate the classification of errors committed, such as interlingual, intralingual, training-induced errors, etc.; rather, it aims only at detecting the linguistic level at which errors were noticed abundantly.

2. Key Concepts

2.1 English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI)

English as a Medium of Instruction concerns the teaching of any subject matter via the medium of English, starting from primary school to the university level, to refine the linguistic and academic competencies of the learners regardless of their first language (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014). Thus, it can be deduced that it involves both ESP and GE: at basic levels, GE is the dominant aspect of EMI until ESP takes over in academic contexts (at the university level) or in work-related instruction, such as *automobile mechanics, electricity,* and so forth.

Recently, EMI has become more widespread thanks to the effects of globalization (Tasin Abir, 2025, p. 1) and its contribution to preparing trainees with the necessary skills –whether linguistic or academic- to make them efficient in a constantly intertwined universe (Macaro, 2015).

2.2 English for Specific Purposes (ESP) vs General English (GE)

To begin with, it must be borne in mind that there is no clear-cut distinction between ESP and GE, and that the two components of EMI should be perceived as a continuum rather than two separate entities. Nevertheless, due to the fact that using or preferring one over the other in some contexts that require the opposite can be problematic, many scholars have sought to define the major properties that distinguish ESP from GE.

For instance, Stevens (1980, cited in Mebitil, 2011, p. 22) explained that ESP aspires to equip its trainees with communicative competence specific to their area of expertise, after a thorough needs analysis of their linguistic mastery level, which tends to be intermediate or advanced; in contrast, GE equips trainees with a general linguistic competence designed to make them proficient in English with no reference to a specific area of expertise (general cultural).

To illustrate, a student who aspires to pursue medical studies in the United States America, and who has no prior knowledge of English, cannot under any circumstances start directly studying medical sciences focusing on ESP; rather, s/he must first undergo GE training, in order to master basic English, and then be introduced to ESP gradually, enabling him/her to pursue specialized studies.

2.3 Phonological Errors

"Let's eat grandma!"

Whoever possesses perfect pronunciation of stress, consonants, vowels, and rhythm, yet misplaces a pause, will cause this sentence to change from "*inviting Grandma to eat*" into "*making Grandma the meal herself*". In accordance with this, any given speaker with an acceptable pronunciation paired with errors in other subsystems of the language, would still be intelligible to his/her listeners, and vice versa (Fraser, 2000, p. 7). Consequently, phonological errors can have negative impacts on the intended outcome; if left untreated, communicative efficiency remains low, and in worse case scenarios, it could lead to catastrophic results especially in academic settings.

Simply put, errors are defined as deviations from established norms (Corder, 1974, p. 250, 272; Brown, 1994**,** p. 205), that is to say, they are anomalies at the core of the linguistic ability (competence), which manifest themselves in the linguistic execution (performance). In order to eradicate them, the teachers need to identify the root causes of their appearance and address them permanently. To draw an analogy, think of a typewriter wherein one of its keys -the one of the letter "C"- is broken and starts printing an "O" instead. To repair this problem, one must replace the broken key, rather than changing the ink color, font type, the paper or even cleaning the head of the key.

Hence, since ESP involves the use of communicative competence, it is imperative that all future trainees benefit from practical training in the phonological aspects of English. This is essential to eliminate their pre-existing phonological errors and prevent potential ones in their future oral/aural communicative exchanges.

3. Method and Materials

3.1 Research Design

The approach adopted for this study is primarily exploratory and descriptive. To implement this approach, a quantitative method was employed in the form of a questionnaire composed of Multiple-choice, open, and closed questions. This was administered to all English language teachers at the Department of English Language and letters at the University of 8 Mai 1945 Guelma via Google Forms in November 2025. Due to the large number of trainers and the breadth of the inquiry, the questionnaire was preferred as the most effective tool to gather as much information as possible within a short period of time.

3.2 Research Instrument

The questionnaire was originally composed of *five* sections with 83 questions (Section 1 with 5 questions; Section 2 with 28 questions; Section 3 with 39 questions; Section 4 with 10, and Section 5 with one question). The Google Forms version is available for download online (the link is http://forms.gle/CjTtRkY5XxpywRHH9); nevertheless, many questions were merged and the total was reduced to 20 questions -due to formatting requirements- spread over *three* sections.

The *first* section revolves around the *Pre-Training Phase*, with questions highlighting the specific situation prior to the start of the training. The *second* is devoted to the Mid-Training Phase in order to reveal the procedures, circumstances, and obstacles faced by the trainers. Finally, the *third* section concerns the *Post-Training Stage*, addressing the evaluation of the experience in order to propose some possible suggestions or recommendations for perfecting future training programs.

3.3 Participants

The study sample is composed of 23 trainers from the Department of English Language and Letters out of a population of 60, who had been assigned to 23 departments including: *Archeology; Bibliotheconomy; Biology; Commerce; Communication Sciences; Computer Sciences; Economics; Electro-technical Engineering and Automatism; Environment and Ecology; Human Sciences; Law; Mathematics; Matter Sciences; Mechanical Engineering; Nature and Life Sciences; Political Sciences; Psychology and Social Sciences Departments* (Nine trainers did not answer the questionnaire; and therefore data concerning *Tele-Communication, Architecture and Civil Engineering, Electronics, History, Management and Philosophy* departments is missing and needs further examination).

This sample encompasses 14 Assistant Lecturers (MAA), seven Associate Professors (MCB), and two Associate Professors (MCA) specialized in *linguistics*, *didactics*, *literature*, *civilization* and *translation*. They possess teaching experience ranging from 5 to *25 years*, and nearly half of them (13 out of 23) possess a scientific secondary school background (BAC), while 10 out of 23 have a literary background. Moreover, 10 out of 23 affirmed possessing a second BAC (6 in the *literary stream* and 4 in the *scientific* one). Regarding their ESP teaching experience in teaching, their experiences range from *two months* to *three years*. Only four out of 23 trainers had previously followed online or face-to-face instruction in ESP.

4. Results

This section presents the results gathered from the trainers' responses, as well as a rigorous analysis and description thereof, in order to propose some solutions to the problems and shortcomings encountered.

4.1 Section I: Pre-Training Phase

I.1.Does your University/department offer any training courses or programs for you on how to teach ESP?

Nineteen out of 23 trainers (82.61%) agreed on the fact that the University of 8 Mai 1945 does not offer any kind of training course or program on how to teach ESP for other students of other specialties. Meanwhile, four out of 23 (17.39%) expressed their unawareness, ignorance, or lack of information concerning the existence of such training programs. This inescapably has a negative impact on training the teaching staff, as the trainers themselves had never received any kind of ESP training prior to this initiative; apart from their personal experience teaching ESP before becoming full-time university professors (see Participants).

I.2.For teaching extra sessions during 2022-2023, were you: *(In favor, Indifferent, Against, I do not know)* ***and Why?***

Table 1. Attitudes towards Training

Stance	Number	Percentage
In favor	07	30.40
Indifferent	01	04.30
Against	12	52.20
I do not know	03	13.00
Total	23	100

On the one hand, 12 out of 23 trainers expressed their reluctance regarding the training of the teachers at the University of Guelma. The reasons varied: some *disliked the additional overload*, some *had their requests to be excused declined despite being busy trying to finish their PhD theses*. Some *feared repercussions if they had refused*, and one teacher explained that *due to pregnancy complications, she had hoped to be*

exempted from such training. On the other hand, seven out of 23 affirmed their willingness to participate, stating that some wanted t*o break the monotony of their routine and do something new for a change*, others *enjoyed training motivated individuals*, and others believed the experience *would personally benefit them.*

Indeed, maintaining such a negative attitude towards training ipso facto negatively affects the process and outcome of any kind of instruction, where the teachers are expected to be a source of positive motivation, attitude and vibes. The university should have taken into consideration the personal conditions of the trainers and should not have mandated this training for them; otherwise, the trainers may lack the necessary devotion to such an initiative.

I.3.Was there any gap between your English background and your trainees' specialty? *Yes, No, I do not know.*

Unfortunately, as anticipated, the majority of the teacher trainers (13out of 23, 59.10%) confirm a lack of harmony/consistency between their background knowledge and that of their trainees. This implies that they were assigned to departments whose specialty conflicted with the trainers' English and secondary school (BAC) specializations, which undoubtedly creates numerous difficulties for all participants in the teaching/learners learning process. Only five out of 23 (22.70%) perceived no existing gap, indicating, that they had been dispatched to departments whose specialties aligned with their backgrounds.

Logically, assigning trainers who have never dealt with biology, chemistry, physics, or mechanics -and expecting them to deliver EMI related to English for Science and Technology (EST)- (see the title of EMI, ESP and GE) is surely inappropriate, especially since the majority were shown to lack any kind of ESP training.

I.4. A syllabus was provided by your department to teach ESP, did you really follow? *All of it, Some of its parts, Not at All,* ***and Why?***

Table 2. Use of Provided Syllabus

Use of Syllabus	Number	Percentage
Yes, all of it	02	08.70
Some parts of it	07	30.43
Not at all	12	56.52
I do not know	01	04.35
Total	23	100

Surprisingly, only two out of 23 of all trainers applied the syllabus exactly as it was without changes; however, the remaining trainers (7 out of 23) made use of only portions of it, while 13 out of 23 reported not having applied it at all. The reason for such behavior was that the syllabus did not reflect the specialized English of their trainees, their proficiency level, or the available materials; furthermore, it lacked a prior needs analysis. Thus, these trainers were forced to design new syllabi to meet the requirements of the situation and, which revealed a significant need for authentic materials.

I.5.Had you carried out any Needs Identification/Analysis prior to teaching English to your trainees? And via which tool? If not, why?

14 out of 23 (60.87%) trainers performed a needs analysis via *oral tests, exercises*, as well as *written and reading assignments.* This was done in order to fulfill their trainees' needs, make the sessions interesting and enjoyable, and detect the level and difficulties of each trainee. For those (9 out of 23; 38.13%) who declined and refrained from doing so, some justified their choice by stating that they simply *did not know how to do it*, which strongly denotes their inaptitude to teach ESP. Others affirmed that the trainees *were already distributed according to their needs* and that the *syllabus was imposed* on them; therefore, the use of a needs analysis would have been futile and superfluous.

The common singular syllabus that was sent to all trainers for teaching all various specialties at the university lacked ESP and is surely inappropriate. If it were based on a needs analysis of a sample, it clearly dismissed one of the obligatory phases in any specialized EMI teaching; the collection of the different linguistic profiles of all trainees via needs analysis and the conceptualization of syllabi and courses based on such findings. As

a result, it is no wonder that more than half of the sample did not opt for using it.

4.2 Section II: Training Phase

II.1. At which level the class you taught was homogenous and heterogeneous? and How did it affect you?

Table 3. Degree of Class Homogeneity and Heterogeneity

	Homogeneity		Heterogeneity	
Level	**Number**	**Percentage**	**Number**	**Percentage**
Age	02	05.56	08	18.18
Cultural Awareness	02	05.56	04	09.09
English Proficiency	02	05.56	10	22.73
Gender	02	05.56	07	15.91
Grade/Status	03	08.33	03	06.82
Language Problems	06	16.67	07	15.91
Needs	09	25.00	01	02.27
Specialty	09	25.00	03	06.82
I do not know	01	02.78	01	02.27
Total	36	100	44	100

Many respondents expressed their agreement regarding the fact that their trainees' classes were homogeneous at the level of *needs* and *specialty*, whereas these same classes proved to be heterogeneous at the level of *age*, *English proficiency*, *gender*, and *language problems*.

According to the literature, ESP classes are perfectly fruitful if their composition is as homogeneous as possible, so that all the tasks, lessons, evaluation tools, teaching techniques, and procedures are the same for all the trainees, leading to a significant decrease in the effort and time required for training. Yet, if the composition is heterogeneous at many levels, it becomes a burden for the trainers to fulfill all the needs and necessities of their trainees.

Consequently, 11 out of 23 teacher trainers displayed that such heterogeneity affected them negatively, which is understandable and relatable, since, by simple analogy, cooking different meals for vegan, gluten-free, and halal customers is more tiresome than cooking just one type of a meal. Likewise, teaching with the same tasks and techniques, and fixing

the same problems, is automatically easier than teaching trainees, whose needs, levels, and linguistic proficiency, etc., are deemed divergent.

II.2. Did you really teach them? *(100% GE + 00% ESP; 80% GE + 20% ESP; 60% GE + 40% ESP; 50% GE + 50% ESP; 40% GE + 60% ESP; 20% GE + 80% ESP; 00% GE + 100% ESP?*

Table 4. Real Type of EMI Taught to the Teaching Staff

Composition of EMI	Number	Percentage
100% GE + 00% ESP	06	27.30
80% GE + 20% ESP	07	31.80
60% GE + 40% ESP	01	04.50
50% GE + 50% ESP	01	04.50
40% GE + 60% ESP	06	27.30
20% GE + 80% ESP	02	09.10
00% GE + 100% ESP	00	00
Total	23	100

Seven out of 23 teacher trainers taught both ESP and GE with a ratio of 20% and 80%, respectively. Six out of 23 taught 40% GE and 60% ESP, whereas another six out of 23 taught solely 100% GE, and the rest of the respondents varied their ratio from 40% to 80% for ESP. Thus, more than half [13 (7 + 6)] of the respondents technically taught GE over ESP as EMI, which is also consistent with the results of Question II.3 Teaching entirely GE instead of ESP to teachers, who are supposed to start teaching their specialties in English would, without a doubt, lead to catastrophic results. Being able to speak GE does not equate to being able to transmit scientific or literary English to students. Special syntactic structures, scientific or specialty-related jargon, terminology, expressions, and the special pronunciation of words, etc. need to be taught in order to be transmitted as accurately as possible by the trainees to their students.

II.3.On which part did you focus in your teaching and their learning? (EL= Everyday Life; S= Specialized)

Table 5. Focus of training and of Types of Communication

Language Part	Number	Percentage
Communication (100% EL + 00% S)	03	06.52

Communication (80% EL + 20% S)	05	10.87
Communication (60% EL + 40% S)	02	04.35
Communication (50% EL + 50% S)	05	10.87
Communication (40% EL + 60% S)	05	10.87
Communication (20% EL + 80% S)	01	02.17
Communication (00% EL + 100% S)	01	02.17
language Functions	09	19.57
Grammatical Rules	13	28.26
Culture	05	10.87
Total	46	100

Fifteen out of 23 trainers selected *communication* as one of the main parts of their training focus. When they were asked to select the exact percentage, five out of 15 divided into 80% *everyday life communication* and 20% *specialized communication;* another five divided it into 50% *everyday life communication* and 50% *specialized communication;* and the last five out of 15 shared it between 40% *everyday communication* and 60% *specialized communication*. These choices are consistent with the results of Question II.2, and this clearly reflects the fact that this training lacked the true English of the trainees' specialties (ESP) and emphasized mainly GE.

These trainees, apart from greeting, giving orders or advice, and providing feedback, etc., would involve the teaching of their specialty (ESP) via the medium of English (EMI) in the majority of their lessons.

The selection of functions of language, such as *maintaining contact, explaining, expressing,* etc. along with the teaching of grammatical rules, such as: *orthography, syntax, pronunciation*, etc., as well as *English culture* by 9, 13, and 5 out of 23 respectively, supports the overall inclination towards GE over ESP unfortunately.

II.4.Did you feel the trainees were ready for receiving ESP? Why?

When asked whether the trainees were ready for ESP or not, four out of 23 (34.80%) trainers expressed their indifference, while eight out of 23 (34.78) believed that their trainees were apt to receive it. They justified this by stating that *the trainees have to be ready in order to transmit their specialized knowledge to their students*, and that *they are expected to learn ESP*. However, 11 out of 23 (47.80%) indicated that they were nowhere near ready; because their *English proficiency was too low*. This, along with

their low level of motivation, as well as their *physiological and psychological state,* made them unprepared enough for any extra-specialty information overload.

To a certain degree, these results justify the motives behind the exclusive use of GE in favor and instead of ESP (as shown in previous results), and simultaneously suggest that any kind of future training should be based on separating trainees according to their different levels of language proficiency and motivation, even within the same specialty.

II.5.Did you work in collaboration with other teachers of the trainees' discipline specialized in their field to help you with their ESP? and Why?

The overall majority, 20 out of 23 (87%), disapproved of having worked in collaboration with trainees who already perfectly mastered English (due to living/studying abroad or having a diploma in English). Thirteen of these 20 trainers mentioned that *they did not have time to do so,* or that they *preferred to teach on their own.* This signifies that these trainers wasted a really helpful and rich opportunity to make their lessons more authentic and specialty-oriented. In contrast, the remaining seven out of the 20 cited that *no one who mastered English was available,* and that *no trainee had materials about their specialty in English,* or that *no trainee was proficient enough in English to participate in collaborative teaching.*

The remaining three out of 23 (13%) expressed their initiative to resort to such trainees; because, as they justified, they liked to get rid of monotony and some of their trainees had materials (such as books, articles, etc.) about their specialty in English.

II.6.What activities in each skill did you involve your trainees in?

Table 6. Most Practiced Activity in Each Skill

Skill	Activities	Number	Percentage
Speaking	Answering questions	08	08.42
	Interactive conversation	12	12.63
	Discussions	07	07.37
Listening	Listening to oral question/answers	11	11.58

	Information Gap Activity	07	07.37
	understanding/retaining information	07	07.37
	Paraphrasing	04	04.21
Writing	Taking notes in class	05	05.26
	Writing e-mails	04	04.21
	Reading specialty text	09	09.47
Reading	Reading Comprehension	09	09.47
	Learning Vocabulary	12	12.63
	Total	95	100

The most relied-on activities for speaking are: *conversations* and *Q&As*, followed by *discussions*. For listening: *Q&A's*, *information Gap, and understanding/retaining information* are the most used tasks. For writing, *cohesion* and *coherence exercises* followed by *note-taking* are the most practiced activities; and finally, *reading specialty texts*, *comprehension*, and *learning vocabulary* are the focus for the reading skill.

Sadly, essential tasks such as *oral presentations and simulations* for speaking; and *listening to presentations and to lectures* for listening; *writing different types of texts, writing reports, and articles* for writing; and *reading textbooks or specialty articles* for reading, were infrequently selected or totally neglected by the sample. Including these would have been an additional asset and provided excellent practice for enhancing the trainees' communicative competence.

II.7.If you dealt with Listening and/or Speaking, which part of English phonological system did you teach?

Table 7. Most Taught Feature of English Phonological System

Feature	Number	Percentage
Vowels	08	18.60
Consonants	09	20.93
Syllable	03	06.98

Stress	05	11.63
Aspect of Connected Speech	06	13.95
Rhythm	03	06.98
Strong and Weak Forms	05	11.63
Intonation	04	09.30
Total	43	100

All trainers normally dealt with both listening and speaking; hence, the English phonological system must have been taught, at least implicitly or inductively. Consequently, 15 out of 23 trainers pointed out that the *vocalic* and *consonantal systems of English*, along with *aspects of connected speech* (such as: *assimilation, elision, linking, etc*.), and *weak/strong forms*, were the main focus of their teaching, as well as the remaining features of the phonological system to a lesser degree. This implies that speaking and listening inevitably involve the teaching of phonology, and require the trainers to be experienced phoneticians, while also indicating the fact that phonology must be an inseparable part of any ESP or EMI training.

II.8.Could you list please the difficulties you had encountered in that context?

Table 8. Most Recurrently Faced Difficulties

Difficulties	Number	Percentage
I was sick many times	00	00.00
Lack of authentic/compatible materials	06	17.14
Lack of means of transportation	03	08.57
Lack of media	04	11.43
Lack of motivation from my part	01	02.86
Lack of motivation from their part	08	22.86
Lack of professionalism	02	05.71
Lack of time	01	02.86
Many absentees	10	28.57
Total	35	100

Nineteen out of 23 trainers responded to this question, which signifies that four out of 23 did not really encounter any worth-mentioning obstacles. This must be examined for further clarification and insight regarding the prevention and elimination of future barriers, and the planning of optimal ways to prepare similar training sessions under trouble-free circumstances. As for the 19 claimers, they cited the *frequent absence of their trainees* and their *lack of motivation to return to classes as students,* as well as the tremendous *lack of genuine materials,* as the most annoying factors that have created difficulties for the majority of the trainers during the training.

The teaching process is a two-way process; it starts with teaching aiming towards learning, and then the latter returns to teaching as feedback. If something goes wrong in one of the two directions, the process is doomed to failure. If the learner is taught by the most brilliant teachers or trainers ever, s/he will not grasp any information if s/he is not interested in the essence of the teaching or training.

Regardless of logistical difficulties, if personal issues, a lack of commitment, and a lack of motivation persist, no perfect setting or organization will work out.

II.9.Where did you teach your trainees? *Amphitheater; Auditorium Class; Language laboratory; Other.*

Table 9. Whereabouts of Training

Setting	Number	Percentage
Amphitheater	00	00.00
Auditorium	00	00.00
Class	21	91.30
Language laboratory	00	00.00
Meeting room	02	08.70
Total	23	100

Twenty-one out of 23 stated that they taught in *classrooms,* whereas two confirmed teaching in *meeting rooms*. All of them agreed on the

unsuitability of these settings for teaching ESP, and to some degree, GE; since many of these settings possess fixed seats and tables, lack fixed loudspeakers or headphones, and have no curtains for using data-projectors, etc. As long as phonology is a part of the communicative competence that ESP aims to foster, language laboratories should be exploited to teach the oral/aural side of any EMI, and by extension of any ESP.

II.10. Which part of the language your trainees witnessed many difficulties/problems?

Table 10.Most Struggled with Part of the Language

Language Part	Number	Percentage
Cultural differences (falling into "faux pas", etc.)	04	04.44
Lack of accuracy (many mistakes and errors, etc.)	12	13.33
Lack of Spontaneity (lots of pauses, hesitations, etc.)	09	10.00
Morphology (unable to distinguish stem from affixes)	05	05.56
Mother/other languages Interference (Using other languages' structures, words, etc)	10	11.11
Phonology (incorrect sounds, foreign accent, etc.)	16	17.78
Pragmatics (not knowing metaphors, entailment, etc)	04	04.44
Semantics (knowing only one meaning, etc.)	09	10.00
Specialized Knowledge (ignoring their jargon, etc.)	03	03.33
Syntax (abnormal word order, etc.)	08	08.89
Vocabulary (false friends, etc)	10	11.11
Total	90	100

Problems at the level of *phonology*, a *lack of accuracy, limited vocabulary, and mother tongue interference* proved to be the most recurrent issues faced by the trainees, followed by *semantics (meaning) problems and* a *lack of spontaneity*. This denotes that such matters need to be carefully taken into consideration when designing future programs or courses. In addition, pronunciation problems urgently need to be addressed and eradicated by allocating more time, courses, and tasks to teaching accurate and spontaneous oral expression. Besides, trainers should be made aware of these areas of extreme difficulty in order to be fully equipped to overcome them.

To a lesser degree, *abnormal syntax, a lack of morphology awareness, superficial pragmatics,* and *cultural confusion* were also selected, underscoring the fact that grammatical drills, as well as immersive cultural simulations ought to be part of the courses.

II.11.In which part exactly of the phonological system did you detect errors in your trainees' pronunciation? *Vowels, Consonants, Syllable, Stress, Aspect of Connected Speech, Rhythm, Strong and Weak Forms, Intonation, All previously mentioned parts.*

Table 11.Most Error-Producing Part of the Language

Features	Number	Percentage
Vowels	08	14.29
Consonants	05	08.93
Syllable	03	05.36
Stress	07	12.50
Aspect of Connected Speech	06	10.71
Rhythm	04	07.14
Strong and Weak Forms	06	10.71
Intonation	04	07.14
All Features	13	23.21
Total	56	100

All parts of the phonological system, followed by *vowels, stress placement,* as well as *rhythm* and the use of *strong/weak forms,* were attested to be the aspects of English pronunciation with which the trainees struggled. Consistently, English vowels are varied and distinguish between many words sharing similar sounds, English words are also differentiated grammatically based on changes in stress position. Moreover, rhythm, which uses the alternation between strong and weak forms in order to keep the focus on the most important words, along with the rest of the English phonological system, is of immense importance for any trainee wishing to master any kind of EMI.

Realizing that errors exist and identifying the reasons behind them is a key component of any kind of teaching. EMI, be it ESP or GE, cannot be successful if errors are not addressed. However, the trainers neglected these problems, since the majority focused on teaching other parts of the phonological system (see Question II.7.). Nevertheless, many confined themselves to just indicating or correcting errors. (see Question II.12)

II.12.What ways did you use to help your trainees overcome their errors?

Table 12.Most Applied Ways to Suppress Trainees' Errors

Procedures	Number	Percentage
Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL)	01	01.61
Correcting their errors	18	29.03
Indicating their errors	11	17.74
Language laboratory tools	02	03.23
Listening after a model	08	12.90
reading after a model	06	09.68
Speaking after a model	10	16.13
Websites	02	03.23
writing after a model	04	06.45
Total	62	100

Obviously, *correcting* and *indicating the type of errors or the reasons behind them* were the most frequently selected ways of dealing with errors, followed by *speaking* and *listening based on a model*. This clearly denotes that phonological errors (oral and aural) are the most frequent type of errors and corroborates the results of the previous questions. This highlights, again, the primordial place of phonology in any training linked to EMI, be it ESP or GE.

4.3 Section III: Post-Training Phase

III.1. Did you notice any improvement in your trainees' English by the end? *Yes, No, I do not know.*

Fifteen out of 23 (65.22%) trainers approved of the presence of some kind of improvement in their trainees; however, four out of 23 (17.39%) trainers observed no kind of improvement at all, and the rest of the trainers

(four) showed no awareness of such progress. As such, this EMI training at least proved to have a positive outcome and to be a worthwhile journey; yet, further search needs to be carried out in order to reveal the real reasons behind the lack of recognition or absence of progress for the rest of the trainers. As far as this progress is concerned, the trainers selected *listening to GE, expressing basic ideas,* and *learning about ESP lexis*, which is clearly more GE-oriented rather than ESP-oriented.

III.2. Were you a member in designing the evaluation tests and did the tests evaluate: *ESP Knowledge, GE knowledge, or Both*

Table 13.Test Design Inclusion and its Targeted EMI

Test Designer	**Number**	**Percentage**	**Tested Knowledge**	**Number**	**Percentage**
Yes	04	17.59	ESP Knowledge	00	00.00
			GE knowledge	20	86.96
No	19	82.61	Both	03	13.04
Total	23	100	**Total**	23	100

Only four out of 23 trainers were involved in the test design, and they all agree that it tests only GE competence. Unfortunately, excluding all other trainers from designing tests for all four skills for their trainees is definitely inappropriate and lacks reliability and validity, as well as many other criteria of good testing and assessment (Brown, 2003, p. 19-28). Eventually, this becomes counterproductive, since it tests what those four test designers conceptualized rather than what had been actually and technically been taught by the rest of all trainers. Teaching something while testing something else is comparable to teaching how to cook salty food, but being tested on how to bake sweet cakes.

III.3. Would you volunteer to do it once more?

The responses were contradictory: 10 (43.48) declined and nine (39.13%) accepted, while three (13.04%) abstained from answering. These fluctuations clearly highlight the shortcomings of this training and their

negative effect on the follow-up programs to come, which will probably need to be adjusted and enhanced to avoid such an attitude towards training.

5. Discussion

This survey revealed that the training staff focused more on teaching EMI with major emphasis on GE, rather than ESP (see Question II.2). This could be explained by the fact that, even though many of them conducted a needs analysis at the beginning in order to train their trainees in ESP, they later shifted their focus to GE due to the poor proficiency level of their trainees (see Question II.4).

Many trainers were against their mandatory deployment in such training without their full consent, due to various academic obligations (such as PhD requirements), work overload, and sickness leave (see Question I.2). This must be avoided in future training sessions by carefully selecting staff members who are voluntarily or consensually inclined to be part of the programs. Taking into consideration the academic and psychological states of the trainers is a key component for the success of any type of training.

Considering the major problems faced by the trainers, such as heterogeneity in terms of backgrounds and English proficiency, the constant absences of the trainees, a lack of motivation, and the scarcity of authentic materials, etc. -these were the most urgent issues to be addressed. This can be achieved via the creation of homogeneous classes based on needs, linguistic proficiency, and common problems, as well as the provision of authentic ESP materials consistent with the trainees' specialties.

6. Recommendations

1. Any programmed training must be solely based on a systematic needs analysis, involving all types of situations and considering the profile of the trainees, their needs and lacks, the appropriateness of the setting and its features, as well as the profile of the trainers and their suitability, etc.
2. The establishment of a highly professional committee by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research to oversee the whole process of training is a mandatory step that needs to be officially

programmed. This process should range from the selection of proficient trainers and their assignment to compatible departments; testing trainees diagnostically and sorting them according to similarities at levels of needs, specialty, and language proficiency, etc.; designing suitable syllabi and lessons; negotiating suitable ESP programs, materials and media from International Councils; to the supervision of trainers throughout all ESP training programs, is a mandatory step that needs to be officially programmed.

3. Communicative competence is the cornerstone of ESP and EMI at the University level, and any kind of training devoid of teaching the phonological system in language laboratories would certainly lead to poor oral production and aural comprehension, and inexorably to many tenacious errors that would hinder communication.
4. Teaching something while testing something else is entirely counter-productive and injudicious. Any kind of training should be based on continuous and final evaluations involving all members, and their results should be the subject of scrutiny and supervision by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, in order to learn from past mistakes and avoid them in future scenarios.
5. A Preparatory Year Program (PYP) must be implemented prior to students' entrance to Algerian universities and before the implementation of EMI (Abdaoui and El Aggoune, 2023, p. 5) with mid-term and final examinations. This should be done in order to ease the transition between GE and ESP, to prepare students for the use of English instead of Arabic, and simultaneously to facilitate the task of their teachers by providing classes with acceptable English proficiency and readiness for EMI.

- CONCLUSION

Certainly, this survey is by no means an attempt to undermine the efforts, time, and energy consumed in this premier initiative at the university level; rather, it is an endeavor to perfect, enhance, and remedy the circumstances, conditions, and problems that may surround future training sessions. It shed light on the fact that the training focused more on GE than

ESP and neglected the design of syllabi and lessons based on ESP principles.

Moreover, it revealed that the most prominent obstacles faced by the trainers is the lack of homogeneity between trainees of the same specialty, a lack of their motivation, their weak language proficiency (especially at the level of pronunciation and accuracy), and the lack of language laboratory necessary for perfecting the phonological side of English, etc. Furthermore, many trainers were excluded from designing tests for their own trainees, which might have had some negative effects on their trainees' performance.

Obviously, it is not in the slightest a case study that could be generalized; however, its results and recommendations could have a great deal of impact on other inter/national universities dealing with training their academic staff in English.

- References:

Abdaoui, M., & El Aggoune, A. (2023, December 4-5). English as a medium of instruction in the Department of Economics at 8 May 1945 University-Guelma: Resistance and resilience [Paper presentation]. The First International Conference on ESP Teaching at the Crossroads of the Marketplace Demands, Eshahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Tebessa, Algeria.

Aguilar, M., & Muñoz, C. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in higher education and teacher training in Catalonia: Opinions, perceptions, and beliefs. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17(2), 232–243. doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.860953

Arroyo-Barrigüete, J. L., López-Sánchez, J. I., Morales-Contreras, M. F., & Soffritti, M. (2022). The impact of English-medium instruction on university student performance. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 45(6), 2315–2320. doi:10.1080/01434632.2022.2047193

Brown, H. D. (1987). Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. D. (2003). Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices. California, CA: Longman.

Corder, S. P. (1974). Error analysis. In J. P. B. Allen & S. P. Corder (Eds.), Techniques in applied linguistics (pp. 122-154). London, England: Oxford University Press.

Dekhakhena, A. (2025). English in Algerian higher education: A paradoxical path to decolonization. Annals for Social and Human Sciences of Guelma University, 19(1), 443–471.

Fraser, H. (1999). ESL pronunciation teaching: Could it be more effective? Australian Language Matters, 7(4), 7-8.

Gouvernement, algérien. (2020, 6 février). Plan d'action du gouvernement (pp. 1-43). République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire. Retrieved from:
http://www.majliselouma.dz/images/pdf/nossousse/Texte_janv20/Plan_act_gov _fr.pdf

Macaro, E., & Han, S. (2020). Challenges of implementing English medium instruction in higher education: Teachers' perspectives. Studies in Higher Education, 45(4), 1–15. doi:10.1080/03075079.2019.1610427

Tasin Abir, M. (2025). Challenges in shifting from Bangla medium to English medium instruction at a reputed public university in Bangladesh. EMI Implementation in Public Universities of Bangladesh, 1–17. Doi : 10.35542/osf.io/t528q_v1

Mebitil, N. (2011). An exploration of the main difficulties, challenges and requirements of the ESP teaching situation in Algeria: The case of ESP teachers at Abou Bekr Belkaid University, Tlemcen (Magister dissertation). University of Tlemcen, Tlemcen, Algeria.

Strevens, P. (1988). The learner and the teacher of ESP. In D. Chamberlain & R. J. Baumgardner (Eds.), ESP in the classroom: Practice and methods (pp. 39-44). London, England: Modern English Publications in association with the British Council.