

Danica M. Jerotijević Tišma¹
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
English Department
ORCID: 0000-0002-4973-0405

PRONUNCIATION STRATEGIES AND ORAL COMMUNICATION NEEDS OF THE PROSPECTIVE EMI INSTRUCTORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC²

As EMI continues to expand across higher education worldwide, understanding instructors' linguistic needs and pronunciation practices has become increasingly important for ensuring effective teaching in multilingual classroom settings. Hence, the current study investigates EMI prospective instructors' views on oral communication needs and pronunciation strategy use before, during and after a speaking activity. A total of twenty-two lecturers from eight faculties of the University of Kragujevac, who were attending an EMI training program funded by the Foundation Tempus, completed two questionnaires related to the explored issues. The results of the relevant statistical testing show that the instructors understand the importance of oral communication skills, especially clarity, confidence and effective presentation delivery. However, more experienced instructors rated speaking abilities lower and reported a reduced use of pre-speaking pronunciation strategies when compared to less experienced colleagues. No significant group differences were found for strategies used during and after the speaking activities, yet the reflective strategies were consistently low across all participants. The findings indicate that even though EMI trainees recognize the importance of intelligible communication, they differ in confidence and strategies employed. The pedagogical implications of the study highlight the need for structured pronunciation training on suprasegmentals and reflective strategy use in future EMI training programs.

Keywords: EMI, pronunciation, NNES, pronunciation strategies, speaking, teaching experience

1 danica.tisma@filum.kg.ac.rs

2 The research conducted in the paper was funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia (Agreement on the Transfer of Funds for Financing Scientific Research of the Teaching Staff at Accredited Higher Education Institutions in 2026, number: 451-03-34/2026-03/200198.).

1. Introduction

English as a medium of instruction (EMI) has gained increasing popularity among higher education institutions in recent decades worldwide, probably due to the fact that internationalization represents one of the major strategic priorities of universities (Macaro et al. 2018: 37). Universities seek to enhance their global profile, but also to attract international students and develop opportunities for research collaborations. Furthermore, since English has been established as a lingua franca of publications and international knowledge exchange, offering it as a medium of instruction seems to help students increase their chances of employability, mobility, and, last but not least, language competence. EMI likewise represents a competitive strategy as it boosts the competition between private and public educational sectors, especially taking demographic shifts and financial pressures into consideration (Galloway, Rose 2015: 230). Looking from the perspective of the very students, EMI offers a twofold benefit in the sense that students engage with the relevant disciplinary content while simultaneously, yet implicitly, developing their English academic language skills. As such, EMI represents a particularly demanding task for both instructors and students, since every discipline has its own register, genre and specific lecture delivery, as well as student interaction and assessment, which all need to be performed in English, i.e. a non-native language (Han 2023).

EMI thus represents a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon involving language policy, teacher competence, institutional goals, equity issues and student language and disciplinary readiness. Macaro (2018: 19) defines EMI as the practice of using English to deliver academic content in subjects that are different from English and in settings where the majority of people speak a different mother tongue. Pecorari and Malmström (2018: 507) point to a broader perspective of EMI, including situations where English has a dominant role with efforts made to foster learners' English language skills.

Not just the popularity of EMI implementation itself, but the number of related publications has grown as well, reaching about 1500 papers in total from 1974 to 2024, with a special rise happening since 2018 (Karabay, Durrani 2024). However, despite the expansion of interest and findings, there is a considerable variation in the modalities of EMI implementation and a lack of systematic evidence regarding learning outcomes, teacher preparedness, equity implications and coherence in language policy (Zuaro 2025). Moreover, the relevant literature draws attention to definitional ambiguity and insufficient teacher development, as well (Rose, Galloway 2019). Research has shown that one of the results of the switch to EMI, if the students' language proficiency is inadequate or if institutional support is weak, may be the deepening of inequalities (Kir 2024). EMI research does raise questions regarding how academic grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation should be handled when non-native speakers teach and learn content

in English, yet the issue of pronunciation has not been extensively covered in general, and it is particularly scarce in the Serbian scientific context. The present study seeks to fill that void by investigating the EMI instructor trainees' self-assessment of pronunciation competence and views on oral communication needs.

2. Pronunciation in EMI

Even though pronunciation has emerged as one of the crucial elements in EMI settings, it is often a neglected component of both lecturer competence and student comprehension. Traditionally, EMI research has underscored the importance of policy, teacher readiness and proficiency (Macaro 2018). Nowadays, spoken intelligibility is regarded as a prerequisite for effective disciplinary communication (Kiczkowski, Lowe 2021). Teachers' pronunciation seems to directly affect students' access to academic content, whereas students' pronunciation influences their participation and oral tasks assessment. Non-native instructors must deliver complex disciplinary content in English while simultaneously making sure that their pronunciation is intelligible to an audience whose linguistic background may vary significantly (Ball, Lindsay 2013). Comprehension and learning outcomes are enhanced by the development of strategies for clear pronunciation, which include controlled pace, contrastive stress and intonational chunking. In order to enhance clarity and discourse coherence, teachers often need to adjust suprasegmental features, especially rhythm, stress placement and intonation (Derwing, Munro 2015). It is well-known that intelligibility rather than native-like accuracy represents the primary goal in international academic settings (Jenkins 2015; Bolton et al. 2025). Therefore, pronunciation in EMI should be regarded as a matter of strategic clarity and communicative efficiency, rather than native speaker accent imitation.

Sometimes students in an EMI classroom may not share either the same first language or the same variety of English, which is why EMI is characterized by a specific linguistic asymmetry. This is where *lingua franca core*, i.e. mutual intelligibility norms, proposed by Jennifer Jenkins at the end of the 20th century, come in handy (Jenkins 2000). Namely, the expected linguistic diversity may be foregrounded by focusing on core phonological features – maintaining vowel length contrasts, avoiding consonant deletion and producing obstruent voicing accurately. In this way, both intercultural inclusion and clarity of pedagogical approach are preserved in EMI contexts (Kirkpatrick 2020).

Non-native EMI lecturers' phonetic delivery may affect their perceived expertise and credibility, since pronunciation not only conveys content but also indexes stance, identity and authority, especially in academic discourse (Jenkins 2017). Hence, pronunciation instruction in an EMI setting should at least try to incorporate both rhetorical and pragmatic dimensions in order to show how stress and intonation signal emphasis, academic caution, as well as politeness.

However, relevant research indicates that non-native lecturers often experience insecurity when speaking English, which is why integrating pronunciation awareness and corrective feedback into EMI programs could strengthen teachers' academic self-concept, reduce anxiety and boost confidence (Lasagabaster 2022). Since EMI brings multilingual participants together, encouraging tolerance toward non-native varieties and explicit training in diverse accents perception aligns with the ELF pedagogical principles and fosters equity and inclusion at the same time (Jenkins 2015).

Pronunciation research in EMI settings remains relatively meagre to this day, with limited data revealing lecturers' self-perceived pronunciation competence, students' attitudes toward accented speech and the impact of L1 transfer on intelligibility in specific local contexts, particularly Serbia. There are only a few fairly recent available studies dealing with some of the aforementioned issues.

Richer (2019) investigated EMI's influence on learners' pronunciation development through increased exposure to English. The findings showed that pronunciation improvement did not occur automatically, regardless of the fact that EMI settings provide valuable opportunities for meaning-focused communicative use of English in authentic academic tasks (e.g. presentations, discussions, lectures), yet more focus needs to be placed on feedback, targeted support and explicit awareness. In a preliminary study, Gómez-Lacabex and Gallardo-del-Puerto (2021) examined Spanish History and Economics university students' pronunciation performance and attitudes. Students' speech was assessed for intelligibility and comprehensibility by both native and non-native speakers of English. The results demonstrated a certain advantage linked to the shared L1 background, since their speech was moderately intelligible, with Spanish speakers understanding them more easily than others. The participants also expressed limited confidence in pronunciation, even though they actually prioritized intelligibility over accuracy. Through a qualitative study, Aksakalli (2022) examined EMI academics' beliefs concerning English pronunciation in university classrooms across different disciplines. Using semi-structured interviews with instructors, the author found a generally positive attitude toward accurate pronunciation being perceived as essential for content comprehension and overall language development. The findings also pointed to the fact that EMI facilitates subject learning but likewise provides an effective environment for pronunciation improvement through the increased practice of English. Looking into how EMI students perceive pronunciation and experience pronunciation-related anxiety in academic contexts, Soruç and Griffiths (2023) found that students viewed pronunciation as a tool for effective communication rather than the goal of linguistic perfection, again valuing fluency over accuracy. Generally, even though they expressed little discomfort

with lecturers' pronunciation, they reported feeling greater anxiety when interacting with native English speakers than with local or non-native peers.

3. Methodology

3.1. Aims and research questions

The present study is based on the overall aim to investigate how university instructors engaged in EMI training perceive and manage pronunciation and oral communication demands of their teaching. Focusing on self-assessment and strategy use, the paper seeks to identify strengths and room for improvement useful for EMI teacher-training practices. More specifically, the goals are to examine prospective EMI instructors' pronunciation strategies used before, during and after speaking activities and assess their perceived importance of different oral communication needs. Furthermore, the aim is to determine whether teaching experience relates to the investigated phenomena.

Bearing the goals in mind, the investigation is based on the following research questions:

- How do the prospective EMI instructors evaluate the importance of oral communication skills and their own ability in this area?
- What pronunciation strategies do the prospective EMI instructors report using before, during and after a speaking activity?
- Are there any observed differences in oral communication needs and pronunciation strategies between participants with diverse teaching experience?

3.2. Participants

The chosen sample of participants included 22 EMI trainees, i.e. university instructors from the University of Kragujevac, representing a notable range of scientific areas and disciplinary backgrounds. Namely, at the time of the examination, the instructors were attending the EMI training period, consisting of eleven workshops and micro-teaching sessions. They were all selected based on the previous evaluation of their current English proficiency. The training was funded by the Foundation Tempus of Serbia and held at the University of Kragujevac from November to January 2024/2025. The sample of the participants consisted of 8 male and 14 female instructors, with birth years ranging from 1963 to 1997. The largest age group was 25–34 years of age ($n=9$), followed by 45–54 years of age ($n=6$), 35–44 years of age ($n=4$) and 55 and above ($n=2$). Regarding their teaching experience in higher education, 11 instructors reported having less than 10 years of teaching experience, 6 had 10–20 years of experience, and 5 instructors had more than 20 years of teaching

experience. The EMI training in question was designed for instructors preparing to engage in teaching foreign students, and prior EMI experience was not a selection criterion. Based on the information gathered from the interaction with the participants during the training sessions, they had no prior formal experience with EMI. Since this criterion was not systematically controlled for in the present study, there may have been some participants who had limited informal practice. Therefore, for the purposes of the current investigation, they are treated as prospective EMI instructors and their responses are interpreted as reflecting beliefs and intended practices, rather than established EMI teaching behaviour. Even though they were all from the University of Kragujevac, the instructors belonged to various faculties: 8 of them were from the Faculty of Medical Sciences, 6 from the Faculty of Science, 2 from the Faculty of Philology and Arts, 2 from the Faculty of Education in Jagodina, 1 from the Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja, 1 from the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, 1 from the Faculty of Economics and 1 from the Faculty of Law. Though not ideal, this distribution allowed for a multidimensional understanding of pronunciation awareness and attitudes toward EMI teaching within the specific context of the University of Kragujevac.

3.3. Instruments and Procedure

A quantitative, descriptive research design was employed to allow for systematic measurement of EMI trainees' pronunciation strategies and oral communication needs. Two structured questionnaires were used for collecting data. The first instrument was an Oral Communication Needs Assessment ranking questionnaire, adapted from Gerhisser and Wrenn (2007). It contained ten oral communication activities relevant to academic contexts (e.g. giving presentations, participating in discussions, etc.). The participants' task was to rate the importance of each activity for their work on a five-point Likert scale (1=not important, 5=very important) and to do a self-assessment of their current ability in each of the areas mentioned in the questionnaire, again using the scale from 1 to 5 (1=low, 5=high). The second instrument was a Pronunciation Strategies Self-Assessment Questionnaire developed for the purpose of this study based on the previously made suggestions on oral communication strategies (Nakatani 2006) and pronunciation learning and self-monitoring strategies (Pawlak 2018, 2020). It contained a brief introductory segment searching for demographic information (gender, age, teaching experience and affiliation) and the main segment incorporating 22 statements reflecting the evaluative criteria of pronunciation strategies before (8 statements), during (7 statements) and after the speaking activities (7 statements). The participants' task was to indicate the frequency of potential use of each of the strategies on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (=never) to 5 (=always). This particular instrument

was designed in order to capture the instructors' reported and anticipated strategic behaviour in relation to speaking activities, comprising both metacognitive and communicative dimensions of pronunciation performance. The author made sure that the questionnaire was contextually relevant to EMI, theoretically grounded in pronunciation pedagogy and reliable in generating data aligned with the goals of the present study.

The questionnaires were distributed in person or online during the EMI training period at the University of Kragujevac in November and December 2024. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation and the confidentiality of responses. They all received the informed written consent before completing the questionnaires. The approximate time needed to complete the questionnaire was 10-15 minutes. Upon finalizing the data collection, the responses were coded and subjected to SPSS, version 20.0, for further analysis. Descriptive statistics and frequency counts were used for summarizing the data and identifying general patterns in participants' perceived oral communication needs and reported use of pronunciation strategies. The general analysis concentrated on determining the relative importance of communication skills, self-rated ability and frequency of pronunciation strategy employment before, during and after speaking activities. A non-parametric, Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare the responses based on different levels of teaching experience, while Pearson and Spearman correlations were used to look into the relationship between perceived importance and current ability in oral communication skills, as well as for the relationship between teaching experience and pronunciation strategies.

4. Results and Discussion

The results of the Oral Communication Needs questionnaire are presented in Table 1. Percentage counts for each level of the ranking scale (1–not important, 2–slightly important, 3–moderately important, 4–fairly important, 5–very important for the importance section, and 1–low, 2–almost low, 3–moderately high, 4–fairly high, 5–high for the current ability section) are provided along with median and standard deviation scores.

Table 1. Results of the Oral Communication Needs Assessment

Oral Communication Activities	How important is this skill to your work? (%)					
	1	2	3	4	5	Median s.d.
1. Participating in informal conversations	/	27.3	27.3	22.7	22.7	3 1.14
2. Participating in discussions	/	4.5	27.3	31.8	36.4	4 0.93

3. Giving short presentations	/	/	4.5	40.9	54.5	5 0.59
4. Giving long presentations	/	/	4.5	27.3	68.2	5 0.58
5. Giving information or instructions	/	/	/	27.3	72.7	5 0.46
6. Speaking confidently	/	/	/	18.2	81.8	5 0.39
7. Speaking clearly	/	/	/	18.2	81.8	5 0.39
8. Using appropriate stress patterns in words	/	9.1	18.2	18.2	54.5	5 1.05
9. Using appropriate rhythm pattern in sentences	/	4.5	27.3	45.5	22.7	4 0.83
10. Using appropriate non-verbal communication	/	/	22.7	27.3	50.0	4 0.83
What is your current ability in this area? (%)						
1. Participating in informal conversations	/	/	9.1	59.1	31.8	4 0.61
2. Participating in discussions	/	/	18.2	40.9	40.9	4 0.75
3. Giving short presentations	/	/	13.6	45.5	40.9	4 0.70
4. Giving long presentations	/	4.5	18.2	45.5	31.8	4 0.84
5. Giving information or instructions	/	/	13.6	45.5	40.9	4 0.70
6. Speaking confidently	/	/	40.9	36.4	22.7	4 0.80
7. Speaking clearly	/	4.5	27.3	40.9	27.3	4 0.87
8. Using appropriate stress patterns in words	/	4.5	18.2	59.1	13.6	3 0.84
9. Using appropriate rhythm pattern in sentences	/	13.6	50.0	36.4	/	3 0.69
10. Using appropriate non-verbal communication	/	13.6	31.8	50.0	4.5	4 0.80

Judging by the presented results in Table 1, EMI trainees generally rate oral communication skills as important for their EMI teaching responsibilities. Speaking confidently, speaking clearly, giving instructions and delivering long presentations received the highest scores, thereby they can be regarded as the most important skills for the chosen sample of participants. Participating in informal conversations was deemed the least important, which is

understandable given that the sample of participants was composed of academics and higher-education teaching professionals.

When it comes to the self-perceived ability in the oral communication areas, slightly lower median scores can be noticed when compared to the importance results. As opposed to the least importance given to participating in informal conversations, the participants rate their own ability as one of the highest in this area. Other skills with the highest ratings are participating in discussions, giving short presentations and giving information or instructions. Slightly lower scores of self-rated ability can be noticed for suprasegmental features, particularly rhythm patterns, indicating that the instructors felt less proficient in prosodic aspects of pronunciation than in general speaking tasks.

To determine whether the perceived importance of oral communication skills was associated with the perceived ability in these areas, a Pearson correlation test was performed. A moderate, positive and statistically significant correlation was found ($r=0.485$, $p=0.022$), suggesting that instructors who considered oral communication skills important also rated themselves as more competent in these areas. This could point to the conclusion that self-perceived professional relevance can be connected to self-efficacy in anticipated EMI contexts. Moreover, a Spearman correlation test was used to investigate the relationship between teaching experience and oral communication skills importance and self-rated ability. A moderate statistically significant correlation was found with the importance scores ($\rho=-0.505$, $p=0.017$), yet a strong, negative correlation was found with self-rated ability ($\rho=-0.783$, $p=0.001$). These findings show that less experienced instructors perceive oral communication skills suggested in the questionnaire as more important to their professional engagement than the more experienced ones. Similarly, more experienced instructors rated their oral communication ability lower than that of less experienced colleagues, which could suggest issues with self-confidence in L2 oral communication. The Kruskal-Wallis test did not show any statistical difference between groups differing in experience with regard to the importance scores ($\chi^2(3)=5.699$, $p=0.127$), yet a decreasing trend was noticed from the least experienced (mean rank=14.18) to the most experienced group (mean rank=6.63). However, the differences between groups were statistically significant for the self-rated ability ($\chi^2(3)=12.939$, $p=0.005$), with mean ranks decreasing from less experienced to more experienced instructors (*up to 10 years* mean rank=16.00; *10-20 years* mean rank=9.50; *more than 20 years* mean rank=4.25). The findings of the Kruskal-Wallis test further support the negative correlation results, suggesting the interpretation that more experienced instructors may be more self-critical and hold higher internal standards.

Table 2 presents the results of the pronunciation strategies self-assessment questionnaire before, during and after speaking activities. Both the frequencies

for each of the levels (1–never, 2–rarely, 3–sometimes, 4–often, 5–always) and the median and standard deviation scores are provided.

Table 2. Results of the Pronunciation Strategies Self-assessment

Strategies	Frequency Level (%)					Median s.d.
	1	2	3	4	5	
Before the speaking activity						
1) I practise my pronunciation.	13.6	22.7	36.4	27.3	/	3 1.02
2) I choose words which I can pronounce easily.	9.1	9.1	27.3	36.4	18.2	4 1.18
3) I check on the pronunciation of difficult words.	18.2	50.0	22.7	4.5	4.5	2 0.98
4) I pronounce the words clearly in English.	9.1	22.7	31.8	18.2	18.2	3 1.25
5) I stress the words accurately in English.	/	27.3	54.5	13.8	4.5	3 0.79
6) I speak English with a regular rhythm.	/	13.6	27.3	45.5	13.6	4 0.91
7) I practise speaking English with a natural intonation.	13.6	45.5	22.7	9.1	9.1	2 1.14
8) I refer to the ICAO Language Proficiency Rating Scale (LPRS) as guidance for my pronunciation for my speaking activities.	100	/	/	/	/	1 0.0
During the speaking activity						
9) I am careful when pronouncing the words in English.	/	9.1	27.3	40.9	22.7	4 0.92
10)I notice my pronunciation mistakes when I am speaking.	22.7	9.1	18.2	27.3	22.7	3 1.5
11)I self-correct my pronunciation whenever I mispronounce.	18.2	36.4	27.3	9.1	9.1	2 1.18
12)I try to pronounce each and every word clearly in English.	4.5	40.9	31.8	13.6	9.1	3 1.05
13)I stress the words accurately in English.	9.1	36.4	36.4	13.6	4.5	3 0.99
14)I pay attention to speaking English with a regular rhythm.	4.5	36.4	40.9	13.6	4.5	3 0.92
15) I speak English with a natural intonation.	18.2	45.5	27.3	4.5	4.5	2 0.99
After the speaking activity						

16) I reviewed the recording of my speaking activity for self-improvement.	54.5	45.5	/	/	/	1 0.51
17) I listed down the words I mispronounced.	31.8	54.5	13.6	/	/	2 0.66
18) I took note of the words that I stressed inaccurately in English.	31.8	59.1	9.1	/	/	2 0.61
19) I took note of where I spoke with the wrong rhythm.	90.9	9.1	/	/	/	1 0.29
20) I took note of where my intonation caused problems for my listeners.	77.3	22.7	/	/	/	1 0.43
21) I listened to correct examples of pronunciation in English.	40.9	50.0	9.1	/	/	2 0.65
22) I practised speaking correctly after listening to examples of pronunciation in English.	9.1	40.9	13.6	27.3	9.1	2 1.21

The results from Table 2 demonstrate that the chosen participants report using pronunciation strategies with variable frequency across three stages – before, during and after a speaking activity. The most frequently reported strategies before speaking are choosing words they can pronounce easily and speaking with regular rhythm, suggesting the awareness of the need for clarity and fluency. Nevertheless, checking the pronunciation of difficult words and referring to the ICAO proficiency scale are reported as rarely, i.e. never used, suggesting the need for improved resourcefulness and currently limited reliance on external reference tools. During a speaking activity, the most frequently anticipated strategies are being careful in the pronunciation of words and occasional self-monitoring in terms of noticing mistakes while speaking. It should be noted that the overall frequency of reported strategy use in this phase is only moderate, with most median values clustering around 3, and some falling to 2, indicating that these strategies are not consistently employed. The least frequently reported strategies are self-correction and natural intonation control, which further supports the observation of generally limited strategic engagement during real-time speech production. After a speaking activity, the results suggest a generally low reported strategic reflection on the part of the instructors and a tendency to rely on intuitive rather than systematic pronunciation improvement interventions. The results thus underscore the need for a structured pronunciation awareness training promoting metacognitive engagement before, during and after speaking tasks.

The findings based on Spearman correlations show a statistically significant negative correlation between teaching experience and pre-speaking

pronunciation strategies ($\rho=-0.637$, $p=0.001$). This means that more experienced instructors reported less frequent use of preparatory pronunciation strategies. No statistically significant correlation was found for during ($\rho=-0.036$, $p=0.874$) and after speaking strategies ($\rho=-0.334$, $p=0.129$), indicating that real-time and effective strategies did not vary substantially with teaching experience. Looking into the potential differences in results among the three experience groups, the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference across three experience groups for the use of strategies before speaking ($\chi^2(3)=8.629$, $p=0.035$), further supporting correlation findings. There was a clear decreasing trend in mean ranks, as well (*up to 10 years* mean rank=15.32; *10-20 years* mean rank=9.08; *more than 20 years* mean rank=6.75). This points to the conclusion that less experienced instructors indicate reliance on more heavily on preparatory pronunciation strategies than those with more teaching experience. Similarly to the correlations results, no statistically significant differences were found for strategies used during speaking ($\chi^2(3)=1.774$, $p=0.621$) with mean ranks being relatively stable across groups (mean ranks=11.36, 11.83 and 9.50, respectively). No statistically significant difference was detected for strategies used after speaking, either ($\chi^2(3)=3.199$, $p=0.362$), yet the mean ranks showed a slight increase in reflective strategies used with experience (mean ranks=9.55, 12.92 and 12.63, respectively). Overall, based on the particular sample of the current study, the findings indicate that teaching experience shapes self-perceived and presupposed strategic behaviour in EMI, especially in preparatory stages and self-assessment areas. Based on self-reported tendencies, more experienced instructors appear to prefer relying on intuition, while novice instructors report that they would employ more explicit strategies and exhibit higher levels of L2 speaking confidence.

Although limited in scope and number of participants, the findings of the present study align with relatively recent discussions in EMI literature that emphasize the central role of intelligibility, self-awareness and strategic spoken communication in multilingual higher-education settings. The fact that the chosen participants generally rated oral communication skills as highly important for EMI is consistent with previous findings (Aksakalli 2022), placing high value on intelligible pronunciation as part of effective classroom interaction. The correlation results related to instructors' choice to positively rate both the importance and their own ability in oral communication skills, support the view that pronunciation awareness enhances communicative self-efficacy (Derwing, Munro 2015). Since, based on the correlation and Kruskal-Wallis test analysis, more experienced instructors appeared to be more critical of their own pronunciation or more sensitive to high communicative demands in EMI, the findings likewise agree with previous conclusions about the heightened awareness of pronunciation limitations in EMI contexts (Soruç, Griffiths 2023). The differences across teaching experience groups may likewise reflect a generational

shift in English language education policies, with less experienced instructors benefiting more from international communication and digital engagement in English. The fact that less experienced instructors reported potentially using explicit preparatory strategies more frequently may support the finding that those learners who engage consciously in pronunciation improvement use planning strategies more efficiently (Pawlak 2018). The scarcity of possible use of reflective strategies, i.e. strategies used after speaking, aligns with the previous results that EMI students rarely engage in post-task reflection (Gómez-Lacabex, Gallardo-del-Puerto 2021). A consistent pattern that emerged is that less experienced instructors report feeling more confident and potentially rely on explicit strategies, which underscores the findings on EMI instructors facing tension between disciplinary expertise and linguistic demands (Macaro 2018; Lasagabaster 2022). Finally, supposedly limited prosodic strategy use underlines the significance of focusing on suprasegmentals in EMI as one of the key targets of linguistic instruction in future EMI training programs.

5. Conclusion

The present study investigated EMI prospective instructors' views on oral communication needs and pronunciation strategies used before, during and after a speaking activity. The results revealed a complex interrelationship between perceived importance and ability, pronunciation strategies used and teaching experience. Generally, instructors recognize the importance of clear and intelligible communication, especially in tasks important for EMI, such as lecturing, giving instructions and presenting disciplinary content. Statistically significant differences were noticed across experience levels, with less experienced trainees reporting more frequent use of pronunciation strategies. However, more experienced trainees rated their ability in oral communication lower, reporting less reliance on explicit pronunciation strategies, suggesting greater self-awareness and increased linguistic self-doubt at least when it comes to high-stakes EMI contexts. Strategy use during the speaking activity was relatively stable across experience groups, while the post-speaking activity reflective strategies were rarely implemented.

The results of the study underline important pedagogical implications for EMI teacher development and institutional policies. Namely, the fact that the instructors generally acknowledged the importance of oral communication suggests that EMI trainees would be highly receptive to linguistic training, including targeted pronunciation instruction. Bearing in mind that prosodic features were consistently rated lower than general speaking skills, EMI training should prioritize these areas. Additional workshops focusing on intelligibility-oriented pronunciation, rhythm and prominence, as well as the activities aimed at enhancing prosodic clarity, might directly benefit the participants.

Furthermore, the findings on strategies used indicate the need for structured materials and checklists that reinforce the habits of using pronunciation strategies. Training focused on rebuilding confidence through awareness raising and guided reflection could benefit more experienced instructors. Reflective tools incorporation into EMI pedagogy with activities such as self-recording, peer coaching and error-noticing normalizing post-lesson reflection, should likewise be considered more often. Moreover, even though it seems extremely demanding, particularly in small, developing countries like Serbia itself, EMI support should try to be discipline-sensitive as much as possible.

One of the most significant limitations of the present study is definitely the limited scope of participants, since the sample size is relatively small and institutionally bounded, restricting the generalizability potential of the study. The lack of systematic control over participants' prior experience in EMI teaching represents another limitation of the study. Hence, the data presented in the paper may reflect a combination of hypothetical and self-reported practices, which potentially limits the conclusions drawn about the actual classroom behaviour. Future research should incorporate a larger population of instructors coming from diverse universities in order to possibly confirm or refute the patterns observed in this investigation. Furthermore, the incorporation of classroom observations, audio recordings, or external pronunciation ratings could provide more objective measures of instructors' actual performance than self-report questionnaires. Future studies might likewise take students' perceptions of instructors' pronunciation into account and explore how perceived intelligibility affects learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Aksakallı 2022: Aksakallı, C. EMI academics' cognitions and actual practices of correct pronunciation. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 10/4, 10–22.
- Ball, Lindsay 2013: Ball, P., Lindsay, D. Language demands and support for English-medium instruction in tertiary education: Learning from a specific context. In: A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges* (pp. 44–61). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Derwing, Munro 2015: Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J. *Pronunciation Fundamentals: Evidence-based Perspectives for L2 Teaching and Research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.42>
- Galloway, Rose 2015: Galloway, N., Rose, N. *Introducing Global Englishes*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gerhiser, Wrenn 2007: Gerhiser, A., Wrenn, D. *Second Language Pronunciation Assessment Handout Packet*. GA TESOL.
- Gómez-Lacabex, Gallardo-del-Puerto 2021: Gómez-Lacabex, E., Gallardo-del-Puerto, F. Pronunciation in EMI: A preliminary study of Spanish university students'

- intelligibility and comprehensibility. In: A. Llinares, T. Morton (Eds.), *Language Use in English-Medium Instruction at University* (pp. 135–158). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bpa.12.07gom>
- Han 2023: Han, Z-H. In English Medium Instruction you can walk and chew gum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1134982. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1134982>
- Jenkins 2000: Jenkins, J. *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins 2015: Jenkins, J. *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315761596>
- Jenkins 2017: Jenkins, J. The future of English as lingua franca? In: J. Jenkins, W. Baker, M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 594–605). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173>
- Karabay, Durrani 2024: Karabay, A., Durrani, N. The evolution of English-medium instruction research in higher education: A bibliometric study. *Education Sciences*, 14/9, 982. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090982>
- Kiczowski, Lowe 2021: Kiczowski, M., Lowe, R. Native-speakerism in English language teaching: ‘Native speakers’ more likely to be invited as conference plenary speakers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45/5, 1408–1423.
- Kir 2024: Kir, F. S. English-medium instruction (EMI) as the great (un)equaliser: Experiences of former EMI students in Turkey. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 0/0, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2302950>
- Kirkpatrick 2020: Kirkpatrick, A. *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003128755>
- Lasagabaster 2022: Lasagabaster, D. Teacher preparedness for English-medium instruction. *Journal of English-Medium Instruction*, 1/1, 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jemi.21011.las>
- Macaro 2018: Macaro, E. *English Medium Instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macaro et al. 2018: Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., Dearden, J. A systematic review of English-medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51/1, 36–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350>
- Nakatani 2006: Nakatani, Y. Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90/2, 151–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00390.x>
- Pawlak 2018: Pawlak, M. Investigating the use of speaking strategies in the performance of two communicative tasks: The importance of communicative goal. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8/2, 269–291.
- Pawlak 2020: Pawlak, M. Grammar learning strategies as a key to mastering second language grammar: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 53, 358–370. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000314>
- Pecorari, Malmström 2018: Pecorari, D., Malmström, H. At the crossroads of TESOL and English-medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52/3, 497–515. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.470>

- Richter 2019: Richter, K. *English-Medium Instruction and Pronunciation: Exposure and Skills Development*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.22730645>
- Rose, Galloway 2017: Rose, H., Galloway, N. Debating standard language ideology in the classroom: Using the “Speak Good English Movement” to raise awareness of Global Englishes. *RELC Journal*, 48/3, 294–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216684281>
- Soruç, Griffiths 2023: Soruç, A., Griffiths, C. Pronunciation in EMI: Conceptualization, interlocutor anxiety and attitudes towards lecturer speech. *Journal of Multilingual Theories and Practices*, 4/1, 76–98. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jmtp.23508>
- Zuaro 2025: Zuaro, B. English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education: The Evolution of EMI Research in European Higher Education. *Applied Linguistics*, 46/3, 547–550. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amae022>

Даница М. Јеротијевић Тишма

СТРАТЕГИЈЕ ИЗГОВОРА И ПОТРЕБЕ УСМЕНЕ КОМУНИКАЦИЈЕ КОД БУДУЋИХ ПРЕДАВАЧА УНИВЕРЗИТЕТСКЕ НАСТАВЕ НА ЕНГЛЕСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ

Резиме

Како се универзитетска настава на енглеском језику (ЕМИ) популаризује у високом образовању широм света, разумевање лингвистичких потреба предавача и праксе изговора постаје све важније за обезбеђивање ефикасне наставе у вишејезичним учионицама. Имајући претходно наведено у виду, у раду истражујемо ставове будућих предавача универзитетске наставе на енглеском језику о потребама усмене комуникације и коришћењу стратегија изговора пре, током и после активности конверзације на енглеском језику. Укупно двадесет два предавача са осам факултета Универзитета у Крагујевцу, који су похађали програм обуке за ЕМИ који је финансирала Фондација Темпус, попунили су два упитника у вези са истраживаним питањима. Резултати релевантног статистичког тестирања показују да наставници разумеју важност вештина усмене комуникације, посебно јасноће, самопоуздања и ефикасне презентације садржаја. Међутим, искуснији предавачи су ниже оценили своје разговорне способности на енглеском језику и навели да ређе користе стратегије изговора пре усмених активности на енглеском језику у поређењу са мање искусним колегама. Нису пронађене значајне разлике у односу на искуство у настави за стратегије које предавачи користе током и након говорних активности, али се стратегије рефлексije доследно ретко користе код свих учесника. Резултати указују да, иако полазници ЕМИ препознају важност разумљиве комуникације, разликују се по нивоу самопоуздања и коришћеним стратегијама. Педагошке импликације рада истичу потребу за структурираном наставом изговора домену супрасегменталних обележја и употребом стратегија рефлексije у будућим програмима обуке за универзитетску наставу на енглеском језику.

Кључне речи: универзитетска настава на енглеском језику, изговор, неизворни говори-ници, стратегије изговора, конверзација, искуство у настави

Примљен: 13. новембар 2025. године
Прихваћен: 1. април 2026. године