

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO

“It’s a nice wishing list”?

Teachers and the Language Policy:
Perspectives on English-medium teaching
at the University of Helsinki

Netta Hirvensalo
Master’s Thesis
English Philology
Department of Modern Languages
University of Helsinki
September 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Theoretical background	7
2.1 English as an academic lingua franca	7
2.2 The role of English in higher education language policies	9
2.3 Users' attitudes towards EMI in an ELF setting.....	13
2.4 Language support for teachers teaching in English	15
2.5 Internationalisation at the University of Helsinki	18
2.6 A language Policy for the University of Helsinki.....	21
3. Material and methodology	24
3.1 Material	24
3.2 Research methodology	26
3.3 Methodological limitations	29
4. Results.....	31
4.1 Teachers' familiarity with the Language Policy	31
4.2 The role of English at the University of Helsinki	33
4.3 Relevance of English to teachers' own work.....	37
4.4 Preparedness to take on teaching in English.....	38
4.5 English and Finland's national languages.....	40
4.6 Language support for teachers	42
4.7 Teaching in English as opposed to teaching in L1	46
4.8 The effect of students' language proficiency and attitudes	49
4.9 Effect of time spent abroad on language proficiency and confidence	51
5. Discussion.....	55
5.1 Teachers' views on English-medium teaching at the University.....	55
5.2 Teachers' views on language support at the University	57
5.3 The Language Policy in light of teachers' responses.....	60
6. Conclusions.....	63
References:.....	65
Appendix A: Interview questions	68
1. Interview questions in Finnish	68
2. Interview questions in English.....	70
Appendix B: Teaching Through English course needs table.....	72
Appendix C: Original interview quotes in Finnish.....	74

1. Introduction

The purpose of the present study is to gain an understanding of the attitudes of teachers at the University of Helsinki towards using English as their medium of instruction (EMI). This phenomenon manifests itself, for example, as English-medium (Master's) programmes offered at the University and additionally as separate teaching modules using English as the or a language of instruction. I studied some of these programmes and their course descriptions and aims for my Bachelor's Thesis (Hirvensalo 2011) side by side with roughly corresponding programmes offered at Stellenbosch University in South Africa. It was the research done for this paper, and discovering the differences in approach between a country that recognises English as an official language, and a rather dominant one, and a country that uses English mainly for reasons of globalisation and internationalisation, that initially sparked my interest in the topic. In South Africa, the use of EMI seemed only natural as the language is already so widely spoken across the country and serves as a lingua franca in an environment that hosts such a wide variety of languages. The situation in Finland is vastly different.

That is, in matters of language policy at the University, and particularly in two dimensions of English-medium teaching: on the one hand, the goals and guidelines set by the University; on the other, the reality that teachers face teaching English-medium courses, either individual or as part of a English-medium programme. More precisely, I was interested to find out whether teachers felt sufficiently equipped to provide teaching in a foreign language. With that in mind, the study at hand sets out to investigate teachers' attitudes and experiences side by side with the University of Helsinki Language Policy.

The respondents' attitudes are investigated in terms of their approach to the general role of English as an academic lingua franca as well as their personal experiences with the day-to-day reality of using English, a foreign or a second language, in their work as a teacher and as a researcher. The teachers are asked to reflect, for example, on the manner in which they first came to teach in English, on how relevant they actually see English to their work, on how teaching in English compares to teaching in their first language and on how the proficiency,

attitude and other qualities of their students affect the teaching experience. By asking questions on a variety of issues related to English-medium instruction, the study at hand aims to achieve an in-depth understanding of the attitudes of a handful of teachers, not simply to determine whether their orientation towards the phenomenon is straightforwardly negative or positive, but rather to demonstrate that one does not rule out the other, and that a “negative” attitude towards certain issues does not automatically equal a negative approach to the general phenomenon, and vice versa.

There is another goal to this study, too, relating to the greater issue of English as an academic lingua franca at the University. That is, studying how the University itself attempts to support teachers teaching in English who perhaps feel that their proficiency or confidence in using English is insufficient. More specifically, the study focuses on a form of language support offered to such teachers as promised in the University of Helsinki’s Language Policy, attempting to determine whether attending a language support course has met the teachers’ needs and improved their language skills or confidence in the desired way. It is also important to investigate whether the teachers have felt that attending this one course satisfactorily met their requirements, or whether they were left in need of more support in their language use – a second course or some other form of support. It may be difficult to determine the specific effects of the course now, several years after it took place, but the focus is rather on how the teachers themselves viewed the course and whether they feel their teaching has changed into one direction or another, as a direct or an indirect result of the support course.

The study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How do teachers perceive the role of English at the University of Helsinki, in general and as a part of their own work?
2. How well does the language support provided by the University meet teachers’ needs?
3. How do the teachers’ views correspond with those expressed in the Policy?

As seen here, in addition to outlining teachers’ attitudes towards English-medium teaching, their responses to the Language Policy itself are under scrutiny. The study aims at uncovering whether the teachers are familiar with the policy or not.

In the latter case familiarising them with some of the points it makes about English as an academic lingua franca is a key element in the sense that this gives them an opportunity to respond with their own, supporting or contradicting, views. As the Language Policy is the original starting point for the research conducted for this study, and the teachers' attitudes towards teaching in English can often arise from the issues ultimately spelled out in the Policy, combining these two questions seems not only feasible but really rather necessary.

The significance of the study lies in determining whether teachers feel that they are equipped to teach in a English when it is not their native language, whether the language support promised in the Language Policy is seen as beneficial and sufficient, and seeing whether there are points in the Language Policy that need to be revised. The intention is to investigate if the language policies and recommendations of the University meet the reality of English as a third language at the University, and if the teachers teaching in English-medium programmes feel equipped to provide teaching in a foreign language. In addition, the study can be seen as significant in the sense that it strives to acquaint its subjects with the University's Language Policy, provided that they are not already familiar with it. Indeed, if this study in any way attempts to provoke discussion on the applicability of the Policy, the first step certainly is making the Policy's existence known to university staff.

The study at hand is divided into chapters in the following manner: Chapter 2 introduces the key theoretical framework used to specify the research topic and justify the place of the present study in the field. Chapter 2 also provides a look into the proportion of foreign students and staff at the University, and finally introduces the Language Policy document itself and its central goals. In Chapter 3, the methodology of the present study is specified and justified, and its limitations are acknowledged. Chapter 3 also presents the material of the study, in this case the interviewees and their background as far as it is relevant to the study. Chapter 4 presents the interview results; that is, divides the responses into categories according to themes that are present both in them and in extracts from the Language Policy. The purpose of this is firstly to provide the reader a clearly structured presentation of results and secondly to map out how the interviewees responses and the views of the Policy correspond with one another. The results laid out in Chapter 4 are then further discussed and analysed in Chapter 5. In this

chapter, the findings are related to the theoretical background presented in Chapter 2. Finally, Chapter 6 provides the reader with conclusions about the research that has been conducted and the discoveries that have been made, and makes suggestions for further research. The sources used for this study are listed under Bibliography, and additional material, such as the interview questions and original Finnish transcriptions can be found in the Appendices.

The study at hand happens to fall into a time period when internationalisation and the use of English at the University are also discussed in the media, and the reality of language use at the University is called into question. Even though the present study was originally inspired by personal interest more than anything else, such media coverage of the same issue further justifies it by suggesting that the questions asked in the study are valid and causes for concern to many. These articles will be presented in Chapter 2 and further discussed alongside with the results in Chapter 5.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 English as an academic lingua franca

A key concept for the present study is the notion of English as a lingua franca – ELF. A generally accepted definition is the one employed for example by Jenkins (2009b: 143), of English being used as a “contact language” by speakers who do not share a first language – that is, usually nonnative English speakers (Graddol 1997: 76). Whether English used in a lingua franca setting should be regarded as a foreign (EFL) or a second (ESL) language is debatable, and Graddol (1999: 205) questions the understanding that in the non-English speaking parts of Europe, English is seen as a foreign rather than a second language. ELF seems to be bringing a change into this traditional view, and this shift can arguably be seen as introducing English as not only a second language in a specific country, but in Europe as a whole (Graddol 1999: 205). And even though English can be seen as an European lingua franca in almost every domain (Seidlhofer et. al. 2006: 5), the study at hand is particularly concerned with English used as a lingua franca in a higher education setting.

As a relatively new area of research (Mauranen 2010: 6), albeit a growing one, there are still a great number of aspects of ELF that have thus far attracted little or no serious interest (Smit 2010: 3). The English department at the University of Helsinki hosts an active group of researchers in the ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) and SELF (Studying in English as a Lingua Franca) projects, and studies on ELF attitudes have been conducted for example by Pilkinton-Pihko (2010) and Suviniitty (2010), as well as by Lehtonen & Lönnfors (2001). Mauranen (2010: 6) describes ELF as “better known as a topic of debate than empirical research”, “hotly debated but relatively little studied”. Mauranen (2009b: 1). It is true that especially in traditionally English-speaking countries the focus has been more on the effect of ELF on the English language, for example through studies concerning English language teachers (see for example Jenkins 2009a). As Hynninen (2010: 29) points out, ELF has attracted most research interest in relation to attitudes towards varieties of English, for example native varieties versus ELF. The aim of this study is to

give voice to those who may well see ELF as a topic of debate, but to whom it is also a more or less unavoidable part of their work and thus something that can be discussed and analysed in its own right, not only on the grounds of whether or not is it a “good” thing.

When considering the reasons behind the role of English as a central language in higher education, international academic mobility can be seen as a very significant one, on the part of students as well as teaching and research staff (Erling & Hilgendorf 2006: 271), and in fact it might be reasonable to assume that the two phenomena feed off of each other. It could be that the more English becomes an established world language in traditionally non-English speaking countries, the more attractive these destinations become, and on the other hand, the more international mobility is directed towards a specific country or university, the more motivation it has to increase the amount and quality of English-medium teaching and research. Smit (2010: 3) supports this interpretation by arguing that attracting international students has become so important to higher education institutions that nowadays English-medium teaching is more of a necessity than a luxury.

Björkman (2011: 80) notes that the shift to English as an academic lingua franca has occurred in two stages: first, it became the language of scientific publishing, and only later has it begun to transform into a (and often ‘the’) language of instruction as well. Although the extent to which English is acknowledged and used as an academic language is likely to be dependent on the country in question as well as on the academic discipline (Graddol 1997: 66), it cannot be denied that an increasing share of the academic world functions in English (Björkman 2011: 82). The distinction between English as a language of publication and as a language of instruction is an important one, as in some cases students and staff may be used to reading material in English while still conducting their own studies, research and teaching in their L1. The increase of English-medium instruction (EMI) thus proposes a new challenge: from knowing a language in theory to becoming an active user of it.

There are certain problems associated with ELF in general as well as with English-medium teaching in higher education. For one, Kaur (2009: 107) argues that the levels of English proficiency may vary greatly in an ELF situation, “which can again impinge on the outcome of the encounter”. That is, in a higher

education setting, the competence of both students and teachers contribute to the success of the learning process. Also, as Phillipson (1992: 281) reminds us, calling English a “world language” can also be dangerous, if we assume it to mean that English is a currency that can be used anywhere. Although English is admittedly gaining ground, and has done so in great leaps since Phillipson (1992) wrote his account, it would be arrogant to assume that English is used as a language of higher education everywhere. In addition, there are a number of mainly positive attributes associated with English, such as a “window onto the world” and “neutral language” (Phillipson 1992: 282), as opposed to negative ones describing other languages, and it is important to remain critical of such descriptions. Mauranen (2009a: 291), however, argues that rather than suffer, “minority languages” may benefit from the use of English as a global language as it leaves room for local multilingualism. Clearly, this is also an issue that divides opinions and that is why ELF and EMI are such important concepts to study. We return to the relationship between English and local languages in higher education in ELF countries in Section 2.2, looking at the phenomenon in relation to language policies.

2.2 The role of English in higher education language policies

In discussing the role of English in higher education, the language policies of universities aiming for an international environment have a significant role in influencing how the ELF phenomenon is received and implemented. Here we need to remember the distinction used for example by Coulmas (1991: 103) between *language politics* and *language policies*. The former “incorporates the ideas and conceptual framework of the envisaged regulation, while [the latter] implement such ideas” (Coulmas 1991: 103). For the purposes of this study, we will focus on *policies*, rather than politics. That is, the focus will be on how universities, and one university in particular, implement the language regulation and status put forth on a national (Ministry of Education 2008) and a European level (*The Bologna Declaration; Mobility Strategy*). Of course, the role of English

in Finnish language politics has not yet been as clearly established as the roles of Finnish and Swedish (for example), but that means that there is all the more reason to study how it is implemented in practise.

When discussing language policies, we may have in mind an ideal world that could be difficult or impossible to achieve in practise. However, the lack of a language policy altogether can also lead to confusion and problems, for example if English is only assumed to function as the lingua franca even though its role has not been officially established (Erling & Hilgendorf 2006: 271). Erling & Hilgendorf (2006: 271) suggest that this leaves open the questions of language teaching and access to language, risking an unequal standing for students and staff alike who have not been informed on the language requirements or expectations of their institution (see also Pecorari et al. 2011: 75). Wren (1997: 3–4) also emphasises the importance of being aware of the language policies of one's own country and institution as well as those of others, although her primary concern are language teachers and students. This is relevant for the present study in that the more teachers are aware of the language policies and expectations of different countries and higher education institutions, the better they can channel these into their teaching and thus prepare their students for them (Wren 1997: 4).

When English is introduced as an additional language into a country where there are one or more national languages already in use in higher education, there are bound to be concerns over the role of these national languages and whether they become less used or even obsolete (for example Bergan 2002: 6). This is a challenge for higher education institutions in Europe and elsewhere in the traditionally non-English speaking world, maintaining the balance between the wish and need to be international and stay up to date in the globalising world, and the responsibility and desire to preserve the national language(s) and, subsequently, the national identity (Pecorari et al. 2011: 73–74; Bergan 2002: 17–18). Naturally, the effect of English on other languages extends on not only status but also the actual structure and vocabulary of these languages (Graddol 1997: 128), and both are issues that need to be taken into consideration. In light of this, an explicit language policy is arguably very much called for in higher education institutions where English has become or is becoming a lingua franca, as the priorities of said institutions need to be clarified.

As noted in 2.1, English first became a prominent part of the international academic world in scientific publishing, and as a consequence a significant amount of material may be available only to those who have an adequate command of English (Pilkinton-Pihko 2010: 59). Furthermore, this can put pressure on academics to report their findings in English in order to reach a wider audience, even in cases where the researcher's English skills may not be sufficient to produce that kind of text. This, in turn, could lead to a significant decrease in scientific material produced in other European languages, and in the worst case scenario, to a situation where some of these languages are no longer considered appropriate or adequate for this type of publishing (Bergan 2002: 6). If universities are to preserve the national languages as an academic asset, they need to pay particular attention to maintaining the share of academic material published in these languages at a level that allows for the languages to continue to develop and influence their respective fields.

It is not only a language policy that influences how languages are viewed and received at an institution. Similarly to Germany (Erling & Hilgendorf 2006: 286), Finnish universities do not charge tuition fees, which is likely to be one of the reasons that make it an attractive exchange destination. With this in mind, while reasons other than language may draw foreign students to Helsinki, language is still very much present in their academic life, and insufficient skills in the language of instruction or alternatively failure on the university's part to provide sufficient instruction in English might lead to problems that could be prevented by a more thorough screening system – or a more explicit language policy. Of course, as Erling & Hilgendorf (2006: 286) point out, the lack of a tuition fee system is also very much a positive thing in the sense that it encourages internationalisation and student mobility – the very reason why many universities strive to increase English-medium teaching.

Assuming that the need to provide English-medium higher education stems less from the aim to improve the language skills of local students and more from having to accommodate foreign students who do not have an adequate command of either of the national languages, the formulation of a language policy becomes all the more important (Bergan 2002: 18). It could well be, as Erling & Hilgendorf (2006: 272) suggest, that for some of the students who come to non-English speaking countries on exchange, that country is actually not the first

choice. Rather, they would prefer to study abroad in an English-speaking country, but are forced to choose another destination due to lack of available spaces. Gürüz (2011: 204) also supports the view that English-medium education is one of the key motivations for going on student exchange, as he finds that the three most popular exchange destinations in 2006 are English-speaking countries – the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. When we add Canada and New Zealand, the total number of enrolments is 1,348,751. Of course there are likely to be other reasons that also make these countries attractive destinations, such as the type of education they offer (Gürüz 2011: 204), but the language of tuition is bound to play a role not entirely unimportant.

If indeed EMI contributes to the selection of an overseas institution, this could put pressure on the host universities to increase the amount of English-medium courses and programmes in order to compete in the international academic market (Smit 2010: 3), even if they do not have the resources to do so. And if there are students who come to these universities wishing to improve their English, among other goals, the clash between supply and demand may lead to confusion and disappointment for both parties. Students may have unrealistic expectations of the quality or amount of English-medium instruction available at the host university, and on the other hand, the university may also have expectations for the students in terms of language proficiency, which might not be completely fulfilled (Smit 2010: 5). Here, the goals of the university and those of the students might not always meet: while the students may see the exchange studies as an opportunity to improve their English skills, it is unlikely that the university (apart from language departments) sees language education as its primary task. The courses available to exchange students are not courses *in* English, but rather courses *using* English as the *medium of instruction*. This can be expected to affect teachers and other academic staff in that they may either feel obligated to use English in their work to a great extent (Airey 2011: 43), or they would like to use English, but do not possess sufficient skills (either according to them or others). Section 2.3 addresses this issue by outlining some previous studies on teacher and student attitudes towards EMI.

2.3 Users' attitudes towards EMI in an ELF setting

In terms of university teachers' attitudes towards internationalisation, and EMI in particular, Jensen & Thøgersen (2011: 30) make an important point about how these attitudes should probably not be measured on a simple scale of positive versus negative. Rather, there should be room to acknowledge for example scepticism towards the phenomenon simultaneously with an acceptance of the situation. People who feel generally positive towards internationalisation are still "allowed" to criticise it and feel uncomfortable with certain aspects of it, and alternatively people who appear to be opposed to the increasing use of EMI may still recognise the benefits it has on the academic community. This is also reflected in the description of EMI as a "double-edged sword" (Pecorari et al. 2011: 67), an all-around complex issue that needs to be analysed accordingly and taken into consideration in planning rather than simply being deemed "right" or "wrong", "good" or "bad".

Jensen & Thøgersen (2011: 27) also make an interesting discovery on how age correlates with attitude towards EMI in that youth seems to equal a more positive attitude towards the role and use of English. They even go as far as to propose that the general atmosphere at the university could become more favourable of EMI as the old, negatively oriented teachers make way for the next generation. Alternatively, they suggest that teachers may grow more "sceptical" over time (Jensen & Thøgersen 2011: 28). They do not, however, relate teaching experience to the age of the respondents, and this can give the impression that older teachers are automatically more experienced as well, when in fact they might have made a career elsewhere and returned to academia only later in life.

One perspective into teacher and student attitudes towards EMI is the evaluation of one's own language proficiency as well as that of others. Pilkinton-Pihko (2010) has studied ELF lecturers' self-perceptions of the English they use in teaching in light of language ideologies. She finds that while they were somewhat concerned with language correctness, speaking like a native speaker was not a highly important goal to all (Pilkinton-Pihko 2010: 72), or rather, the perception of one's own language use changed according to the frame against which it was measured. It appears that ELF lecturers sometimes have a hard time remembering that they are interacting mostly with non-native speakers,

in which case there may be other issues that should be of greater concern than sounding native-like. For example, Suviniitty (2010: 55) has found that in terms of lecture comprehension, students view questions asked by the lecturer a significant factor in making the topic easier to grasp. This shows that it is also important to view teachers' language capabilities from perspectives other than their own in order to get a more realistic picture of what matters. Erling & Bartlett (2006) contribute to the idea that language correctness is often not the primary concern in an ELF setting; rather, they merely wish to speak good English instead of attempting to mimic a certain native variety (Erling & Bartlett 2006: 16). This is understandable when considering the reasons behind using English in a lingua franca setting: more often than not, the objective is simply to get the message across in this one language that is, to an extent, shared by the other interlocutors.

The increase in EMI has had repercussions that have even attracted attention in the academic media, for example concerning the actual resources of the University to offer English-medium teaching and research as opposed to what it advertises. Vairimaa (2012: 11) reports that the optimism of the University concerning internationalisation and expressed in documents available online to prospective students and researchers does not always translate into reality. Students have been attracted by these promises and been sorely disappointed when studying in English has not been as widely implemented a practise as expected. What is more, there appear to be inequalities in the application time for postdoctoral positions, as the English announcement was given more than two months later than the Finnish one, and even then only "upon separate request" (Vairimaa 2012: 11). Giving applicants only a very limited time to prepare their applications puts them in a very different position than their Finnish counterparts, and this can hardly be argued to increase international enrolment at the University. Perhaps, as Vairimaa suggests, the University should consider "chang[ing] its structures", and the Language Policy (Section 2.6) might be a good place to start.

Graddol (2006: 313) argues that the emergence of English as the global academic language has led to a new linguistic need: the need to protect national languages against the complete dominance of English. This has been addressed in Section 2.2 from the perspective of language policies, but it is an issue that is also bound to stir up controversy on a more personal level. In addition to Graddol

(2006: 312), Bergan also (2002: 6) argues that using smaller languages as languages of higher education alongside English will help prevent the “domain loss” threatening the former. What is more, this is a concern to some Finnish scholars (Hallamaa 2011), prominent enough to be discussed in the magazine *Ylioppilaslehti*. Hallamaa (2011: 5) has a problem with academics having to not only present their research in English but also being required to use sources only written in English. Hallamaa calls for attention to the threat English poses to Finnish as an academic language and to the insufficient English proficiency of some of these scholars.

2.4 Language support for teachers teaching in English

As English gains more and more ground as the academic lingua franca, universities need to not only increase the material and teaching available in English but also pay close attention to the quality of said components. That is, they need to monitor the language skills of students and staff and offer appropriate support in using academic English: a goal that they have yet to reach (Erling & Hilgendorf 2006: 283). The University of Helsinki has an answer to this in the form of Teaching Through English (TTE), a support course organised by the Language Services, designed for teachers who wish to improve their English-medium teaching or prepare for it in advance. The TTE course is a key component of this study, and will be presented in more detail in Chapter 3.

Airey (2011) has also investigated an English course aimed at university lecturers in Sweden, similar to the TTE course. The general concept is that teachers from various disciplines all come together to improve their lecturing in English in *their own subject* (Airey 2011: 39). This allows the participants to focus on the manner of teaching instead of the content, whereas a course aimed exclusively for teachers in a certain discipline might pay too much attention to field-specific details. In Airey’s case, the subjects came from two different Swedish universities, which was enabled by the fact that a significant majority of it was executed in online form (Airey 2011: 39) – a rather curious choice, if the goal is to improve the lecturers’ ability to teach in English; that is, their ability to

adequately communicate with students in said language. However, it may not have been as problematic as it sounds, as improving one's insufficient language skills was listed as only the third reason for attending the course, after gaining a formal qualification for a promotion and "an interest in language issues" (Airey 2011: 40). Whether the latter stems from a need to know more about the language policy and practices of one's workplace remains unclear, but the two may certainly be related.

The key themes that were raised by Airey's (2011: 43) respondents in terms of the challenges of EMI included "short notice", "no training", "more preparation" and, among others, "fluency". They felt that they had been "thrown in" (Airey 2011: 43) to EMI situations and that they were expected to do so with no support from the university (Airey 2011: 44). They also found that teaching in English required "significantly" more preparation compared to teaching in their L1, and time was spent especially on finding the key terminology in English, but the size of their teaching load had not been reduced in spite of the extra time they had to spend on preparation (Airey 2011: 44). And even after the time spent on looking up words and phrases, finding the right expressions in the actual teaching situation proved challenging (Airey 2011: 45).

However, when the teachers were given the chance to see themselves on video, they were surprised by how their English lecturing did not in fact differ from that in Swedish in any drastic ways, and this discovery led to a boost in their confidence to continue EMI teaching (Airey 2011: 47–48). When considering how many problems the lecturers reported relating to EMI and how positively surprised they were at how good their teaching actually was, the implication is that many of the problems likely stem from one source: lack of confidence. As the respondents found the course to be a "confidence boost" (Airey 2011: 48), it can be argued that it reached its goal. Airey (2011: 49) attributes much of the course's success to the videotaping of lectures and giving the participants a chance to see themselves on tape, and this is something that could be implemented more in universities all over.

Erling and Hilgendorf (2006) call for more language support for those affected by the growing use of this academic lingua franca. If teachers are not aware of the significance of English to their work when accepting the post, they will not be able to sufficiently prepare to use it, even if they were willing to do so.

What Erling & Hilgendorf (2006: 284) suggest as a possible reason for the lack of support in English is that students, and presumably staff alike, are assumed to already have an adequate command of the language. This leads to the focus shifting to other foreign languages, which in itself should rightly be encouraged, but overlooking what in many cases is the most important and influential language is unwise. And while it may be a valid assumption, at least to some extent, that students have a solid background in English after language education during their school years, the “school English” can be very different to the academic English and its demands (Erling & Hilgendorf 2006: 284). The situation may be even more severe for teachers: in the worst case scenario, older teachers may not have had direct contact with English since their school years, perhaps apart from reading material written in English for their research, as discussed in 2.1. In a situation like this, even if the teacher possesses language skills in theory, lecturing and interacting in English may prove quite a challenge.

Björkman (2011: 90) offers an interesting take on the issue of language proficiency by drawing a distinction between “correct” English and “good” English, arguing that the latter does not necessarily mean that the speaker is highly proficient in the language. This offers an interesting approach to language support for ELF users, as what is seen as “good” English from a native speaker perspective may not be automatically so in an ELF setting, and vice versa. Not only are ELF speakers generally less concerned with the “correctness” of language, they often have to cope with a wide range of “good” English produced in an array of accents (Björkman 2011: 94). Hynninen (2010: 40) notes that while ELF speakers seem to be aware of L1 English correctness, they see ELF as a separate entity that works according to its own set of rules. This is significant when planning language support for students and staff communicating in ELF situations, as a language course that emphasises grammar and correct language production might not be what the participants need in the situations that they will later be put in. Furthermore, Björkman (2011: 91) argues that in an ELF setting, native speakers and other highly proficient speakers may not have such an advantage over the less proficient speakers, as those used to hearing “standard” native speaker English might struggle with understanding interlocutors with foreign accents.

2.5 Internationalisation at the University of Helsinki

In order for the reader to have background for the responses analysed in section 4 it is necessary to give an outline of the scope of internationalisation currently at play at the University. Naturally, the respondents' views are valuable in their own right, but it helps, when contemplating whether others might share their attitudes and experiences, to have a sense of the extent of international students and staff currently studying and working in this environment. Of course, the numbers listed in the following tables could also provide possible explanations for the issues brought forth by the respondents, especially when considering the positions held by the respondents and the faculties that employ them, as well as the degree level of the students they primarily teach.

Table 1 lists the numbers of international students at the University of Helsinki according to the level of degree they are currently working for, as well as the total share (5.4%) of international students out of all students enrolled at the University. It is noteworthy that the greatest shares of international students appear in post-graduate (8.3%) and doctoral (15.4%) degree takers, while the share of undergraduate international students is the lowest of all (1.6%). It is unclear whether this phenomenon is due to the lack of English-medium teaching at that level or if the lack of English-medium teaching is a result of few undergraduate international students applying to study at the University of Helsinki; most likely, they both feed off each other. For Masters and Doctoral level students, there are more options available, naturally depending on the faculty and subject.

What is not clarified in the tables is whether the figures given cover degree-seeking students only, or whether exchange students and other short-term international students are included.. It is possible that the numbers listed here only account for international students studying for a full degree at the University, which may distort the percentages and be very different to the reality of some courses taught in English.

Degree level	International students	Share of total
Lower (Undergrad.)	334	1.6%
Higher (Post-grad.)	792	8.3%
Licenciate	8	3.0%
Doctor	737	15.4%
Other **)	96	6.6%
Total	1 967	5.4%

Table 1: Number of international students at the University of Helsinki (The University of Helsinki Annual Report 2011)

**) Specialists' degrees: medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine

Another feature of interest in the structure of international students at the University is how they are divided among the faculties. This will be especially interesting later on when discussing the interviewees' responses as the number of international students at their respective faculties could help in determining why the teachers experience the role of English as they do. Looking at Table 2, we observe that in numbers, most international students can be found in the Arts (477), Science (330), Social Sciences (274) and Agriculture and Forestry (262). The Swedish School of Social Science has the lowest number of international students (8). However, in terms of their share of the total number of students in that faculty, Biological and Environmental Sciences hosts the most international students (10.5%), followed by Agriculture and Forestry (8.4%) and Medicine (7.0%).

When discussing the relevance of English-medium teaching, the share of total is particularly interesting, and Chapter 4 will illustrate how a teacher at this faculty (and another one with a history there) views this issue. One could hypothesise that where the role of foreign students is so prominent, the use of English is more familiar to staff and students alike, leading to a more open attitude towards this one, shared academic language. This is not to suggest that English-medium teaching does not come with its problems even in the Biological and Environmental Sciences – after all, there are as many attitudes towards it as there are people affected by it.

Faculty	International students	Share of total
Theology	29	1.4%
Law	68	2.8%
Medicine	222	7.0%
Arts	477	6.5%
Science	330	5.5%
Pharmacy	36	3.7%
Biological and Envir. Sc.	183	10.5%
Behavioral Sciences	54	1.3%
Social Sciences	274	6.3%
Swedish School of Social Science	8	1.6%
Agriculture and Forestry	262	8.4%
Veterinary Medicine	24	3.5%

Table 2: International students according to faculty (The University of Helsinki Annual Report 2011)

Table 3 is included to illustrate the division of foreign staff between various career levels. In the sample used for this paper, the majority of respondents represent levels 2 and 3; that is, they have a postdoctoral research position or that of a university lecturer; while none belong to level 1. Level 2 clearly accounts for the largest share of foreign staff out of the total number. It is noteworthy that the numbers generally decline when we move towards higher positions (especially level 4) while levels 1 and 2 have the highest percentages. From this it could be concluded that while foreign academics do appear to find employment at the University, it may be harder to claim a position as, say, a professor than as a postdoctoral researcher or doctoral student. Whether this is due to the status of English as an academic language is unclear, but Chapter 4 aims to provide one foreigner's perspective on how easy or difficult moving up the career ladder is for a foreign scholar

Teaching and research staff	Share of foreign staff
Research career level 4 *)	7%
Research career level 3	12%
Research career level 2	28%
Research career level 1	18%
Other teaching and research staff (fee-paid teachers)	4%
Total	16%

Table 3: Foreign teaching and research staff at the University of Helsinki (The University of Helsinki Annual Report 2011)

*) Research career levels: 4) Professor, research director, senior curator, academy professor. 3) University lecturer, clinical instructor, university researcher, senior researcher, research coordinator, curator, assistant professor. 2) Postdoctoral researcher, university instructor. 1) Doctoral student, research assistant, teaching assistant.

2.6 A language Policy for the University of Helsinki

As stated in the Introduction to this thesis, the University's Language Policy (University of Helsinki 2007) is one of the key aspects of the research project presented on these pages. It will be used both as a general frame of reference for the respondents' views and attitudes and as a document on which the respondents comment and reflect. For this, it is important to introduce to the reader the document in question, its purpose and contents, to the extent that is necessary for sufficient understanding of the extracts presented in section 4 and of the responses given to them by the teachers. In the interview situations, the contents of the Policy were used to spark discussion on issues of language and internationalisation that are more or less actively present in the respondents' professional lives. They were asked to evaluate whether the goals and principles of the Policy met their reality and whether they found room for improvement, as well as whether they were already familiar with the Policy before the interview, or even aware of its existence. The aim of this section is to provide some background on the nature of the Policy document, which could to some extent explain some of the more critical responses to it in Chapter 4.

It needs to be noted that the Language Policy document is a part of a more comprehensive Strategic Plan (2007-2009), where language and internationalisation are only one aspect of development. As stated in the Policy (University of Helsinki 2007: 42), it aims to

1. Ensure that the language used in research, teaching, administration, services and communication is rich and comprehensible.
2. Increase language awareness, emphasise multilingual capacity as a strength and encourage the use of different languages.
3. Meet the challenges brought about by increased internationalisation.
4. Secure the status and the position of Finland's national languages as languages of research and scholarship.
5. Support and strengthen the implementation of the University's bilingualism.
6. Determine the status and development targets for teaching and research undertaken in other languages.
7. Determine the languages to be used in a given situation at the University.
8. Develop opportunities deriving from partial linguistic competence, parallel language usage and multilingual working environments.

All these aims are in some way significant to the present study in understanding the current practises and teacher attitudes, but numbers 1, 2 and 7 propose particularly interesting features. Aim number 1, concerning the quality of language used, is interesting in relation to the language support aspect of both the Policy and of the interviewees in general, whereas aims 2 and 7, having to do more with general awareness of languages used at the University, are crucial to teachers and students alike who may struggle with knowing what is expected of them, language-wise. Whether these important aims are met and to what extent – that is what this study strives to investigate.

What is interesting about the nature of this particular Language Policy is that it refers to an earlier language policy document called the University of Helsinki Bilingual Programme 1997(1999) (University of Helsinki 2007: 39), which is concerned with the relationship between Finland's two national

languages and their employment in teaching and research. In ten years, the focus has shifted from a bilingual perspective to a more internationally oriented one, and the new documents acknowledge the role of English as well as the presence of other foreign languages, and the potential that foreign languages have in “enriching” the university environment (University of Helsinki 2007: 40). The new Policy (University of Helsinki 2007) does pay attention to the bilingual aspect of the University and the responsibility of preserving the two national languages (University of Helsinki 2007: 43), but internationalisation is clearly the word of the moment.

In an ELF setting such as the University of Helsinki, the question of which language students use when, for example, writing their theses or even essays for individual courses is not all that straightforward (University of Helsinki 2007: 45), nor is it expected to be. In situations where students alternate between two (or more) languages depending on the task, the teacher might have to adopt the role of a language advisor as well (University of Helsinki 2007: 46); that is, he or she needs to be able to guide the students sufficiently in using not only the primary language of instruction but all of the languages that the students are allowed and inclined to use. This could lead to further difficulties if the teacher in question is not comfortable with his or her own language proficiency in the first place. The University appears to strive to create an enriched, multicultural academic environment through the use of several languages even simultaneously, but the flipside of this ambitious goal is, of course, the fact that it has the potential of creating further confusion among students and staff alike.

3. Material and methodology

3.1 Material

The University of Helsinki Language Policy (2007: 45) states that “teachers teaching in English and students studying in English-language programmes will be offered language support which aims to improve their ability to interact in English in a multicultural academic environment”. This is one of the key statements that the present study is based upon, in a variety of ways. The research subjects were chosen from the participants of a Teaching Through English (TTE) course, organised by the University’s Language Services. The course was aimed for teaching staff who wished to improve their English and pedagogical skills for the purposes of teaching in English – in short, one form of the kind of language support the Language Policy promises, and a course very similar to that studied by Airey (2011). As a part of the SELF (Studying in English as a Lingua Franca) project (2009) at the University of Helsinki, the course sessions were recorded and partially transcribed, and additionally, background information on the participants’ needs was collected by the Language Services (see Appendix B). The course involved exercises, discussions and, most importantly, “pilot lectures” given by each participant in order to prepare for actual EMI teaching situations. It was by studying this material that I came to contact the participants regarding further research, as I expected them to have interesting insights both into teaching in English in General and in the University’s language support.

The primary data this research is based on are the interviews conducted between November, 2011, and January, 2012, with roughly half (5) of the TTE course participants. The interviews were partially built upon the TTE course data mentioned earlier in the sense that some of the questions are the result of issues raised during course discussions and the needs table (Appendix B). As far as the course needs are concerned, the most challenging tasks for the participants seem to have been communicating with students in the teaching situation, orally, and only one participant lists written communication as particularly difficult. Increasing one’s knowledge of subject-specific vocabulary and “sound[ing] professional” are also among teachers’ goals, and there are several participants

who admit to having very little or no previous experience in English-medium teaching. In addition to the teachers' teaching practises and general attitudes towards the English language and using ELF in teaching, a key factor in the interviews is the Language Policy of the University of Helsinki, and the teachers' views on it. Naturally, the Language Policy itself is also a significant source of material for the study, and is discussed and analysed alongside with the interview results.

	Nationality	Discipline
T1	Finnish	Swedish School of Social Sciences
T2	Finnish	Agriculture and forestry
T3	Finnish	History
T4	Finnish	Education / Biosciences
T5	Italian	Geography

Table 4: Basic information on respondents

Table 4 provides some very general information on the five respondents. The aim is to give the reader a preliminary understanding of the respondents' backgrounds in terms of their academic orientation and level as well as their nationality – in other words, information corresponding with that given in tables 2 and 3 (Section 2.4). It is, however, important to not provide too much detailed information on the respondents, not only to preserve a degree of anonymity but also to avoid the temptation of making generalisations based on a respondent's age or research interests. With the qualitative approach and small sample size, that is not the aim, and rather than using detailed demographic information to attempt to understand the respondents' attitudes, the study at hand wishes to allow the respondents room to explain their attitudes in their own words as much as they can.

3.2 Research methodology

The data collection method chosen for this study – interviews – is a qualitative one, and the sampling used for data collection is quite straightforwardly convenience sampling, since the starting point is a collection of already-existing (but unused) data, and the subjects for the interviews are the same teachers that appear in that data. In addition, it can be seen as homogenous sampling as well, since the criteria for choosing these particular subjects for the upcoming interviews is that they all attended the same TTE course, which is used as a common thread in analysing their responses. Of those teachers, the interviewees were selected by the simple method of availability, as some of them no longer work at the University or live in the area. Those who were willing to participate all still work at the University and teach in English at least to some extent, so all of them were selected.

One subject expressed an interest in being interviewed even though he had not been teaching. Although his input would probably have been an interesting addition to the existing material, his lack of English-medium (or any) teaching experience would not have benefited the study in the desired way. One issue that surfaced during the sampling stage of the project was that of the 12 participants in the TTE course, three were non-Finnish, and of those three only one is still actively teaching at the University. It would have been very interesting to speak to more of them in order to gain a broader perspective on the matter of how it is for a foreigner to teach in Finland, but it is fortunate that there is at least the one non-Finnish respondent to provide a foreigner's perspective.

The interviews that were carried out were semi-structured (Dörnyei 2007: 136), based on a pre-prepared set of questions but open to issues the interviewees wished to bring up themselves (see Appendix A for interview questions). This serves the purpose of answering questions on attitudes relatively well, as the prepared questions were first of all designed to provoke the interviewees to think about certain aspects of their work and language use, but often they would end up talking about a certain matter more than anything else, showing clearly that for them, this was the most prominent aspect of using English in teaching. In this sense, the interview “resembled a conversation” (Erling & Bartlett 2006: 14) to

some extent, as the respondents' answers often directed the interview towards discussing a related topic.

The interviews also influenced each other by bringing up new themes for discussion. For example, one person (T2) felt that teaching in English in her field meant that the Finnish students were no longer made familiar with the key terminology in Finnish, thus compromising the status of Finnish as a language of science. Her observations were later used in other interviews to see how the other teachers viewed the same issue. Another respondent (T3) spent a considerable amount of time talking about his time teaching abroad, which initially answered the question of whether the subject had spent time abroad and how that had influenced them, but also gave a different perspective on the matter than that of those whose teaching experience had been acquired in Finland. And while he could not reflect on his teaching practices to the same extent as the other respondents, he was also able to offer views on the more general issue of EMI.

The interviews that were carried out strongly support the chosen data collection method. A structured interview (Dörnyei 2007: 135) would not work in these circumstances, as I am interested in the subjects' personal experiences, and those experiences may be ones I have not even considered when compiling my list of questions. It was important to acknowledge the researcher's inexperience as an interviewer and realise that the most interesting results would probably be achieved by allowing the interviewees to focus on issues they find relevant in their own lives. On the other hand, a completely unstructured interview is also out of the question, because I did have particular questions (for example, the participants' take on the Language Policy) which the respondents would have been unlikely to answer on their own, unprovoked. In the first interview I noticed that a couple of the questions I had prepared did not feel relevant anymore once looked at in the interview context, and I was happy to revise my questions based on this interview in order to focus on the "right things" in the upcoming ones. These questions were not, however, eliminated altogether after the first interview, because there was the possibility that other interviewees would find them more relevant. There was no real pilot interview (Dörnyei 2007: 137) in the sense that all the interviews that were carried out were used in the study, but the first interview served the pilot purpose well enough.

Fortunately, the interviewees all had a positive attitude towards the study and were quite happy to share their views. What most likely has influenced their attitude towards participating in this research is that the TTE course was also recorded for research purposes, and they feel confident enough that the data will not be used in a way that would in any way be an inconvenience to them or a violation to their privacy. Of course, being so eager to participate, there were moments during the interviews when the interviewees seemed quite determined to talk about an issue close to their heart even though it was not one I was particularly interested in. I did, however, get answers to my questions and at this point, before beginning the actual analysis part of my research, I am rather satisfied with the material I have in terms of variety and depth.

As for the qualitative methodology, for the purposes of this study this approach seems most appropriate. The idea is to delve deeper into the reasons behind some of the problematic issues – and equally, the advantages – that teachers teaching in ELF have encountered and to focus on the teachers on an individual level. I feel that one of the strengths of this study is that on the one hand, the subjects represent a homogenous group (all attended the TTE course), but on the other, they have very varied backgrounds, both in terms of the subject they teach and do research on and in terms of their language history. The only thing common to all of them, in addition to having attended the same course, is that they do not have a background in linguistics, which is of key importance when the issue of objectivity is raised.

As with data collection, data analysis for this study was also conducted in a qualitative manner. After completing the interview stage, the next step was to transcribe the interviews in order to acquire a thorough understanding of them and also to have the material in a form that makes it easy to refer to in the actual analysis. Because this study does not focus on the language used by the participants, the transcriptions are rather broader than those used to analyse linguistic aspects of the interviewees' speech. Four of the five subjects were interviewed in Finnish, and relevant parts of the transcriptions of those interviews were then translated into English (see Appendix C for original Finnish quotes). In some cases, when necessary for the intelligibility of the interview excerpt, the language was slightly standardised, all the while ensuring that the contents and tone remained intact. When it comes to analysing interview material, Briggs

(1986: 102) notes that a common mistake made during the process is to assume “that different responses to roughly the same question are comparable”, which may easily distort and simplify results. Attempts have been made to avoid this in the course of analysing material for the present study, and the intention has been to look at the interview extracts not merely as answers to questions, but rather as independent statements that have only been provoked by the initial question.

The benefit of interviewing mainly Finnish teachers was that I was able to interview them *in* Finnish, in their first language, and thus they were able to talk about their thoughts and attitudes without being affected by the use of a second language. In one case, however, the interviewee was Italian, and thus we used English as a lingua franca not only as the topic of the interview, but as the medium of communication between interviewer and interviewee as well. In this case it was important to establish that the objective of the study was in no way to evaluate the teacher’s own language competence, as it might have otherwise proven problematic. Fortunately, the teacher in question was used to communicating in English as she could hardly expect most UH students and staff to speak her L1, and the language spoken in the interview situation remained a matter of little importance. Of course, it would have been interesting and possibly more fruitful to interview this teacher in her L1 as well, but I do not believe that this contributed too negatively on the interview outcome.

3.3 Methodological limitations

What can be seen as a limitation of this study is the qualitative approach and subsequent small sample size. That means that the results are not generalisable as such, because they do not speak for “all” of the teachers teaching in English at the University of Helsinki, and hence the suggested changes in the University’s Language Policy might be brushed off with the argument that they only represent individual teachers’ opinions. However, as the purpose of this study is precisely to gain an understanding of individual teachers’ experiences of English-medium teaching, a qualitative study is exactly what is needed to answer this question in an in-depth way. A questionnaire sent out to a much larger sample would have

served in attempting to see how the teachers' views corresponded with one another, but a questionnaire could easily turn into a more black-and-white take on attitudes: who is for internationalisation and Anglicisation, who is against it.

As for practical issues, the chosen method of approach – interview – is definitely more time-consuming than, say, sending out a questionnaire. However, this was taken into consideration when deciding upon data collection and analysis methods. What could be seen as a limitation of this study is the inexperience of the researcher, as an interviewer as well as in terms of linguistic research in general. The fact that I only included a few participants, albeit out of necessity, in the interview portion of the study means that the interviews I have conducted needed to be successful and manage to answer the questions that are relevant for the study. However, none of the potentially problematic issues raised here should be seen as compromising the integrity of the study, and the findings should be considered to be in line with the chosen methodology and research questions. All of the methodological choices were made for a reason, and that reason is to achieve the goals set in the Introduction.

4. Results

The interviews conducted with teachers at the University of Helsinki were approached, broadly speaking, from two angles. The first, more extensive portion of each interview was spent on general questions about the teacher's teaching practises, language use, and of course, the Teaching Through English course they all attended. After this, the interviewees were asked to respond to a number of extracts taken from the University of Helsinki Language Policy, addressing issues related to the use of English as an academic lingua franca.

In the course of the interviews and the analysis of the interview recordings, it soon became apparent that the two parts of the interviews were, in fact, rather intertwined. The problems and benefits of teaching in English that were raised in answer to the more general questions were to some extent repeated, or re-approached, when the Language Policy was introduced. In addition, there were issues that were not covered in the limited number of Policy extracts, but that nevertheless appear in some form or another in the complete Language Policy. Thus, it seemed sensible to use the Language Policy as the backbone of the entire analysis, instead of simply referring to it occasionally.

The analysis itself consists of several subsections, each dedicated to a specific theme found in the University of Helsinki Language Policy. The analysis is built around each of these themes so that the interview extracts discussed are drawn from both the interviewees' direct responses to quotes from the Language Policy and their answers to more general questions about the role of English in their work. In some cases, the theme has not been explicitly discussed with the interviewee in relation to the Language Policy, but in these cases their responses still highlight issues that the Language Policy also addresses.

4.1 Teachers' familiarity with the Language Policy

Before the teachers were introduced to aspects of the Language Policy, they were asked whether they had heard of it before the interview, or perhaps even read it. This was important in order to establish some understanding of if and how the Policy was being made known to teaching staff at the University. The hypothesis,

stemming from earlier discussions with both teachers and students who had never heard of or seen the Policy, was that teachers would not be very familiar with the document or its contents, and it proved correct in the interview situations. A couple of them, however, had some thoughts as to what its implications might be, such as,

Quote 1.1

T4: No I'm not familiar with it, if you were to ask me what the Language Policy is I would say that everyone has the right to use Finnish, English or Swedish, whichever language they want. If someone asked me to prepare a test I'm prepared to give the questions in Swedish, English and Finnish but not in other languages.

Other answers were more straightforwardly in line with the original hypothesis, such as:

Quote 1.2

R: Are you familiar with the university's language policy?

T5: Er

R: Have you read it or..?

T5: I haven't read any any policy paper.

In the following sections, we come to see that the Language Policy "paper" is not the only University document T5 has had a hard time accessing, and in this sense her response is unsurprising. Like T4, T3 has a vague idea about what the University's approach to languages might be, but he is clearly unsure as to whether this really is the University's policy, as he has not read the actual document.

Quote 1.3

T3: No idea, I know that if someone wants their exam questions in Swedish I will do that and ask my colleague to check them, and I know a bit or it could be that I'm confusing policies but that everyone has the right to have the exam questions and write their answers in their first language

In all cases the extent of the interviewees' knowledge was limited mainly to the role of Finland's national languages and to language use in exam situations, and so introducing them to some of the points the policy makes about English was interesting in that they were responding to the claims intuitively, without having too much time to think about it.

4.2 The role of English at the University of Helsinki

In studying attitudes towards English as a lingua franca (ELF) in an academic environment, it is important to first establish what ELF means in this particular setting. This is why the interviewees were first asked to respond to a more general statement the Language Policy makes about the role of English at the university, and also to the reasons that are said to be behind this phenomenon.

In the objectives of the Language Policy it is stated that

The environment in which the University operates is becoming more international, and the English language, the academic *lingua franca*. The multicultural and multilingual academic environment are a source of enrichment for members of the University community; thus, the role of foreign languages should be acknowledged. The University of Helsinki has to be an attractive option for foreign students, teachers and researchers. The objective is to combine internationalisation with the University's responsibility for Finland's two national languages.

Extract 1 (University of Helsinki 2007: 41)

This statement received divided responses: some interviewees passed it without further ado, like in the case of T1:

Quote 2.1

T1: Yeah I agree with it that's fine

T1 tends to give very brief replies to questions throughout the interview, and this as well as many other quotes can be interpreted in at least two different ways. It is possible that she simply agrees with the Policy and finds nothing to criticise, and

her reply to the first extract (Quote 2.1) would certainly suggest this. However, after a moment her attitude becomes much more pronounced:

Quote 2.2

T1: But forced internationalisation that's wrong, you know forcing it on people and that English is somehow automatically better, that's not the case. And also something we see in research now is that people are writing in English even to a Finnish audience, that leads to pretty how should I say it pretty pathetic ...

Of course, here the issue of Finns writing in English to other Finns was raised, which rather exceeds the traditional definition of ELF as a language used by speakers who do not share a language, but it is noteworthy how strongly T1 feels about English being “forced” upon people. What might explain this change in tone is something expressed by another interviewee:

Quote 2.3

T5: Yeah I think it's a it's a very nice wishing list.

T5 is the most critical of the respondents towards the Language Policy, and her definition of the Policy as a “wishing list” can be seen to refer to the rather optimistic depiction of the role of English at the University. This optimistic tone might be what is behind the rather positive first impressions by some of the interviewees, who start to inspect it more critically only after more specific implications of the Policy are introduced.

Some of the interviewees responded to the first extract by relating English to other foreign languages, such as German or French, and even here, the opinions varied from each other quite a bit:

Quote 2.4

T4: Both in Biosciences and now in University Pedagogy the language of research is English (...) I wouldn't even try to read pedagogical publications for example in French anymore so in a way the fact that we have one mutual international language I'm one of those people who want English because it would be

impossible ... I mean I have no idea about publications in German, French and I will never read them

Here, T4 represents someone who not only acknowledges but actually embraces the idea of English as an academic lingua franca, and due to English being the language of research in both her previous and current field she feels that having the majority of material in one, common language benefits the academic community.

To complicate matters further, T2 expresses a contrasting wish:

Quote 2.5

T2: I agree [with the Policy] for the most part and in fact I'd like it if they had more courses in German and Swedish and such for members of the staff like me who'd like to brush up on their language skills

T2, although she agrees with the general idea of the Policy, does not wish to exclude other languages but rather would like to improve her knowledge of both Swedish as the other national language, and German. In the conclusion of the interview, she also emphasises that

Quote 2.6

T2: I would like to see more options

R: What options?

T2: Language options and also something to help you maintain the language skills you've acquired in languages other than English

R: Right

T2: That's something the University doesn't really support you with at the moment

However, she does point out that while German once was a prominent language of publication in her field, it has now “disappeared completely”, so her motives for wishing that the role of German be reinforced seem to be more related to the general language proficiency than the benefits of knowing German (or other languages) in the academic world.

As a foreign teacher, T5's take on the Language Policy is in many ways different from those of her Finnish colleagues. As she does not speak Finnish or

Swedish, English is the only working language for her at the University, and thus puts her in a radically different position.

Quote 2.7

T5: I think that still we're a bit behind

R: OK in what ways?

T5: In the ways that maybe because we are still pioneers we are a minority so that everything is in Finnish particularly I can see that there are some post-graduate students from abroad but the structure in the staff, there are still too few foreigners to transform the working language into English

If we consider the part of Extract 1 that states that “the University of Helsinki has to be an attractive option for foreign students, teachers and researchers” in the light of T5’s comments, she seems to suggest that while the University can be attractive to foreign teaching staff, for example, it is still very much a Finnish university and the position of teachers who rely only on English is inferior to that of native Finnish teachers. T5 feels the effects of her “pioneer” status even financially, as she states that

Quote 2.8

T5: I'm also losing lot of potential benefits or potential changes you know even in the fact that there are a lot of grants advertised and everything all the papers are in Finnish (...) I have been applying to a few but even in the beginning you know three or four years ago and strangely I didn't get even feedback or because I think that also not everybody is ready to support a foreigner

So while the University’s official policy is that multiculturalism and multilingualism “are a source of enrichment” (Extract 1), T5 suggests that foreigners are not met with the consideration they, in her opinion, deserve, and that the inequalities between Finnish and foreign staff are still considerable. What is of key importance is what T5 herself points out in her argument, which is that the number of foreigners is still too small to actually make English “the working language” at the University.

4.3 Relevance of English to teachers' own work

Having established the role of English at the University and in academia in general, the interviewees were asked to think more specifically about the role of English in their own work, in the light of the following statement:

Teaching in foreign languages can be included in studies when it is meaningful from the point of view of arranging the teaching or in order to meet learning targets.

Extract 2 (University of Helsinki 2007: 45)

Whilst acknowledging the role of English at the University in general, the respondents were less unanimous about the role of English in their work specifically. T4 is consistent with her prior statement (Quote 2.4) as far as the significance of English in academic settings is concerned, but her response also highlights a problem:

Quote 3.1

R: How important do you think English is for your work?

T4: It's extremely important and I actually suffer from my English not being so good, especially in writing, because I have to write all my research in English and it's really clumsy and I can see that it's not good but I can't really fix it.

What is interesting about T4 is that while she recognises that there is a conflict between what is asked of her and what she is capable of, she does not see that the problem is in the need to use English, but rather in her own language proficiency.

T3 provides a very different angle on the relevance of English:

Quote 3.2

T3: Of course international scientific communication [is done in English] and to some extent with international Masters students but mainly like I said it's Finnish as at our department most of the teaching is in Finnish all in all not a lot of teaching in English.

T3 stands out from the other four respondents in that most of his teaching occurs in Finnish, and his statement suggest that he, at least, uses English only when it is absolutely necessary.

4.4 Preparedness to take on teaching in English

Having discussed the role of English in the respondents' work, it is also worthwhile to determine how they first came to teach in English; in other words, whether they were aware of the need to teach in English when they were offered their current position at the University. The Language Policy does not address this issue directly, only through statements such as,

By determining a Language Policy, the University seeks to increase language awareness, emphasise multilingual capacity as a strength and encourage the use of different languages.

Extract 3 (University of Helsinki 2007: 42)

One important aspect of EMI, particularly in relation to the possible need for language support (Section 4.6), is how teachers are informed of and prepared for the upcoming task of teaching in English. The Policy (Extract 3) addresses this, although not explicitly, by mentioning concepts such as “language awareness” and “encourag[ing] the use of different languages”. An important part of language awareness, it would seem, is making teachers aware of the language(s) in which they are expected to work.

When asked whether the interviewees were aware of the need to teach in English at least to some extent, the responses were rather unanimous, illustrated here by T2.

Quote 4.1

R: When you took this job and came here was it always clear you would be teaching in English or did the need only arise later?

T2: Apparently it was discussed before I even came here and then I was asked if I could teach in Swedish if necessary, and I thought about it and I didn't know, maybe I could if I had to.

R: But having to teach in English didn't come as a surprise?

T2: No.

From T2's response we can gather that the issue of English-medium teaching is not something that was actively discussed with her, judging by her use of the word "apparently", but she was nevertheless unsurprised about the need to teach in English. What is more, she remembers being asked if it was possible for her to teach in Swedish as well, and it is this she seems to have been more apprehensive about than teaching in English.

T4's response also speaks of a more than adequate preparation period and a satisfaction with the way in which she came to be teaching in English.

R: Have you felt that you've "had to" teach in English?

T4: No, I actually don't "have to" do anything, or it's still so new, this whole job, that I've sort of been able to create it myself so no one would ever have demanded that I teach even that first course or this second one actually there were people asking so it was that pressure but nothing from my superiors or some sort of planning, it came from the students who were asking if we could organise it

To T4, the thought of having been put into an EMI situation against her will seems extremely far-fetched, as she has been more or less able to dictate her own job description. She dismisses the idea of having been coerced into it by superiors and instead credits her second EMI teaching experience to students. In this case, using English as the medium of instruction appears to stem from actual need and demand, and T4 seems happy to have catered to that need.

4.5 English and Finland's national languages

One issue that is prominent in both the Language Policy and the teachers' responses is the relationship between English as the global language and Finland's two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. The Policy itself states that

Arranging teaching in English supports the educational targets set by the University *without undermining the position of Finland's national languages*.

Extract 3 (University of Helsinki 2007: 43; emphasis added)

This clearly divided opinions in the interviews. T2, for one, feels quite strongly about this particular matter, and she has first-hand experience of the problems the use of English may cause to the position of the national languages, and to the quality of teaching in general:

Quote 5.1

T2: One way in which the quality of teaching probably suffers is when now our Master's courses are completely in English and our Finnish students no longer know the relevant terminology in Finnish because everything's in English so they don't have to find out what they are

This is an issue that T2 found important enough to mention even before she was introduced to the Language Policy and its statements.

Quote 5.2

T2: Maybe it doesn't undermine the position of the national languages but maybe a bit and like I said it's the terminology that's problematic I don't know maybe it's the same in other fields but at least in ours

When reflecting on T2's answers to other questions regarding the lingua franca status of English, it can hardly be said that her attitude towards the phenomenon in general is negative. Thus, the fact that she repeatedly point out this issue of field-specific terminology not being taught to students in their native language

would seem to indicate that this is something she is genuinely concerned about, and not just complaining because she is generally dissatisfied with “having” to use English.

Consequently, the issue of terminology is one that is also addressed in the Language Policy:

When introducing teaching and learning objectives for students participating in courses given in English *it is essential that students be aware of the terminology used in their field in both national languages, as required.*

Extract 4 (University of Helsinki 2007: 45; emphasis added)

At first glance, the tone of the Policy is certainly more optimistic than what T2’s account of the actual situation suggests. However, what the policy actually states about students’ knowledge of terminology in the national languages being “essential” is in fact perfectly in line with T2’s concerns (Quote 5.1, 5.2): she, too, feels that it is essential that Finnish students learn the relevant terminology in their native language, even though this need is not being met in reality. It is difficult to ignore T5’s earlier remark about the Policy being a “wishing list” (Quote 2.3). Again, it would seem that the Policy merely provides guidelines and suggestions that, on their own, sound reasonable to say the least, but the Policy does not explicitly express what the University intends to do to ensure that these guidelines are met.

Not everyone shares T2’s concerns (Quote 5.1), however.

Quote 5.3

T4: I don’t really see how it would suffer I don’t see it as a threat

and when asked about the issue that was raised by T2, of whether the use of English had led to a decline in knowledge of Finnish terminology, T4 has a very contrasting view on the matter.

Quote 5.4

T4: well where would they need them I don't see it as a problem I feel they know the terminology they need and for students today it's more the other way around ... coming to the University they have to work hard to learn the English ones and it's a struggle and the problem isn't that they don't know the Finnish terminology but the problem is that they don't know the English they need to be able to work in the field ... and the [Finnish terminology] is pretty easy to learn if they know the topic

T4 is consistently (Quote 2.4) in favour of English as the one academic language, and it also shows in her lack of concern for teaching students the Finnish equivalents of relevant terminology.

In passing, T2 points out another potentially problematic feature of ELF at the University. When speaking about the challenges of terminology, she mentions that

Quote 5.5

T2: reading Master's theses I've noticed that they have no idea about the Finnish equivalents for certain terms

R: right so they write their theses mainly in Finnish

T2: yes the Finnish students mainly write them in Finnish we have maybe one Finnish student every few years writing in English

Here we come across an important question: what, then, are the benefits of running an English-medium Master's programme, if indeed the Finnish students participating in it still write their theses in Finnish, which in turn requires extensive knowledge of the topic in Finnish?

4.6 Language support for teachers

Having thus far established that English does have a rather prominent role at the University of Helsinki, the following statement in the Policy certainly deserves to

be mentioned, and what is more, given its due attention when studying the attitudes of teachers towards teaching in English:

Teachers teaching in English and students studying in English-language programmes will be offered language support which aims to improve their ability to interact in English in a multicultural academic environment.

Extract 5 (University of Helsinki 2007: 45)

During the interviews, the teachers were asked to think back to the time before the course and recall their reasons for attending it in the first place. For T1, the reasons were twofold:

Quote 6.1

T1: I was looking for a course because I had no teaching experience

R: So was it more for the pedagogical reasons than for the language?

T1: Well I specifically wanted an English course (...) and also for the terminology, so the language was definitely a contributing factor, too

Rather than attending the course because she felt that her English was deficient, T1 admits to attending the course because it offered pedagogical support *in English*. What is more, T5 also mentions the pedagogical benefits she gained through attending the course:

Quote 6.2

T5: I was about to leave my work in Italy and I wanted to have more stimulus and tips and you know and it was useful actually

R: So you found it useful?

T5: Yeah I found it useful not only because of the language but also because it was the first time I was in a pedagogical course so I appreciated a lot the pedagogical tools that were given there which I never had before

The difference is that T5 appears to have become aware of the pedagogical aspects of the course while or after attending, while T1 (Quote 6.1) clearly states that she sought support specifically for this reason.

T4 gives a concrete example on how she feels her teaching in English has improved in the course of a few years:

Quote 6.3

T4: [three years ago] I felt very limited by the language and I remember being exhausted from the teaching, so I didn't even really want to organise that course again. Well this autumn we had the same course and I was anxious about getting really tired again and I didn't really prepare for it and thought come what may but I actually didn't find [the language] limiting at all, I wasn't more tired than usual. And I remember three years ago when I got tired I used to get these where I'd completely forget the word "teacher" or something like that.

Of course, she does not explicitly say that the improvement is due to the course she attended, but the course does fall in between the two teaching experiences she mentions, which could indicate a correlation.

Again, T3 has a very different approach to the matter at hand:

Quote 6.4

T3: I attended the course because I was going to leave for Canada for a teaching position for one academic year and knowing that I'd have to teach and well English was never my strong point, and I felt that I had to improve it, so I attended three different courses, this teaching in English course, and also a course in speaking English, and a suggestopedia course.

This time, he differs from the others in that he sought support for a teaching position in an English-speaking country and not for his work in Finland. He is also the only respondent who attended other courses in addition to the TTE course. When asked how the courses affected his language skills, T3's reflections on both the effect of the courses and that of his stay abroad sometimes overlap (see also Quote 10.1), but his satisfaction with the courses is nevertheless apparent from the following:

Quote 6.5

T3: The speaking style [...] is sort of transferred into written communication as is and you can see it's not necessarily formal so I couldn't send out an application like that to an English workplace. But then again, that wasn't my goal, I specifically wanted a chance to develop understanding and self-expression, otherwise I would have attended different courses

Here, he first refers to the negative effect his stay in Canada and subsequent acquisition of more fluent spoken English has had on his written communication skills, but quickly corrects that it never was his goal to improve the "correctness" of his English, which is why he chose to attend the course that he did. It seems that the combination of time spent in an English-speaking country and several carefully selected courses were able to meet his needs satisfactorily. We need to bear in mind that he attended the courses *because* he was about to leave for Canada,

The fact that T3 was able to attend several courses that he found helpful is of importance when considering T1's following response:

Quote 6.6

T1: I probably would have attended a second course if one had been available but I wasn't aware of any

T3's statement (Quote 5.4) suggests that additional courses would have been available, but for some reason T1 did not find them. Whether the courses attended by T3 would have corresponded with the additional course T1 had in mind is, of course, unclear. It may well be that as T3, about to take on a teaching position abroad, had a more acute need to improve his skills and was thus more active in searching for courses that could meet his needs, whereas T1 had a more general goal in improving her skills.

When asked about the need for further support, T4 admits that she would not mind help in her language use, but finds it difficult to see how the kind of support she would like could be made possible.

Quote 6.7

T4: Of course there are not enough resources to hold everyone's hand but the best kind of support is always having someone in your work community to go to for help and support. But our structures are constantly moving to a different direction, where the support is centred. And you have to send e-mails in this code language and then eventually you get a response, so if there was a choice you would have an English teacher or other expert inside the community who would teach courses and build it there, that's what it's like in reality, those moments and you can't prepare for them by attending a course five years earlier (...) But as far as support in course form is concerned, I think we have a great supply of that

While T4 is happy with the amount of language support courses, such as the TTE course she herself attended, she finds that the most acute need for support would be better fulfilled by having support staff working side by side with teachers and researchers so that they could turn to that person whenever they are facing a problem. She acknowledges that this would be difficult to realise, but in her opinion, attending a course to find help for a specific problem would require recognising that problem before it even arises, and this is the downside of support courses.

4.7 Teaching in English as opposed to teaching in L1

Developing and increasing the range of programmes taught in English is an integral part of creating an international learning environment. This will be enhanced by the presence of different values, worldviews and argumentative styles within teaching and learning. The cultural dimension and interaction between cultures will be incorporated into teaching, mentoring and the provision of services.

Extract 6 (University of Helsinki 2007: 43)

When questioning the respondents about their views on English-medium teaching, having them compare it to teaching in their first language was used in order to

further understand what they perceived as challenging. T1 preferred the former to the latter.

Quote 7.1

R: Do you find that teaching in English requires different kind of preparation than teaching in your L1?

T1: Well I'd say that it's almost easier because the source material all the literature is in English, so it's a much bigger job, like right now I'm writing an article in Finnish, I'm struggling to find the words and I almost have to look up how to translate it so I quite think that having to translate it into Finnish or Swedish is more work.

Slightly unexpectedly, T1 is less bothered by teaching in a foreign language than by teaching in her L1 using material written in that foreign language. It appears that to her, consistency in the language used is more important than the language being her L1.

T5, on the other hand, sees the difference between teaching in English and teaching in her L1 as having to do with more than just language. When asked if the former required different kind of preparation or effort than the latter, her response was:

Quote 7.2

T5: Not particularly because of the language I think that culturally it's different but I don't think that the difference refer to the difference of language but I think that the difference pertain more to the target group that is different from what I was used to. So the Finnish students are different from the students I was dealing with before.

Rather than attribute different kind of teaching experiences to the language used in the teaching situation, T5 feels that her teaching is more affected by the culture her students represent, and the conventions that prevail in each culture. So, similarly to T1 (Quote 7.1), English as the medium of instruction does not appear to be a cause for major problems. T4, on the other hand, finds teaching in English difficult for communicative purposes:

Quote 7.3

R: How do you feel [teaching in English] differs from teaching in Finnish, what are the major differences?

T4: Maybe it's something you may not be prepared for, which is not understanding what the students are saying, which is quite essential. Texts are fine, but my teaching is very interactive.

As interaction with her students is a major component of T4's work, she reports that her teaching suffers from the fact that she is not always able to understand them properly. She attributes this to her own insufficient language skills, but as seen in Section 4.8, there is another side to this. As far as preparing for teaching situations is concerned, T4 does not find preparing for teaching in English significantly more time-consuming or challenging, and she tries to

Quote 7.4

T4: When I teach in Finnish I usually don't stick so much to the material, I use more or less the same material and I update the Finnish and the English according to one another translate from one language to the other but [in English] I stick more to the rhythm of the material and emphasise and repeat some of the terminology but other than that, it's more or less the same

The key difference for T4 in terms of preparing and using material in teaching situations is the fact that she feels the need to emphasise key terms more in English and she also relies more on the material, whereas in Finnish she finds herself speaking more freely and adds her own input to the prepared slides in the moment. However, she attempts to form a "dialogue" between her Finnish and English slides instead of the English being merely a translation of the "original" Finnish material.

4.8 The effect of students' language proficiency and attitudes

Good language usage is the responsibility of every member of the university community. University teachers should promote high-quality language usage by setting an example. In this respect, all teachers are also language teachers. All students are responsible for improving their own communication skills in writing and speaking both in their mother tongue and in other languages.

Extract 7 (University of Helsinki 2007: 46)

Although the study is mainly concerned with the attitudes and experiences of teachers regarding their teaching practices as well as language proficiency and confidence in using English, the effect of students' attitudes and language proficiency should not be overlooked. This is why the respondents were also given a chance to reflect on the proficiency level of their students as well as how the students had responded to English-medium teaching. As suggested in Extract 7, teachers should ideally function as language teachers in addition to teaching their own subject, and students are also expected to ensure that the language they use is of a high standard. When asked about the effect of students' language proficiency, T4 felt that the problems that arose were as much due to her insufficient skills as they were to those of her students:

Quote 8.1

T4: When there are students from all over the world, like one from each country, and the level of their language skills varies quite a lot, and also their accents, for example an Indian or a Chinese accent is more challenging, and also because my own language proficiency level is not good enough to get the point right away

As much as she recognises that the students, coming from very different backgrounds, are not always proficient enough in English, she also admits that her own English skills are not sufficient to understand people who have a very distinctive accent (see also Quote 7.3). What is more, she goes on to explain that

Quote 8.2

T4: The common factor is that most of them don't speak English very well, and then there are those who speak it really well as their first language, so it's the mixture of your ears just having got used to Indian English and then someone comes along with a British accent, and it feels like they are two different languages.

Here, the problem seems to be more in the accent and pronunciation than in the correctness of English spoken by various students: an Indian accent as well as a British accent requires some getting used to.

Meanwhile, T5 considers the language capacity of her students here to be generally of high standard, especially when compared to students in Italy.

Quote 8.3

R: In general do you feel that their language skills are good enough for studying in English?

T5: Yes not all of them but the majority

R: And the problems are the problems mainly cultural or just that they don't know the language well enough?

T5: Yes I think that they don't feel confident perhaps but I think that compared for instance to the Italian students who have studied English, here the knowledge is much better

To her, the problem lies more in the students' lack of confidence in using English rather than in their actual proficiency level. She goes on to elaborate that the problems she has observed have to do with the students' attitude towards internationalisation:

Quote 8.4

R: So you still feel that there is room for improvement?

T5: Yes yes of course, also I think there is room particularly in the international attitude because I mean from aside it's important that Finland keeps its identity and culture [...] I have realised for instance despite of the fact that I'm responsible for a specific part of the discipline there are students who don't maybe choose to finish their Master's thesis or Bachelor's essays in my discipline because it's in English so that's why it's a bit of a limitation

T5 is concerned not necessarily about developing the students' language skills but their confidence (Quote 8.3) and subsequently a more open attitude towards internationalisation and the concept of English as the global language of science.

Adding to the discussion concerning how student attitudes towards internationalisation and EMI are manifested in the classroom, T3 reflects on the differences between generations.

Quote 8.5

T3: The current generation of students are in a completely different league than mine when it comes to language proficiency, many of them have been on exchange and language courses and language education as a whole is completely different to when I was in school, we listened to recordings maybe once a month, you didn't necessarily speak at all in English class, and how are you supposed to learn the language then, it was all about grammar.

Although most of his teaching in Finland occurs in Finnish, he has a clear idea about the current state of English proficiency among Finnish students. He recognises the role of international mobility and the shift in language education from a grammar-based teaching style towards a more interactive one as contributing positively to the English proficiency of today's youth.

4.9 Effect of time spent abroad on language proficiency and confidence

Language skills are a means to understanding foreign cultures and for making the Finnish culture known to others. The University promotes the language proficiency of its students and staff as well as supports their knowledge of different cultures. Multilingual and multicultural communities promote creative thinking.

Extract 8 (University of Helsinki 2007: 40)

Although the main interest of the present study is how internationalisation manifests itself in the Finnish context, an important part of the phenomenon is also "promot[ing] the language proficiency of [the] students and staff" and "support[ing] their knowledge of different cultures" (Extract 9), and in order to

achieve this, international mobility needs to be a two-way street. With this in mind, the teachers were also asked to reflect on their (possible) stays abroad and how that had affected their ability or confidence to use English as a working language.

Quote 9.1

T3: At least my spouse, who herself has very good English skills, said, having heard me speak English after this whole process, she said that it's improved noticeably

R: Do you think that it's the proficiency that has increased or your own courage and confidence to speak?

T3: I think it's both, the sort of small talk or the threshold to communicate or maybe [...] simply put, you don't have to search for the expressions so much, they are stored in your brain more permanently

T3, who lists his time working in Canada as the main reason for attending the TTE course, refers the task of evaluating the improvement of his English to his spouse, who appears to have noticed a clear change for the better. When asked whether the improvement has been visible in his actual proficiency or simply the courage to use the language, he cannot emphasise one over the other: on the one hand, he feels that his active vocabulary has increased in size, on the other, speaking in general also seems to come more easily. He has, however, also noticed a less welcome change as a result of his stay abroad.

Quote 9.2

T3: Written communication is still difficult for me and maybe this year in Canada even affected it negatively in the sense that it brings out this spoken style in written text

The improvement in fluency of spoken communication has had a somewhat negative effect on T3's abilities to produce written text in English; in other words, while his confidence may have increased and vocabulary expanded, he has lost some of the "correctness" of language often required from written texts to a greater extent than from spoken communication. It is necessary to bear in mind, however, that T3 does not clearly distinguish between the effect of his stay in

Canada and the effect of the courses he attended (such as TTE), which makes it slightly more difficult to determine just how big an impact the year in Canada has actually had.

While T3 is the only interviewee who has recently lived and worked in an English-speaking country, some of the other respondents have also spent some time abroad that may have contributed to their language skills in one way or another. T1, for example, has spent four years in Canada as a child, and she has also travelled to the United States in later years as a visiting researcher.

Quote 9.3

R: How do you think your stays abroad have influenced your language proficiency or maybe your attitude towards English?

T1: Well of course it has influenced that I learned to read and write in English

R: Right, as a child, how about as an adult?

T1: Well let's just say it's never been a problem

R: So your stays abroad haven't had a big impact?

T1: Well no except of course expanding vocabulary and such

From T1's response it is clear that she has felt quite confident about using English even before her stays abroad, and it appears that it was not for the purpose of improving her English that she decided to go. However, she does acknowledge that working in an English-speaking country has increased the size of her vocabulary.

In addition to discussing the effects of working and living abroad on teachers' language skills, it is also important to acknowledge that not everyone has the desire or ability to do so and to understand why that is. T4, for example, states that she has had plans to go abroad in the past, but has now come to accept that she cannot go on exchange or otherwise improve her English.

Quote 9.4

It doesn't bother me so much but I find it annoying that some colleagues tell me that my language is so bad because I can't help it it's the school language and I haven't been on exchange and I can't go anymore and when you compare to many others and take a more global perspective, I can read and I can write well enough...

She calls her proficiency level “school language”, which we can take to mean that she has not had a chance to study English after leaving school, and although she has been recently interested in improving her proficiency, she finds that the means to do that are limited. This is a direct contrast to T3 (for example Quote 9.1), who has taken on a teaching job abroad at an older age, which suggests that there might be opportunities for others to do the same, even though T4 feels that she is now as good as she is going to get.

T2 has spent time abroad, in several English-speaking countries as well as others, where the primary means of communication has been English. The most significant change she has noticed has to do with her courage to speak, rather than the actual proficiency.

Quote 9.5

T2: I think maybe I'm more able or not more able but less afraid to speak English, to just ramble on in my Finglish because in most cases people haven't been annoyed even if everything's not right

T2 begins to explain how she can speak English better now, but quickly corrects that in fact she just finds speaking English less intimidating, having noticed that she does not need to produce “perfect” English in order to be understood.

5. Discussion

5.1 Teachers' views on English-medium teaching at the University

When discussing the role of English at the University, the respondents, such as T1 (Quote 2.1) and T4 (Quote 2.4), are mostly favourable of the general concept, although T1 (Quote 2.2) is also concerned about internationalisation for internationalisation's sake: using English without a valid reason, for example in a situation where everyone could also understand Finnish, is something she would wholeheartedly avoid, as would Erling & Hilgendorf (2006: 271). But even though they acknowledge the importance of English in the academic world, the teachers' views differ on how important they see English to their own everyday work. T4 (Quote 3.1) stresses that English is "extremely important" in her line of work, and that in fact she does not think her own proficiency is always enough to cope with the tasks she faces.

Meanwhile, T3 differs from the others in that his own work here is mainly conducted in Finnish (Quote 3.2), and thus he is rather unaffected by the University's much debated internationalisation. He does not appear to feel too strongly about English-medium teaching, not for nor against it. This is explained by his statement about the reason for attending the TTE course (Quote 5.4; further discussed in Section 5.2), which was to prepare himself for a teaching position in Canada. At first, T3 might seem a slightly less relevant subject next to the other four precisely because his experience of English-medium teaching is limited to teaching in an English-speaking country, where it is the norm. However, for Bergan (2002) and Hallamaa (2011), among others, it may come as a relief that there are still departments and subjects at the University where English does not have a prominent status and where English-medium teaching is implemented only when deemed necessary.

The issue of English versus Finland's national languages appears to be a concern close to heart for some (Quote 4.2), and T2 raises the important question of the relevance of English-medium teaching if the students still choose to write their Master's Theses in Finnish (Quote 4.5). Or rather, T2 herself does not question this practise, but points out the inconsistency and the problem that her

students are not familiar with the correct terminology in their native language, having completed most of their studies in English. If Finnish is to remain an actively used academic language and if this curious practise is also in use elsewhere in the University, this problem needs addressing. The quality of Finnish academic texts can hardly be expected to remain high if the people writing them are only vaguely aware with the relevant terminology. Here, the “double-edged sword” description of ELF by Pecorari et al. (2011: 67) manifests itself: how do the benefits of an English-medium Master’s programme (involving international students, preparing students for international academic communication and job market) stand against the drawbacks it has on the local academic community?

A stark contrast to T2’s views is provided by T1, who feels that it is precisely the English terminology that students need, and that they can easily learn the terminology in the national languages *if necessary* (Quote 4.4), which may be a justified approach if one assumes, like Pilkinton-Pihko (2010:59), that a great deal of scientific material is only available in English. T1’s attitude towards English as a lingua franca is shared by T4 (Quote 2.4), who is “one of those people who want English” as the “one mutual international language”. Their view is, of course, also justified as a personal opinion, and if it indeed is the case that in their respective fields Finnish is not in much use, they do not appear to be able to relate to the issue T2 is so passionate about. The drastic differences between T2 and T4 could perhaps be explained with the fact that they work in different fields, T2 in Agricultural sciences and T4 in University pedagogy, but it is interesting that T4 has a background in Biosciences, which is not very far from T2’s field. Naturally, the language practises between even two rather closely related fields may vary greatly, but their similar backgrounds could also suggest that their views stem as much from their personal experiences and attitude towards English as they do from a purely professional perspective.

When questioned about their views on their students’ language proficiency and whether that had an effect on their teaching experience, the teachers appeared less concerned about the actual level of proficiency (that is, “correctness”) than of the variety of accents represented in the classroom. T4 (Quote 8.2), for one, described native English speakers as speaking “really well” while hinting that they were, nonetheless, sometimes difficult to understand. This she put down to her own deficiencies. Here, T4 more or less repeats what Hynninen’s (2010: 39)

student respondents also reported: they see the benefits of interacting with a L1 in improving their own skills, but admit that it can be difficult to follow said speakers. It is noteworthy that T4 (Quotes 8.1; 8.2) does not seem to include for example Indian English in the native speaker category, so in her case L1 English is more likely to cover only the inner circle varieties (Jenkins 2009b: 19); that is, English spoken in the United Kingdom, North America, Australia and New Zealand.

5.2 Teachers' views on language support at the University

What all of the five interviewees have in common is their attendance on the TTE course, which is why they were chosen for this study in the first place (Section 3.1). A rather unexpected discovery in the course of this study has thus far been the respondents' reasons for attending the TTE course, which in most cases were, when discussed during the interviews, pedagogical, not linguistic (Section 4.6). When we consider the problems listed in the TTE course needs table (Appendix B), these themes are visible there as well, but for some reason they are only highlighted now, when the the teachers have been given a chance to express themselves at more length and depth. Airey's (2011: 40) respondents were generally more concerned with improving their English, or at least doing so "formally" in order to qualify for a higher position at the university. The respondents in this study appear to have sought support first and foremost to help them get through their teaching tasks (for example Quote 6.3). T3 (Quote 6.4) comes closest to the reason being "qualification" for something, although there is no indication that attending the course was done for any other reason than to reassure himself that he was capable of taking on a teaching task abroad.

When it comes to teachers receiving sufficient notice and being adequately prepared for EMI teaching, a key aspect when looking into the reasons for seeking support, the responses in this study are rather more positive than those of Airey's (2011:43) informants, who felt that it came as a surprise and that they had no choice but to take on the task. In contrast, T2 (Quote 4.1) reports that the need to teach in different languages was brought up well in advance and that she was aware of the prospect of having to teach in English before actually being put into

those situations. In fact, none of the five respondents show indignation similar to that in Airey's (2011: 43) findings. For T5, who does not speak Finnish or Swedish, English-medium teaching is the only option when working in Finland, and for T3, who was about to go teach in Canada (Quote 6.4), English was also the obvious medium of instruction and hardly came as a surprise. As for the time and effort that go into preparing for these teaching situations, T1 (Quote 7.1) feels that preparing for English-medium teaching is in fact easier due to the fact that most of the material she uses is already in English, whereas Finnish-medium situations would require her to first translate the material. As it happens, Airey's (2011: 44) respondents would have liked more time to prepare, or less work to balance out the time spent preparing. It is unclear what is behind these different experiences, as it could be a number of reasons. Perhaps there is a difference between Finnish and Swedish universities that causes what we have seen here, perhaps Airey's subjects were more uncertain and critical of themselves at the time of the course than what the interviewees in this study are now, a couple of years after their TTE course. Or perhaps it is simply a matter of individual experience and opinion.

T1's statement (Quote 6.1), highlighting the fact that part of the attraction of the TTE course can be the pedagogical aspect, plays a significant role in further analysing the language support the University currently provides for teachers. T1 (Quote 6.1) had no prior teaching experience when attending the course, which also strongly implies that her primary concern was to feel more comfortable in a teaching situation. This impression is supported by what T5 sees as the benefits of the course (Quote 6.2). While the respondents clearly find this a positive outcome of the course and a welcome supplement to their existing skills, it calls into question the success of the course in reaching the target audience referred to in the Policy (Extract 4). The Language Centre itself, the provider of the TTE course in addition to other forms of language support, outlines the goals of the course as follows:

[the courses are] aimed at instructors in the University of Helsinki who are preparing to teach courses in English. The purpose of these courses is to assist them in the presentation of their lessons and to develop their communication skills in classrooms where English is the lingua franca.

Admittedly, the statement does take into account both the linguistic and the pedagogical needs of teachers, but that, in turn, raises another question: do the courses achieve these goals? The teachers interviewed for this study report satisfaction mainly on the pedagogical aspect, although the fact that their pedagogical needs were met *in English* seems important to them. What adds to this fascinating yet confusing concoction is what T4 says about her limited language skills (Quote 3.1), and how there really is nothing she can do to improve. It would seem that the type of language support mentioned in the Policy (Extract 4) is meant for teachers such as T4, who would like to improve their English. But rather than seeking additional support, T4 settles for the proficiency level she has at the moment, and simply does her best to get by. Either the University is not doing its part in supporting teachers or T4 merely does not have time or energy to seek more support, even though she reports to have improved in the last three years. But perhaps this is again a matter of pedagogical improvement, which would be consistent with the other respondents' answers.

When asked whether they were satisfied with the quality and amount of support that has been available to them, the former received praise from each respondent, such as T5 (Quote 6.2), again mainly for the support in pedagogical skills but also for gaining more confidence to use English, similarly to Airey's (2011: 48) respondents. T4 (Quote 6.3) finds that her teaching has drastically improved since attending the course, although she does not directly attribute the improvement to the course alone. T4 (Quote 6.7) is, however, also critical of the type of support currently available at the University, as she feels that it does not do what it should in addressing the more acute needs. T4 admits that "hold[ing] everyone's hand" (Quote 6.7) would be impossible to realise, but it is important that she presents a suggestion as to how the support system could be improved in light of her own experiences and needs. This is something for the University and its departments to consider, and if they see improving the language proficiency of students and staff as a goal worth investing in, providing more hands-on, immediate type of support might be worth experimenting with. But as far as the amount of support courses is concerned, T4 (Quote 6.7) finds that it is more than adequate, in contrast to Erling & Hilgendorf (2006: 283), who worry that higher education is lacking in language support.

Although not a direct form of language support, the respondents' experiences of or desire for staying abroad, among other reasons to improve their language skills, is also something to be considered. What T3 (Quote 9.1), T1 (Quote 9.3) and T2 (Quote 9.5) have in common is that all three report having gained more confidence to use English after their periods of working abroad. T4 (Quote 9.4), on the other hand, feels that she is past the time when she can leave to work abroad, for language or other reasons, and confesses that she has settled for the proficiency level she is at because she does not see how it could improve anymore. T1, T2, T3 and T5 (who is currently working outside her home country) are all proof that this is not necessarily the case, T3 (Quote 9.1) being the one with most recent work experience from abroad at an older age. T4's attitude appears strikingly similar to T1's (Quote 6.6) when discussing the need for support beyond the TTE course: they would like the situation to be different, but do not seem to have made much of an effort to change it or to seek for alternatives. T4 characterises the language she uses as "school language" (Quote 9.4), which is interesting in light of what T3 (Quote 8.5) says about the shift in language education from the time he was in school to what the situation is today. It may well be that the type of language education given in schools at a certain time has an effect on how the students approach learning languages and improving their already existing skills, as well as on how accessible they find experiences such as student exchange. It will be interesting to see whether future generations of teachers are, having been conditioned to learn languages more interactively and to think of international mobility as a natural extension to their studies and work life, not only more confident in using languages but also more active in seeking forms of support.

5.3 The Language Policy in light of teachers' responses

The results presented in Chapter 4 and discussed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 highlight some of the most prominent issues that having English as a third – and increasingly more important – working language at the University of Helsinki has helped bring forth. What still remains to be discussed is the Language Policy and how the respondents' views correspond with those outlined in the document.

Firstly we must note that although the results vary greatly in terms of how the respondents feel about various aspects of ELF at the University, what they all have in common is that they were barely aware of the Language Policy document before the interviews took place (Quotes 1.1; 1.2; 1.3). Granted, the Policy states that it “is not an action programme, but a strategic document which aims to guide the preparation of action programmes for the various sectors of university activity” (University of Helsinki 2007: 9), but it still remains unclear to whom it is directed. A broader, quantitative study would need to be conducted in order to draw valid conclusions about whether university staff (and students) are aware of the contents, or even the existence, of the Policy, but it is alarming that five teachers, representing more or less unrelated disciplines and all of them having already sought support in teaching in English, are, on the whole, unfamiliar with the language policy of their working environment.

When asked to respond to a statement that summarises the tone of the Policy (Extract 1), there were those who agreed with it (Quote 2.1), and those who felt that it was “a nice wishing list” (Quote 2.3). Indeed, as a wish list for how languages should be dealt with at the University it is quite exemplary. What stands out in the analysis is T5’s rather pronounced frustration with the lack of information available in English, and all in all the role of English at the University not being prominent enough to accommodate her (Quotes 2.7). However, her indignation, it seems, is by no means unique among foreigners working or studying at the University. Vairimaa’s (2012: 11) discovery that foreigners are not treated equally to their Finnish counterparts goes hand in hand with what T5 says about losing benefits due to lack of information on grants in English (Quote 2.8), and is indeed a serious issue. A common thread running through both Vairimaa’s article and T5’s responses is, again, the optimism expressed in the Language Policy and, it seems, elsewhere in University documents: “Marianna Vivitsou visited University of Helsinki’s website and got the impression of a well-reputed and internationally oriented university.” (Vairimaa 2012: 11)

T2’s (Quote 4.5) concerns about students’ lack of knowledge of subject-specific terminology in their L1 (not English) calls for a critical look into the Language Policy’s statement suggesting that “it is essential that students be aware of the terminology used in their field in both national languages, as required” (Extract 3). As we have already established that it is essential, the Policy only

adds to the confusion by including *both national languages*. How can that be achieved, if the students are not aware of the terminology even in one national language? Furthermore, the Policy's goal of students being aware of the key terminology in the national languages clearly has not been realised in all parts of the University. Hallamaa's (2011) concerns about English stepping on the national languages also speak of a lack of balance between the Policy and the reality of language use at the University.

If we take a look at the goals spelled out in the Language Policy (University of Helsinki 2007: 42), we can see that there is still a long way to go before these goals can be met satisfactorily. "Ensur[ing] that the language used in research, teaching, administration services and communication is rich and comprehensible" is already so extensive that it would be impossible to determine how well it is met in the course of just one study. "Inreas[ing] language awareness, emphasis[ing] multilingual capacity as a strength" has been already discussed in reference to the teachers' awareness of the Language Policy and the language support provided, but again, what exactly the University is doing to "encourage" language use does not become apparent in the Policy document, nor in the interviewees' accounts. And as for "determin[ing] the languages to be used in a given situation", as we have seen, one Policy document is not able to do this in a way that would cater to the needs of all faculties, departments and other smaller entities within the University. Perhaps the next step is for faculties and departments to look into drafting their own language policy documents or, as Vairimaa (2012: 11) suggests, for the University to "change its structures" instead of drawing up new documents that have little to do with the everyday life.

However, when considering the issues discussed in this chapter next to what the Policy says about the University "becoming more international", we should perhaps, rather than simply point out flaws in the Policy, consider the idea that the University is only now working towards creating a more international academic environment, a part of which would be to attract more foreign scholars and thus, as T5 wishes (Quote 2.7), help reinforce the status of English as a legitimate working language. T5 and her unfortunate counterparts, interviewed by Vairimaa (2012), appear to have arrived at the University at a time when internationalisation is on everyone's lips but when there is still a lot of work to be done before the desired equality between local and foreign students and staff can be achieved.

6. Conclusions

The study at hand set out to investigate individual teachers' attitudes towards teaching in English at the University of Helsinki in light of the University's Language Policy. The chosen, qualitative, approach has proved justified and successful in answering the research questions outlined in the beginning of the study. The semi-structured interview model was appropriate for the task, but it also had its challenges when the interviewees took advantage of the conversational tone of the situation and drifted away from the original question. All in all, the study was able to answer the research questions satisfactorily, which is a sign that the method was also chosen well.

Where teachers' attitudes towards English-medium teaching at the University are concerned, all seemed more or less in favour of it, but some are more wary of English taking over than others. Although the Finnish respondents also felt that English has its place at the University, to a varying extent, it was the one foreign teacher who emphasises its significance above all others, and for an obvious reason: as she does not speak either of Finland's national languages, English is the only language she can rely on. It was this teacher who also found that English has not yet acquired an important enough role to accommodate foreign students and staff as equals to their Finnish colleagues.

Another question posed for the study concerned the language support provided for teachers, and whether it is sufficient and satisfactory in their opinion. Overwhelmingly, all respondents reported satisfaction with the Teaching Through English course and were pleased that they had attended it, although some of their reasons for attending it came as a slight surprise. Rather than attending the course simply to improve their English, several of the respondents admitted to seeking support mainly for pedagogical reasons; some had no prior teaching experience and for them, the course was the first step into the world of teaching. Others acknowledged the pedagogical benefit now, after attending the course, but did not list it as a reason for enrolling in the course. And even when a respondent did not directly attribute the improvements she had noticed to the TTE course, her general satisfaction with the course paired with the drastic improvement in her English-medium teaching after attending the course suggest, at the very least, that the course did not influence her teaching negatively.

When the teachers' views are contrasted with those of the Language Policy, several issues surface, the most prominent being the apparent "optimism" of the Policy. The goals and other statements expressed in the Policy are in most cases so broad and ambitious that it is hard to see how they could be achieved as such, or even striven for, as there are as many ways to interpret them as there are people reading the Policy. What is more, at the moment the number of those people is perhaps not very great. None of the respondents were familiar with the Language Policy document, and in general they only had a vague idea about how languages (are expected to) function at the University. In the light of the theoretical background (Chapter 2) outlined in this paper as well as based on the results reported and discussed here (Chapters 4 and 5), making the Policy more known to University staff and students could help in provoking discussion on language issues, and perhaps lead to improvements and solutions to some of the problems that have arisen. It may be too early, and the study too limited, to give suggestions on how the Policy could be improved. What the study at hand has achieved, however, is to point out that there are inconsistencies between the Policy and the reality of English-medium teaching at the University, and that perhaps it is time to try to ensure that the promises and declarations that can be found in the Policy already are followed through. Perhaps then, the University could, if that is what it aims for, begin to move towards a reputation of a truly international university, an attractive institution for Finnish and foreign scholars alike.

References:

- Airey, John. Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. *Ibérica* 22 (2011): 35-54
- Bergan, Sjur (ed.) 2002. *Language Policies In Higher Education: Invitation To a Debate*. Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg.
- Björkman, Beyza 2011. English as a lingua franca in higher education: Implications for EAP. *Ibérica* 22 (2011): 79-100
- Briggs, Charles L. 1986. *Learning How To Ask. A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview In Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caudery, Tim, Petersen, Margrethe & Shaw, Philip 2009. Students on Exchange in Scandinavia. In Mauranen, Anna & Ranta, Elina (ed.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 178-199.
- Coulmas, Florian (ed.) 1991. *A Language Policy for the European Community: Prospects and Quandries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dörnyei, Zoltan 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erling, E. J. and Bartlett, T. 2006. Making english their own: The use of ELF among students of English at the FUB. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5 (2), (2006).
- Erling, E. J. & Hilgendorf, S. K. 2006. Language policies in the context of German higher education. *Language Policy* (2006) 5: 267–292.
- Graddol, David 1997. *The Future of English?* London: British Council. In Graddol, David 2012. *The Impact of Macro Socioeconomic Trends on the Future of the English Language*. Doctoral Thesis at Stockholm University, Sweden.
- Graddol, David 1999. The decline of the native speaker, *AILA Review* 13: 69-78. In Graddol, David 2012. *The Impact of Macro Socioeconomic Trends on the Future of the English Language*. Doctoral Thesis at Stockholm University, Sweden.
- Graddol, David 2006. *English Next*. London: British Council. In Graddol, David 2012. *The Impact of Macro Socioeconomic Trends on the Future of the English Language*. Doctoral Thesis at Stockholm University, Sweden.
- Graddol, David 2012. The Impact of Macro Socioeconomic Trends on the Future of the English Language. Doctoral Thesis at Stockholm University, Sweden.

Gürüz, Kemal 2011. *Higher Education and International Student Mobility in the Global Knowledge Economy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hallamaa, Hannu 2011. Englanti painaa päälle. *Ylioppilaslehti*, 16/2011: 5.

Hirvensalo, Netta 2011. *Everybody speaks English? – English as a Lingua Franca in Master's Degree Programmes at the Universities of Stellenbosch and Helsinki*. Bachelor's Thesis (unpublished).

Hynninen, Niina 2010. "We try to to to speak all the time in easy sentences" – Student conceptions of ELF interaction. *Helsinki English Studies* 6: 29–43.

Jenkins, Jennifer 2009a. English as a Lingua Franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28, (2): 200-207.

Jenkins, Jennifer 2009b. *World Englishes. A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Kaur, Jagdish 2009. Pre-Emptying Problems of Understanding in English as a Lingua Franca. In Mauranen, Anna & Ranta, Elina (ed.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 107-123.

Lehtonen, T. & Lönnfors, P. 2001. "Teaching through English: A blessing or a damnation?" *Conference Papers in the New Millenium*.
< http://www.helsinki.fi/kksc/verkkojulkaisu/2_2001_8.html > [Accessed: 18.7.2012]

Mauranen, Anna 2009a. Englanti lingua francana – onko sillä kulttuuria? In Idström, Anna & Sosa, Sachiko (ed.), *Kielissä kulttuurien ääni*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy: 290–305.

Mauranen, Anna 2009b. Introduction. In Mauranen, Anna & Ranta, Elina (ed.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 1–7.

Mauranen, Anna 2010. Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies* 6: 6–28.

Ministry of Education 2008. *Education and research 2007–2012. Development Plan*. Publications of Ministry of Education 2008 (11).

Mobility Strategy 2020 for the European Higher Education Area.
< http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Koulutus/artikkelit/bologna/liitteet/EHEA_Mobility_strategy_2012.pdf > [Accessed: 17.7.2012]

Pecorari, Diane, Philip Shaw, Aileen Irvine & Hans Malmström 2011. English for Academic Purposes at Swedish universities: Teachers' objectives and practices. In *Ibérica* 22 (2011): 55-78.

- Phillipson, Robert 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pilkinton-Pihko, Diane 2010. English as a lingua franca lecturers' self-perceptions of their language use. *Helsinki English Studies* 6: 58–74.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara 2006. English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In Jenkins, Jennifer 2009. *World Englishes. A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge: 206–214.
- Smit, Ute 2010. English as a lingua franca in higher education: a longitudinal study of classroom discourse. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Suviniitty, Jaana 2010. Lecturers' questions and student perception of lecture comprehension. *Helsinki English Studies* 6: 44–57.
- The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999. Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. < http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf. > [Accessed 19.5.2011]
- The Language Centre. *Support for English-Medium Master's Programmes*. < http://h27.it.helsinki.fi/emkt/support_needs.html > [Accessed 25.4.2012]
- The University of Helsinki Annual Report 2011*. < <http://www.helsinki.fi/vuosikertomus2011/> > [Accessed 10.6.2012]
- Thøgersen, Jacob & Jensen, Christian 2011. Danish university lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Ibérica* 22 (2011): 13-34.
- University of Helsinki 2007. *University of Helsinki Language Policy* 14.3.2007. < http://www.helsinki.fi/strategia/pdf/HY_kieliperiaatteet.pdf > [Accessed 16.9.2011]
- Vairimaa, Reetta 2012. Language barriers. *Yliopistolainen* 1/2012: 10–12.
- Wren, Helen 1997. Making a difference in language policy agendas. In Eggington, William & Wren, Helen (eds.) 1997. *Language Policy: Dominant English, Pluralist Challenges*. Language Australia Ltd. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Appendix A: Interview questions

The interview questions that follow are given in the order that they were used: the first four respondents were interviewed in Finnish, and the

1. Interview questions in Finnish

1. Ensi alkuun voisit kertoa hieman itsestäsi ja työstäsi. Millaisessa roolissa eri kielet ovat elämässäsi? Käytätkö arkielämässäsi muitakin kieliä kuin suomea?

- Mikä on englannin rooli? Mainitsit että olet tutkija – millä kielellä toimit pääosin?
- Kuinka tärkeäksi koet englannin kielen työsi ja tutkimuksesi kannalta?
- Oletko viettänyt aikaa ulkomailla opiskellen/työskennellen/muuten oleskellen? Kenties opetustehtävissä?
- Missä? Millä kielellä?
- Koetko tämän vaikuttaneen kielitaitoosi tai asenteeseesi vieraita kieliä kohtaan? Millä tavoin?

2. Opettaminen: kuinka pitkään olet toiminut opetustehtävissä?

- Minkälaisia kursseja opetat, kuinka paljon?
- Millä kielellä/kielillä opetat?
- Oliko ”alusta asti” selvää, että tulisit opettamaan (myös) englanniksi, vai nousiko sen tarve esiin vasta myöhemmin?
- Mikä siihen johti?
- Opiskelijat: koostuvatko opiskelijasi pääasiassa vaihto- tai muista ulkomaisista opiskelijoista? Kuinka paljon arvioisit joukossa olevan suomalaisia?
- Miten valmistaudut opetustilaisuuteen? Vaatiiko englanniksi opettaminen erityistä valmistautumista (esim. suomeksi opettamiseen verrattuna)? Millaista?
- Mikä on haasteellisinta?
- Entä mikä tuntuu helpolta, luontevalta?
- Oletko opettanut muualla kuin Suomessa? Kerro siitä? Miten se mielestäsi eroi suomalaisessa yliopistossa opettamisesta?

3. Kielipalvelut/-tuki: kuten tiedät, tekemäni tutkimus pohjautuu kielikeskuksen TTE-kurssiin ja sen aikana kerättyyn materiaaliin...

- Miten sait tietää kielipalveluista/-tuesta?
- Mikä sai sinut hakeutumaan TTE-kurssille?
- Mitä Kielikeskuksen kielipalveluita/-tukea olet käyttänyt, jos muita kuin TTE?
- Oletko ollut tyytyväinen saamasi tukeen? Kaipaisitko sitä lisää/muunlaista? Millaista?

→ Onko kielipalveluiden käyttäminen mielestäsi vaikuttanut kielitaitoosi, varmuuteesi kielenkäyttäjänä tai esimerkiksi opetustapoihisi? Millä tavoin?

4. Yliopiston kieliperiaatteet

→ TTE-kurssilla ainakin yksi osanottaja ilmaisi turhautuneisuutta siihen, että ”joutuu” opettamaan englanniksi, ja koki opetuksen laadun kärsivän tästä. Miten itse koet asian?

→ Onko oma kielitaitosi mielestäsi riittävä englanniksi opettamiseen? Entä opiskelijoiden kielitaito?

→ Oletko/kuinka läheisesti olet tutustunut Helsingin yliopiston kieliperiaatteisiin?

→ Jos olet, tunnetko että oma asenteesi englannin kieltä kohtaan on samoilla linjoilla yliopiston kanssa? Ts. koetko että englannin asema akateemisena kielenä on perusteltu ja sitä kannattaa tukea, vai mikä on näkemyksesi?

→

Tuleeko mieleesi muuta kieliasioihin liittyvää, jota emme ole tässä käsitelleet?

2. Interview questions in English

1. If you could start by telling me a little bit about yourself, what is your role at the university and what is your field of expertise?

- What languages do you use in your everyday life?
- What about your work? How important is English?
- Have you studied/worked/stayed in an English-speaking country?
- Do you feel this has affected your English proficiency or attitude towards the language?

2. Teaching:

- What kind of courses do you teach?
- How much of your work consists of teaching?
- What language(s) do you use in teaching?
- Did you teach back in Italy? What language did you use then?
- Did you always know you were going to teach in English?
- What was/is the reason for this language of instruction?
- Are your students mostly Finnish degree-seeking students or international degree or exchange students? How do you find teaching Finnish students in comparison to teaching foreign students?
- How do you prepare for teaching?
- Are there particular differences between preparing to teach in English and teaching in Italian?
- What do you find challenging with teaching in English?
- What is easy, what comes naturally?
- Have you taught in other foreign countries apart from Finland? Do you see any key differences between the countries when it comes to using English as a medium of instruction?

3. Language support: as you know, my research is based on the Teaching Through English course you attended a couple of years ago...

- How did you find out about the language services?
- What prompted you to attend the TTE course?
- Have you used other forms of language services? What?
- Are you happy with the support you have received? Would you like any other types of support, what?
- Do you feel that using language services has increased your language proficiency or confidence in using English? To what extent?
- Have your teaching methods or the number of courses you teach changed since attending the course?

4. The University Language Policy

- ➔ There was at least one participant in the TTE course who felt that she was "forced" to teach in English, and that the quality of teaching suffered from having to teach in a non-native language. How do you feel about this?
- ➔ Do you think it is a matter of language proficiency, or something else?
- ➔ Do you feel that your own proficiency in English is sufficient for teaching?
- ➔ What about that of your students?
- ➔ If not, how do you think the situation could be improved?
- ➔ Are you familiar with the University's language policy?
- ➔ Do you feel that your views on English as an academic lingua franca are in line with the University's policies, or do you find conflicting views?

Are there other language-related issues you would like to bring up that we haven't covered in this interview?

Appendix B: Teaching Through English course needs table

(Data collection by University of Helsinki Language Services 2009)

What classroom tasks in English are easiest for you?	What classroom tasks are more difficult for you?	lecturing	conducting seminars	organizing group work in class	giving oral instructions	giving oral feedback to students	giving oral evaluation to students	dealing with international students
prepared lectures	quick responses	x	x					
I don't feel any of them are easy but talking to students seems to go well.	Giving specific instructions, formulating instructions so that they are easy to understand by various students.	x			x			x
preparing power point presentations. Then I have sufficient time to be prepared in class.	Sometimes I feel that my vocabulary is not sufficient, since I did my studies in an other language (Italian)	x			x			
being there and talking something	to find out right words of subject matter, to sound professional, to understand students' responses and comments	x	x		x	x	x	x
Open discussion	giving oral evaluation to the students	x	x					
none	talking in English in general	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I have no previous experience in using English in my class. I think the biggest challenge is just not to tackle too much	How to keep the students awake during the long lecture	x						
giving oral instructions conducting individual consultations	organizing discussion	x		x		x	x	
Planning the lecture?	Getting the students to respond and ask questions etc.	x	x					x
I talk easily, but not always very good English	Writing correctly, powerpoint	x	x		x	x	x	
No experience	No experience	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
student centred interactive method of teaching is preferable to me. eg. discussions, group work. Powerpoint is easiest	communication and discussion with Finnish students are the more challenging areas or tasks.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

conducting individual consultations	communicating informally with students	texts on OH transparencies/ Powerpoint	preparing materials and handouts	writing student recommendations	grading tests/other student work	Any other suggestions for the course?
						appraisal & feedback
					x	Guidelines for e-mail communication with students
						I am interested in giving oral presentations and get feedback. Sometimes with the students I am not sure if they have well understood what I mean.
						It is nice to participate!
						please, as much practical training on lecturing as possible
x	x					the given list is pretty comprehensive
		x	x			Any experience in English would become in need!
		x				
				x		Not at the moment.
		x	x	x		I have not any suggestions
					x	How to prepare short presentation (20-40min) and make it clear (ex: PhD presentation)? How to create a course of Lectures (2-5) and practical work for/between
x	x	x	x	x	x	I would like to have more discussion or group work through our classes to develop the proper teaching methods for the Finnish and international students.

Appendix C: Original interview quotes in Finnish

Quote 1.1

R: sit tota semmonen kysymys että ootko tutustunut yliopiston kieliperiaatteisiin
T4: en mä kyllä oo tai siis en en oo siis jos multa kysyttäis mitkä on kieliperiaatteet niin mä sanoisin että jokainen saa käyttää suomea englantia tai ruotsia sitä kieltä mitä haluaa jos multa joku kysyis että vaikka tekisin tentin niin et mun mä oon valmistautunut antamaan ne ruotsiksi englanniksi ja suomeksi mut en muilla kielillä

Quote 1.3

T3: en en ei aavistustakaan sen verran mä tiedän että jos mul tulee joku haluaa tenttikysymykset ruotsiks niin sitten mä teen ne ja pyydän kollegaani tarkistamaan ne tai aa jonkun verran mä tiedän että hetkinen et jos onks se nyt voi olla et mä sotken ne periaatteet mut jos et jokaisella on oikeus äidinkielellään saada tenttikysymykset ja kirjoittaa

Quote 2.1

T1: joo kyl mä oon samaa mieltä et ei siin siinä mitään

Quote 2.2

T1: sellanen pakkokansainvälistäminen se on se on taas niinku väärin, semmonen et sitä tuputetaan ja sit et lähtökohta oli et englanninkielinen on jotenkin parempi näin ei oo vaan tota myös sitte sellanen mikä mihin nyt tutkimuksessa on nyt sit menty siihen että kotimaisellekin yleisölle kirjoitetaan englanniks niin ni se tuottaa kyllä aika semmosta miten sen nyt sanois aika säälistävä

Quote 2.4

T4: molemmissa siis siel biotieteessä ja nyt tässä tässä tota yliopistopedagogiikassa ni se on se tutkimuskieli on englanti et ei se oo siel niinku englanti ja sit toisaalt se on niinku itselleki et joskus sillan kun mä alotin kasvitieteen näitä niin siellä vielä tai siellähän on latinaa ja saksaa ja jotain ranskankielisii julkasui mihin joutui tutustuu ja sehän on vaan helpotus et sitä ei oo esimerkiks tääl kasvatustietees tai et en mä enää edes yrittäis mitään ranskankielisiä kasvatustieteellisiä julkaisuja niin tietyllä tavalla se et on sit yks yhteinen kansainvälinen kieli ni se on mä oon itse aivan sitä joukkoo joka haluaa sitä englantia koska ei se olis ihan mahdoton tai siis se jää se koko ei mul oo mitään käsitystä onks jotain saksankielistä ranskankielistä enkä mä koskaan niihin tuu tutustumaan

Quote 2.5

T1: olen samaa mieltä aika pitkälti ja tota itse asiassa mun mielestä olis kun nois kielikeskuksen henkilöstökursseissa olis jopa saksaa ja ruotsia vähän enemmän ja tämmöselle kenellä se on ihan ruosteessa se kieli

Quote 2.6

T2: niitä vaihtoehtoja saisi olla enemmän

R: mitä vaihtoehtoja

T2: niitä kielivaihtoehtoja ja sitte tota sitä justinsa että millä sitä kielitaitoa vois ylläpitää jos semmosen on hankkinu jossain muussakin kun englanninkielessä

R: aivan

T2: et siihen ei ihan kauheesti oo nyt yliopisto tukenu

Quote 3.1

R: miten sä koet sit englannin onks se kuin tärkeä sun mielestä sun työn kannalta

T4: se on ihan hirveen tärkeä et mä niinku kärsin siitä et se englanti ei oo niin hyvä varsinki se kirjallinen koska mun pitää kirjoittaa kaikki tutkimukset englanniksi ja mul on hirveen semmonen niinku kökkö mä niinku nään sen et se ei oo hyvä mut mä en pysty oikeestaan korjaamaan sitä

Quote 3.2

T3: no siis tottakai kansainvälinen tieteellinen kommunikaatio niinku tavallaan tutkimuspuolella tääl tulee ja tottakai sit jonkun verran tässä näiden IMES opiskelijoiden tai englanninkielisten maisteriohjelmien kanssa mut et pääosin tässä kyllä tulee kuten sanottu ni suomea kun tää opetus ainakin meidän laitoksella on vielä pääosin suomeksi että loppujen lopuksi aika vähän englanninkielistä opetusta

Quote 4.1

R: kun sä otit tän työn vastaan ja tulit tänne niin oliko alusta asti selvää että opetus tulis tapahtumaan myös englanniksi vai tuliko se vasta myöhemmin esiin semmonen tarve

T2: siitä ilmeisesti oli puhetta jo ennen kun mä tulin tänne ja sit multa kysyttiin että onnistuisko ruotsinkielinen opetus tarvittaessa ja sit mä jäin sitä pohtimaan en osannu vastata ehm ehkä se onnistuis jos ois pakko

R: joo mutta se ei tullut mitenkään yllätyksenä että tarvitsis opettaa englanniksi

T2: ei

Quote 4.2

R: Oletko kokenut että ”joudut” opettamaan englanniksi?

T4: En, mä en nimittäin joudu tekemään tai meillä on sen verran uusi toi koko työnkuva että mä oon saanu tavallaan itse luoda sen aika lailla että kukaan ei olis ikinä missään tapauksessa vaatinut mua esimerkiksi opettamaan sitä ensimmäistäkään eikä nyt tästä toisella kerralla alkoi tulla kyselyjä enemmän että

vähän siitä painostuksesta mutta ei siis mistään mun esimiehiltä tai jostain suunnittelusta vaan opiskelijoilta alkoi tulla että eikö tällaista voisi järjestää

Quote 5.1

T2: sitä kautta se opetuksen laatu ehkä kärsii että nyt kun meillä on maisterikurssit kokonaan englanniksi ja meidän suomenkieliset opiskelijat ei enää tiedä sitä terminologiaa alan terminologiaa suomen kielellä koska kaikki tulee englanniksi ne ei joudu miettimään mitä ne on sit kun mä luen noita graduja niin sit mä huomaan että henkilöllä ei oo minkään näköistä käsitystä mikä on se suomenkielinen vastine jollekin tietyille termille

Quote 5.2

T2: ehkei se ihan kauheesti horjuta kansalliskielten asemaa mut ehkä vähän ja niinku mä sanoin niin just se ammattisanasto tulee vastaan mä en tiä ehkä se on ihan sama asia muillakin aloilla mut ainakin mejän alalla

Quote 5.3

T4: en mä kyllä koe että kärsis en mä näe että se olis mikään uhka kielelle

Quote 5.4

T4: niin no missäs ne niitä tarvii että tota joo en mä näe sitä ongelmana että tota kyllä ne tuntee ne termit mitä ne tarvii että se on sit nykyopiskelijalle kuitenkin lähtökohtaisesti se on päinvastoin että se ei oo se maailma ton tyyppinen vaan se et kun he tulee yliopistoon niin heillä on hirveä työ opetella sitä englanninkielistä ja ne on ihan pulassa ja ei se ongelma oo se et ne ei osais niitä suomenkielisiä vaan se ongelma on se että ne ei osaa niitä englanninkielisiä jotka niiden on pakko osata jos ne meinaa toimia sillä alalla että se niinku että mä nään sen kyllä edelleen vielä vähän päinvastoin että se ei oo kyllä niin että se ongelma että kun he täältä lähtee niin he ei osais niitä suomenkielisiä että kyllähän niinku osaa ne mitä tarvii ja ne on aika helposti opittu että jos sen asian osaa

Quote 5.5

T2: kun mä luen noita graduja niin sit mä huomaan että henkilöllä ei oo minkään näköistä käsitystä mikä on se suomenkielinen vastine jollekin tietyille termille että siinä mä näkisin että ehkä meidän sitten pitäis ottaa itseämme niskasta kiinni ja tehdä esimerkiksi joku pieni oppimateriaali missä tulis esiin niitä oleellisimpia termejä suomen kielellä

R: niin aivan kuitenkin gradujakin kirjoitetaan pääasiassa suomeksi

T2: joo suomenkieliset tekee pääasiassa suomenkielisiä graduja et englanninkielisiä suomenkielisiltä opiskelijoilta tulee ehkä yksi muutamassa vuodessa

Quote 6.1

T1: mä etin jotain sellasta niinku mulla ei oo opetuskokemusta eikä sellasta niinku pedagogista (...)

R: eli oliko se enemmän pedagogisista syistä kun kielen takia

T1: kyllä mä nimenomaan siis ajattelin et englanninkielinen et mä oisin halunnut sen yliopistopedagogiikan kun siitä on englanninkielisiä kursseja nimenomaan sitä ja sitä terminologiaa et ei se (kieli) mikään sivuseikka ollut

Quote 6.3

T4: koin sen kielen kauheen rajottavaks ja mä muistan et mä olin niin väsynyt siitä opettamisesta että se jopa aiheutti sen että mä en oo järjestänyt sitä kurssia kauheen innolla uudestaan koska mä olin niin puhki no nyt meillä oli tänä syksynä se sama tai se niin mä jännitin etukäteen että oonks mä taas ihan väsynyt ja en mä siihen mitenkään erityisesti valmistautunut sen kummemmin ajattelin vaan että se otetaan vastaan miten tulee mut sit mä en itse asiassa kokenutkaan sitä rajottavaksi ollenkaan et se oli ihan jännä kokemus et mä en itse asiassa yhtään ollut mitenkään erityisen väsynyt enkä mä kokenu siellä tilanteessa mitenkään rajoittavaks tekijäks. Et mä muistan sillon kolme vuotta sitten mul tuli semmosia et sit ku mä aloin väsyä niin mä en saanu enää semmosia et mikä on joku ”opettaja”

Quote 6.4

T3: Menin tälle kurssille aikoinaan siitä syystä että mä olin lähdössä Kanadaan jossa mä olin opettajana tai sellasta virkaa hoidin yhden akateemisen vuoden, ja kun siihen liittyi opetusta niin mä tunsin itseni aika no englantia ei oo koskaan ollu mun vahva ala ja koin että pakko prepata ja mä kävin siinä sen kevään ja kesän aikana kolme erilaista kurssia sekä englanninkielisen opettamisen kurssi [TTE], mut sit myöskin tällasen sujuvan englannin puhumiskurssi ja sit vielä sellanen suggestopedia kurssin.

Quote 6.5

Se puhetyyli jota käytti siellä kun kuitenkin se verbaalinen ilmaisu on sen verran kapeeta niin se siirtyy tavallaan sellasenaan siihen viestintään ja huomaa että se ei oo välttämättä ihan virallistakaan et en mä voi silleen laittaa jotain hakemusta johonkin englanninkieliseen työpaikkaan nehän naurais heti ulos. Mutta en mä siihen tähdännytkään siinä eli mä halusin nimenomaan vaan tällasia kielen ymmärtämisen ja ulosilmaisun mahdollisuuksia kehittää et mä oisin sit mennyt johonkin toisille kursseille

Quote 6.6

T1: joo mä olin kyllä siihen hirveen tyytyväinen että olisin voinut jotain jatkokurssiakin jos sellasta olis ollut tarjolla niin harkita mutta en huomannu

Quote 6.7

T4: No en mä tiedä ei tietenkään oo resursseja siihen että käsi kädessä kuljetaan mutta että ainahan oikeesti se paras tuki on se että sulla on joku siinä työyhteisössä jolta voi kysyä ja saada sellaista lähitukea sehän on oikeesti se mitä kun niitä hetkiä tulee ja on joku teksti vaikka lähdössä niin se olis ihan mieletöntä kun sais jonkun kattomaan sen läpi ja ajallisestihan siihen ei mene kauan mutta nää meidän rakenteethan rakentuu koko ajan toiseen suuntaan että on keskitettyä tukea jonne pitää laittaa joku koodikielellä sähköposti ja sit sieltä tulee joskus vastaus, että jos sais valita niin olisi joku oma englanninopettaja tai asiantuntija siellä omassa yhteisössä käytettävissä joka vetäis siellä ne kurssit ja rakentais sinne sitä, se on se mitä käytännössä että ne on niitä hetkiä eikä niitä pysty ennakoimaan käymällä kurseja viis vuotta aikasemmin (...) Mutta kyllä mä nään että sellasta kurssimuotoista tukea on hirveen hyvin tarjolla

Quote 7.1

R: koetko että englanniksi opettaminen vaati erilaista valmistautumista kuin omalla äidinkielellä opettaminen

T1: no mä sanoisin et se on melkein helpompaa koska se lähdemateriaali kaikki kirjallisuus se on englanniksi paljon suurempi työ nytkin kun mä kirjoitan suomenkielistä artikkelia niin mä en meinaa löytää niitä sanoja ja mun täytyy jostain yrittää kattoo jotain mallia et miten mä nyt käännän tän et melkein se on must työläämpää et pitää lähteä kääntämään suomeksi tai ruotsiksi sitten

Quote 7.3

R: miten [Englanniksi opettaminen] sun mielestä eroaa suomeksi opettamisesta mitkä on ne semmoset tärkeimmät erot siinä

T4: ehkä se eniten on siinä se mihin ei välttämättä oo varautunu se ettei ymmärrä niiden opiskelijoiden puhetta että se niinku että joutuu tavallaan et se on must se keskeinen homma et pitää et tekstien kanssa ei oo mitään ongelmia mut se opetus mitä mä teen on semmosta hyvin vuorovaikutteista

Quote 7.4

R: miten sit siihen opetustilanteeseen valmistautuminen miten se eroo jos miettii ihan suomenkielistä opetusta

T4: ei se loppujen lopuks et sit se on ne samat ehkä vähän enemmän joutuu tukeutuu siihen et pitää niinku huolta niistä slaideista et ne avainsanat tulee siellä ja täytyy niinku opiskelijoiden kannalta tarkemmin miettiä et tulee niinku ne ydinasiat siellä koska myös sit se et ymmärtääks he mun puhetta ja sit ku se ei oo heidän kieli et heille pitää jäädä sit niinku ne sanat joista he voi kattoo et joutuu vähän enemmän et suomenkielisessä opetuksessa mul on tapana irtautua siitä et aika samat materiaalit mä teen periaatteessa et mä käytän niin suomenkielisiä ja englanninkielisiä silleen niinku et mä päivitän niitä näin ? et mä katon et mitäs tuolla on tehty ja suunnilleen ihan samat niinku tavallaan käännän puoleen tai toiseen ja sitte mut et mä enemmän pysyn siinä materiaalin rytmissä ja korostan sit et nää on niinku ne käsitteet ja näitä käsitellään ja sitten selitän ne moneen kertaan ne jotkut käsitteet mut muuten se ei oikeestaan poikkea

Quote 8.1

T4: nytkin oli et ne on niin kansainvälisiä et siel on ihan kaikkia maita tai ihan suunnilleen yhdestä maasta yks ihminen ja se kielitaito on aika vaihteleva kuitenkin että ja sit nää aksentit et se intialaisten ja kiinalaisten aksentti on semmonen mikä on haastava kans et siinä ihan just se kun se oma kielitaito ei oo silleen hyvä et pystyis jotenkin heti nappaamaan sieltä sen jonkun viestin

Quote 8.2

T4: The common factor is that most of them don't speak English very well, and then there are those who speak it really well as their first language, so it's the mixture of your ears just having got used to Indian English and then someone comes along with a British accent, and it feels like they are two different languages.

Quote 8.5

T3: Kyllähän meidän opiskelijapolvi on kielitaidoltaan ihan toista luokkaa kuin vaikka oma sukupolveni, useat on olleet vaihdossa jo ja kielikurssit ja koko kieliopetus on ollut ihan toisentyypistä kun silloin kun mä olin lukiossa niin hyvä kun siellä oli mankka josta kerran kuukaudessa kuunneltiin, englannin tunnilla saattoi olla ettei sanonu sanaakaan, miten sitä sitten oppii, kielioppi oli kaikista tärkeintä

Quote 9.1

T3: Ainakin puoliso arvioi jolla on itsellä hirveen hyvä englanninkielen taito niin hän kyllä sanoi että kun hän on tietysti kuullut mun puhuvan englantia tän koko ruljanssin jälkeen niin hän sanoo että se on kyllä huomattavasti parantunut

R: Luuletko että se on enemmän se kielitaito joka on parantunut vai se oma rohkeus ja varmuus puhua

T3: Mä luulen että se on sekä että, sellanen tavallaan small talk tai tällanen kynnys kommunikoida tai ehkä semmonen että osa kielestä ei enää prosessoituolla yksinkertaisesti sanottuna ei enää hae niin paljon ilmaisuja vaan nyt ne tulee jostakin käyttömuistista

Quote 9.2

Kirjallinen esittäminen on mulle edelleen vaikeeta ja ehkä jopa tää Kanadan vuosi on saattanu heikentää sitä tavallaan et se tuo tällasia niinku puhekielen tyylejä tai ilmaisutapoja kirjallisen tekstin sisään jolloin se ehkä vielä muuttuu

Quote 9.3

R: miten sä koet onks tää ulkomailla oleskelu vaikuttanut sun kielitaitoon tai ehkä myös sun asenteeseen englannin kieltä kohtaan

T1: no kyl kai se nyt vaikuttaa kun mä oon oppinu lukemaan ja kirjottamaan englanniksi

R: aivan lapsena sit jos miettii näitä aikuisiällä tehtyjä

T1: no sanotaan et ei se oo ollu mulle mikään ongelma

R: et ei oo vaikuttanu mitenkään oleellisesti nää ulkomailla oleskelut

T1: niin paitsi tietysti siihen niinku tietysti sanastoa ja tämmöstä tietysti laajentaa

Quote 9.4

T4: nyt mä oon ajatellu et mä oon melkein 50 et jotenki tos 5 vuotta sitten viel meil oli ajatus lähteä uuteen-seelantiin vuodeks et mä ajattelin et mä saan sen kielitaidon kuntoon nyt mä oon vähän niinku luovuttanu tai silleen hyväksyny että tää on niinku nyt tää on tällä tasolla kun tää on et mä pystyn muodostaan lauseita ja mä nään et se ei oo kielellisesti semmosta kaunista kieltä mutta sitte kielentarkastajat korjaa ne hirveen hyvin et jos ne ymmärtää sen et itse asiassa mä kärsin siitä vähemmän et sit mua närkästyttää jotkut kollegat jotka sanoo et sun kieli on niin huonoa että koska en mä sille voi mitään et mul on se koulukieli ja mä en oo ollu missään vaihto-oppilaana enkä mä enää tästä nyt voi lähteä vaihto-oppilaaks ja sit se on kuitenkin sit kun vertaa taas moniin ottaa vähän sellasen maailmanlaajusen kannan että mä pystyn kuitenkin lukemaan ihan sujuvasti ja mä pystyn kirjottamaankin sitä tutkimuskieltä silleen et mä itse saan ainakin selvää niistä

Quote 9.5

R: miten sä koet et tää on vaikuttanu onks se vaikuttanu sun kielitaitoon ja ehkä myös asenteeseen kieliä kohtaan

T2: mä ehkä osaan tai en mä sano että mä osaan mä uskallan puhua sitä englantia sötköttää sinne kaikkea finglishiä sekasin kun yleensä ihmiset ei oo vetäny hernetä nenään siitä vaikei kaikki oo ihan kunnossa