"IF I BEGIN IN FINNISH AND RECEIVE AN ANSWER IN ENGLISH, I WILL NOT BE USING FINNISH AGAIN":
Language choice and translanguaging between Finnish-speaking students and lecturers of English

Bachelor's thesis
Heidi Marttila

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Englanti	Laitos – Department Kielten ja viestinnän laitos
Tekijä – Author Heidi Marttila	
Työn nimi – Title "If I begin in Finnish and receive an answer in English, I will not be using Finnish again": Language choice and translanguaging between Finnish-speaking students and lecturers of English	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Kandidaatin tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Marraskuu 2019	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 29 + 1 liite

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Kielentäminen (*translanguaging*) on käsite, joka on viime vuosikymmenenä noussut kielenvaihtelun (*code-switching*) käsitteen rinnalle antamaan monipuolisemman kuvan siitä, miten postmodernissa maailmassa hyödynnetään omaa kielirepertuaaria yksilöllisten kommunikatiivisten tavoitteiden mukaisesti (esimerkiksi García ja Wei 2013). Tätä tapahtuu myös opetuksellisissa konteksteissa, mikä onkin ilmiö, johon on ohjattu huomiota tutkimuksessa. Kuitenkin, aiheeseen liittyvä tutkimus korkeakoulujen kontekstissa on jäänyt melko vähäiseksi, etenkin oppituntien ulkopuolella. Pyrin tämän tutkielman kautta osallistumaan tähän tutkimukseen.

Tutkielmassani pyrin selvittämään, millaisia kielivalintoja suomea puhuvat englannin yliopisto-opiskelijat tekevät suomea puhuvien englannin luennoitsijoidensa kanssa luentojen ulkopuolisissa tilanteissa. Lisäksi tutkin sitä, ovatko nämä valinnat tietoisia, minkä perusteella niitä tehdään ja millaisia tunteita niihin liittyy. Sain selville, että suurin osa tutkimukseen osallistuneista englannin opiskelijoista miettii kielivalintojaan tietoisesti. Lisäksi, osallistujat käyttävät enemmän suomea kuin englantia suullisissa keskusteluissa, kun taas sähköposteissa englanti on yleisempi kieli. Osallistujat antoivat monipuolisesti syitä kielivalinnoilleen, mutta luennoitsijan käyttämä kieli oli selkeästi yleisin peruste tutkimukseen osallistuneiden opiskelijoiden kielivalinnoille.

Keskustelen saamistani tuloksista kielentämisen viitekehyksestä, ottaen kantaa siihen, miten kielentämisen käytänteet näkyivät tutkimuksen tuloksissa. Liitän keskusteluun myös identiteetin sekä muodollisuuden aspektit, sillä syyt kielivalinnoille voitiin usein liittää joko opiskelijoihin itseensä, tai siihen, minkä kielen he kokivat tilanteissa soveliaaksi ulkoisten tekijöiden vuoksi. Argumentoin kuitenkin, että koska sekä identiteetti että kieli voidaan nähdä sosiaalisesti rakentuneina, kielivalintoihin liittyviä syitä ei voi erotella ulkoisiksi ja sisäisiksi. Lisäksi nostan esiin keskustelun siitä, olisiko aiemmankin tutkimuksen valossa hedelmällistä kannustaa opiskelijoita hyödyntämään kielellistä repertuaariaan yksilöllisesti, erinäisten kommunikatiivisten tarpeiden toteuttamiseksi.

Asiasanat – Keywords translanguaging, language choice, Finnish, English, higher education
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX
Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

Recently, the research on language choice, use and switching has taken a significant turn through the occurrence of the concept of translanguaging, which endeavours to capture the dynamic nature of language use in the globalized post-modern era, where contexts and languages are under constant change (e.g. García and Wei 2013). The occurrence of the previously more popular concept of code-switching in classroom situations in lower levels of education is something that has been studied a great deal. However, not that many studies have been conducted in educational settings regarding the use of an array of languages outside the context of actual teaching, particularly from the perspective of translanguaging. In this study, I seek to reach understandings about language choices outside the classroom. For the purposes of the study at hand, I presently find higher education the most beneficial context. In earlier English studies, even if Finnish is not used during lessons, Finnish-speaking teachers and students of English usually seem to agree upon using it in discussions occurring outside of teaching. Furthermore, this may be an unconscious decision.

The present thesis may bring attention to this topic that has not been widely researched. In my view, it is useful to examine the social conventions, thoughts, and feelings that affect language choice for Finnish-speaking students of English in student-lecturer interaction, as the topic seems to be a source of confusion for many students. Additionally, lecturers may not be fully aware of this. My aim is to clarify the motivations behind students' language choices through collecting thoughts arising from students' reflection concerning language use between them and lecturers of English, in connection to quantitative data on the students' language use. In addition, I aim to reveal whether implied norms about which language should be used when conversing with lecturers of English do exist.

Through the present study, confusion over the issue could be addressed and taken into consideration in interaction between English students and lecturers. The results derived from this study that are discussed through the lens of the chosen theoretical framework may have the potential of initiating discussion regarding the issue. This could help English students and lecturers build mutual understandings about unclear conventions concerning language use, which, consequently, may create a more comfortable working environment within higher education. Furthermore, I aim to examine students' language choices with their lecturers reflecting on translanguaging and the concepts entailed in it. I seek to discover whether translanguaging practices are presented in students' language use with lecturers, and whether they should be encouraged, considering recent understandings of language and its use in higher education.

2 THEORY AND BACKGROUND

2.1 Translanguaging

The present study relates to the field of sociolinguistics and, more specifically, to the somewhat recent concept of translanguaging. I will examine the phenomena at hand through the framework of translanguaging, which is related to the prior concept of code-switching. Additionally, the concept of code-switching seems to provide a more unilateral perspective to using an array of codes or languages, as according to García and Wei (2013: 22), it concerns switching between two languages. The notion of translanguaging, on the other hand, entails utilizing one's linguistic repertoire for varied purposes that may arise based on an array of motivations, be them individual or attributed to the social context the communication takes places in (e.g. Blackwell and Creese: 2015; García and Wei 2013). The participants of my study do not *switch* between languages, rather, use language according to their specific needs. Thus, making language choices with English lecturers may be viewed as demonstrating translanguaging practices. It is common for students to use both Finnish and English when conversing with English lecturers if Finnish is the shared first language for both participants in the discussion, albeit the language of instruction within the

English subject in Finnish universities is usually English. In light of these factors, I view the concept to be a relevant framework for the purposes of this study.

A vast amount of research has been conducted on language use through code-switching. However, in the recent decade, a demand has arisen for theories that explain the dimensions of post-modern, multicultural 21st century language use in a more multifaceted way (Makalela 2015: 15). García and Wei (2013: 9), for example, discuss how the globalized, post-modern and post-structural world has changed notions about language and its use. In their book, they discuss the "translanguaging turn" (García and Wei 2013: 19) the conceptualization of language has experienced. According to García and Wei (2013: 6), previous structuralist views of language discard the influence of the contexts it is used in. García and Wei (2013: 6) mention Saussure's views of language as a monolithic system and Chomsky's notions of Universal Grammar; the existence of common aspects visible in all languages, as examples of structuralist constructions of language.

However, these views were challenged by Bakhtin (1981), as according to him, language use is inherently bound to contexts, as it is always affected by speakers' individual viewpoints and ideologies. Furthermore, in the post-modern era, language has come to be seen as a "series of social practices and actions" (García and Wei 2013: 9). This entails that language use cannot exist without a social context (e.g. Becker 1988; García and Wei 2013; Pennycook 2010). Pennycook (2010: 2-3) considers language as a set of practices that, in addition to other social practices, constructs our daily life with others. He argues that viewing language as a practice means understanding it as a social activity occurring in dynamic contexts that we remake in communication with others, as opposed to it being unchanging structures we employ. This, again, challenges previous understandings of language as given systems. As García and Wei (2013: 20-21) discuss, the concept of translanguaging has been coined to account for this epistemological shift that takes into consideration the intricacy of language practices in the post-modern world, where language users have seemingly different backgrounds. García and Wei (2013: 21) refer to Mignolo (2010)

in stating that these new practices have freed understandings of language from ideas of fixed language identities previously endorsed by nation states.

In addition, the concept of the linguistic repertoire is something that has been constituted in connection with translanguaging. García and Wei (2013) understand the notion of the linguistic repertoire as one dynamic repertoire that entails all languages an individual may choose to use as a continuum, as opposed to viewing languages as autonomous systems that are used in separation from each other. In the present study, the participants have their own repertoires which they choose to utilize in the situations that I examine, according to their own motivations to those choices.

Furthermore, what is central for the present study is the concept of languaging which underlies translanguaging. Becker (1988, cited in García and Wei 2013: 8) was among the first to use the term when discussing how language affects our very being in the world. According to Becker (1988, cited in García and Wei 2013: 8), using language is something that is both shaped by our world, but also shapes our world. As García and Wei (2013: 9) state to have been discussed by many (e.g. Canagarajah 2007; Mignolo 2000; Pennycook 2010; Shohamy 2006), the concept of languaging places the language user into a more active role in the practice of making sense of the world, together with other language users. Thus, as García and Wei (2013) discuss, languaging also entails our "continuous becoming of ourselves and of our language practices" (García and Wei 2013: 8). Hence, as may be understood, how we choose to use language is something that not only conveys information between and about us, but, in addition, shapes our individual identities, which I will discuss further in the next section.

2.2 Identity

Consequently, although it may seem like a very mundane, non-conscious action, the process of choosing the language to use with a university lecturer not only entails

information about how the interlocutors make sense of the world, but in addition, how they project their very identity through languaging in the contexts as individuals. As all of us have different backgrounds that are displayed in our languaging (e.g. García and Wei 2013), for each student, very differing factors may affect how he or she employs his or her linguistic repertoire when interacting with a lecturer. Thus, language choices can be seen as highly relying on students' personal identities, as students participating in the present study are able to make the choices for themselves, as a set rule for whether they should use Finnish or English in communication with their Finnish-speaking lecturers of English has not been decided on. Blackledge and Creese (2015: 21) have examined the relationship between translanguaging and identity in educational settings. They argue that today, as people have a broader access to language resources, identities may be represented through employing them as needed, to be able to fulfill individual communicative purposes. Furthermore, as Jørgensen (2008) understands, identities may arise in interaction between people, as discourse affects the formation of identities through constructing and negotiating them. These views can be seen as supporting the idea of students' identities being reflected in their language choices.

2.3 Social distance and formality

Moreover, in the case of this study, what may possibly be an important factor in affecting the motivations behind the students' language choices are the sociocultural dimensions in which they are executed, which Holmes (2001: 9-11) has discussed. According to Holmes (2001: 7), different communities have their own linguistic repertoires from which the members of a community may choose a language best suited for the social context it is used in. For the present study, out of the four dimensions she has discussed, two are particularly relevant. One of those is the solidarity-social distance scale, according to which the familiarity of those in communication with each other affects language choices. In each community, through their language choices, speakers may express either solidarity or social distance to another speaker. According to Holmes (2001: 35), linguistic choices based

on this type of factor are often due to the language users' identities, or the relationships between speakers. Another scale that is relevant for the present study is the formality scale, through which it may be examined how a social context or type of interaction affects language choice. As Holmes (2001: 10) discusses, the formality of a social context affects language use in it. Furthermore, the formality of language use may be also be affected by the solidarity-social distance scale. In educational communities consisting of both students and lecturers, issues of formality and social distance are likely to affect language use. Participants in these communities may have needs and expectations over signifying distance and formality, but on the other hand, also solidarity or informality.

2.4 Language choice

Language choice also closely relates to the present study, as I argue that when Finnish-speaking students and lecturers of English converse outside classroom situations they do make choices about which language they use, be those choices conscious or not. The research that has been conducted on language choice in higher education mostly focuses on issues of learning and teaching (see for example Ige 2010). However, the discussions in the contexts examined in the present study may be more personal, which may affect language choice in a very different manner. Haberland et al. (2013) have compiled an overview of research on language choice in international higher education, which has mostly been conducted from the point of view of language learning or interaction between students. I will discuss this volume further in the next section.

2.5 An overview of previous research

One of the chapters included in Haberland et al. (2013) is a study by Van der Walt (2013), in which she examined students' strategies in utilizing languages other than the language of instruction, for the purpose of making sense of academic tasks. The study quite highly concerns language as a tool for learning, not as a social practice as

the present study does. However, Van der Walt (2013) also focuses on what she has coined as "active biliteracy" (Van der Walt 2013: 104-105). In the case of the study, she defines it as consciously making use out of one's linguistic repertoire for academic purposes. In my thesis, I am also interested in whether choosing the language used is an active, conscious choice or not for students, when there is no clear expectation for which language should be used. Based on her findings, Van der Walt (2013) argues that in addition to students themselves, strictly monolingual university policies may discourage the utilization of an array of languages. This, in turn, may have a negative effect on students' progress in the academic world, as it prohibits the use of varied biliterate strategies that students utilize in making sense of academic literature and tasks.

Another study within the volume (Haberland et al. 2013) by Moore et al. (2013) examined translanguaging for Catalan students and lecturers using English as a lingua franca. It was discovered that the students not only used different languages to solve linguistic problems, but, in addition, to indicate friendliness. As previously discussed, the participants in the present study may or may not have similar aims. Furthermore, the researchers argued that plurilingual resources of both the students and staff are something that should be utilized in order accomplish the goals that Catalan universities have concerning internationalisation. Universities in Finland may also have such goals, which is an issue I will discuss in Section 5 of the thesis.

Ljosman (2011) has also examined language choice in a Norwegian university department in which the official language of education is English. Her goal was to find out the role of English in actual use within the department, in relation to Norwegian and other languages. In her study, she discovered that competence and personal preferences affect students' language choices in situations where it is possible to choose the language used. Similar discoveries are also likely to arise in the present study.

Gotti (2015) has studied the use of English as a lingua franca in situations in which English has been chosen as the language of instruction when the students and lecturers do not speak English as their L1. The study focuses on code-switching during lectures as a means to clarify vocabulary that is central to the courses taught. The results of the study were that code-switching is a central strategy utilised in student-lecturer communication. The results of the study do not support the notion that code-switching entails linguistic incompetence, but that it has diverse functions, such as communicating culture and demonstrating engagement during a conversation. It may be expected that the participants of the present study also use either Finnish or English for an array of communicative purposes.

In addition, in recent years, studies focusing on translanguaging in higher education settings have surfaced. For example, Carroll and Mazak (2017) have noted the deficiency in this field of research. In their book, they present an array of research conducted on translanguaging in higher education. For example, Makalela (2015) has studied how the practices of ubuntu affect learning and teaching an African language in a South African institution, on a language course he has constructed based on ubuntu. Ubuntu is a worldview based on the mantra "I am because you are, you are because we are" (Makalela 2015: 12), which highlights the interconnectedness of human life. It is practised in Sub-Saharan Africa, by people that speak bantu languages. In ubuntu, languages are not complete without other languages. Makalela (2015) discovered that the practices had positive effects, as they returned multilingualism to the classroom, for it was previously abolished by apartheid. It may also be discussed whether multilingual practices should be present in Finnish higher education, to which I will turn my discussion in Section 5 of this thesis.

In the Finnish context, Leppänen et al. (2009) have conducted a large-scale survey on the competence in and use of English in the Finnish society. Leppänen et al. (2009) also examined Finnish people's views and attitudes over the use of English in Finland. The study related to the work that VARIENG, a Centre of Excellence project, has done in the University of Jyväskylä, concerning the use of English in an

increasingly globalized Finland. The research unit was a joint project between the Universities of Helsinki and Jyväskylä. The aim of the survey was to gain a broad overview of the relationship Finnish people have towards English. The study focuses on many different aspects of English in the lives of Finnish citizens. Some of the results closely relate to the present study. As Leppänen et al. (2009: 149) discovered, for younger Finns, English is a part of their daily lives. It could be argued that in the case of students of English, the number of participants that feel this way is likely to be even higher. In the present study, the focus is on English use in the academic context, however, the information gained on whether Finnish people feel like they use English as naturally as they use Finnish is something that can be considered in relation to the present study. One-fourth of the participants in Leppänen's et al. (2009: 106) survey felt that they use English as naturally as they use Finnish. The participants that felt this way were mostly younger people and highly educated people. The participants of the present study are amidst the process of acquiring a university degree, and, as students, likely to be considered young. Thus, considering Leppänen's et al. (2009) study, it may be expected that the participants of the present study perceive English as a language that is as accessible to them as Finnish. However, it is possible that not all participants feel this way about English, and it is a factor that may affect students' language choices with their lecturers.

Furthermore, Leppänen et al. (2009: 116-128) also examined how Finnish people experience code-switching. Even though the focus of my study is on translanguaging, a relevant finding of the study (Leppänen et al. 2009) for the present study was that for Finnish people, code-switching is a rather common phenomenom. However, switching to English is not done to facilitate understanding, rather, to construct social and cultural meanings. In the present study, it is possible that the participants signify similar aims behind using either English or Finnish. In addition, according to the survey (Leppänen et al. 2009), code-switching is more common for younger Finnish people. This may entail that for younger students of English, whether they may use English or Finnish with their lecturers of English is not

something that is pre-given. Rather, it is something they may choose upon, as it is natural for them to switch languages according to their own motivations.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Aims of the study

Not a great deal of attention has been drawn to language choices between students and lecturers in university settings outside the classroom. My I aim is to contribute to this. In the present study I seek to find out which language; English or Finnish, Finnish-speaking students of English use with their Finnish-speaking lecturers of English in discussions that occur in situations outside actual teaching. The study focuses on discussing factors that affect why, or why not the students use the language of instruction; English, in communicative contexts outside teaching and why Finnish may be chosen instead. Furthermore, I aim to discover whether these choices are consciously made. Although other concepts concerning switching languages or codes are also considered, as for example, language choice can be seen as entailed in translanguaging (as in choosing a language for certain purposes), I focus on examining the reasons from the point of view of translanguaging. Reflecting on notions of translanguaging, I will endeavour to initiate discussion on whether the practice of choosing between Finnish and English according to specific needs should remain unchanged in the context of Finnish higher education.

My research questions are:

1. Why do Finnish-speaking students of English use either Finnish or English with their lecturers of English that also speak Finnish?
2. Do the students consciously consider these choices?
3. How is translanguaging presented in these practices?

3.2 Data collection

The data of this study are a series of answers collected from Finnish-speaking students of English. The data were collected through a survey that included four questions. To receive data on whether the students are divided in the language they use, I asked the participants which language; English or Finnish, they use with Finnish-speaking lecturers of English in alternating situations. I wanted to ask the participants which language they use before and after lectures and through emails, as I was interested in seeing whether there were differences in language choices between the contexts. In addition, I asked whether students consciously consider these choices. These questions were closed-ended, as I wished to receive clear quantitative data on which language the participants use, and whether they usually concretely consider which language to use. However, in addition, I wanted to have more in-depth personal data on the issue, and thus, added two open-ended questions. I asked the participants to list factors that affect which language they choose to use. I also wanted to collect possible feelings that arise from using English or Finnish, as I expected it to give further insight on students' language use with their Finnish-speaking lecturers of English.

Through surveys, it was possible to collect a vaster, possibly more varied array of answers than through interviews. I shared the link to the survey through an email list for an English subject association and asked Finnish-speaking students of English to fill it in. I did not specify whether the participants should study English as their major or minor subject, as I wished to gather as many participants as possible to receive a diversity of reflection on the issue. In total, 63 students participated in the survey.

3.3 Methods of analysis

I analysed the data using two different methods, according to the format of the question. For the open-ended questions, I performed a content analysis. I carefully read each answer, made categorically coded markings on them and compared and

contrasted them in relation to each other. I examined and coded the answers on the factors that the participants listed as affecting their language choice based on whether they are internal, such as personal feelings, or external, such as norms over which language to use. I examined the types of experiences, thoughts and feelings arising, and whether some of them were very frequent. Furthermore, I also reported on the more unusual findings that may not have come to mind before looking at the participants' answers.

In the case of the closed-ended questions, I quantified the answers. I quantitatively collected them and created tables that display how frequently participants chose a particular answer. Through this, it was possible to see whether there were differences in which language students choose to use and whether they consciously consider their language choices in different situations in communication with lecturers. Using a quantifying method in addition to the qualitative method of analysing the open-ended data provided concrete, quantitative data on the students' choices, to which it was possible to reflect the qualitative data, and vice versa. I compared the answers given to the closed- and open-ended questions to identify the kinds of connections there were between them, and how they correlated with each other. Furthermore, after receiving the results, I inspected them reflecting on the provided framework, translanguaging in particular. I will forward my discussion to this reflection and its outcomes later in Section 5 of the thesis and offer possible further implications.

The outcomes I expected to have were that for some students, choosing whether to use Finnish or English is a somewhat conscious choice, motivated by individual factors. Some students may feel that it is easier to converse problems relating to courses or personal issues in their native language, as they may have a certain bond towards their L1 that makes it a more natural means to communicate difficult issues when possible. Other students may experience that the lecturer is the one that dictates which language is used, and the students choose the language they use when starting a conversation with a lecturer according to which language the lecturer seems to use most often. However, for some participants, using either English or

Finnish may not be an issue they have even considered, as it is an unconscious decision for them.

4 ANSWERS TO THE SURVEY

4.1 Closed-ended questions

In the case of the two closed-ended questions, the percentage of answers to each option for both questions can be seen from the tables below. The survey was carried out in Finnish; however, I present my translations of the questions and their respective answers in English. As is seen from Table 1, the participants were divided in their answers on whether they use English or Finnish with their lecturers. However, as is also visible from Table 1, a broader number of participants seem to use Finnish in situations that entail oral communication with lecturers. In contrast, English is the more common choice when contacting lecturers via email. In addition, as is presented in Table 2, most of the participants reported that they at least sometimes consider which language to use in the three situations I examined.

Table 1. Answers (n= 63) to the question "Which language do you usually use when approaching English lecturers that you also know to speak Finnish?"

	English	Finnish
Before lectures	**30%**	**70%**
After lectures	**40%**	**60%**
Via email	**63%**	**36%**

Table 2. Answers (n= 63) to the question "Do you feel that you consciously think about which language to use in these situations?"

Yes	37%
No	11%
Sometimes	52%

4.2 Open-ended questions

The first open-ended question was as follows:

What factors do you experience as affecting which language you use? Why? List below all the factors that come to your mind.

According to the answers I received through the first open-ended question of the survey, both internal and external factors motivated the participants to choose either Finnish or English in communication with their English lecturers. The distribution in which external and internal reasons occurred was very even, and many of the participants listed both of them, as in Example 1.

> (1) "Jääkö englannin puhuminen "päälle", välillä mietin millä kielellä luennoitsija haluaisi minun puhuvan, välillä yritän harjoitella kommunikointia englanniksi."
>
> *"Does speaking English stay "switched on", sometimes I wonder which language the lecturer would like me to speak, sometimes I try to practise communicating in English."*

However, for some, the motivations seemed to be clearly attributed to the participants themselves, whereas for some, the influence of aspects that can be attributed to more exterior reasons were prevalent.

The most commonly surfacing external reasons were connected to lecturers. Furthermore, the language choices a lecturer makes was the most common affecting

factor for the participants: approximately one-third of the participants listed it as the determining factor for which language they choose to use. However, as some of the participants expressed, it may sometimes be unclear which language a certain lecturer prefers to use. However, what was mentioned very often was that if a student did not know this about his or her lecturer, he or she examined how others communicated with the lecturer in question and based his or her language choice on that. This was the second most commonly emerging external reason behind language choices with English lecturers. Many students also listed a lecturer's mother tongue to affect the language choices they make. My intention was to define the lecturers as L1 Finnish speakers in the survey, however, it could have been problematic, as it cannot always be known which language a lecturer speaks as his or her L1.

The answers that I received to the question on factors that influence the students' language choices that were more internal in nature seemed to be more diverse. However, some of them occurred on multiple accounts. Many participants reported that they preferred to use either English or Finnish due to it being more comfortable to use. There was a lot of variation in which language felt more natural to the participants, as could also be seen from the data on the language choices by students in the differing contexts. For some, it felt peculiar to switch to English after a lesson taught in English, which then caused participants to continue communicating in English. However, for some, using English felt forced or unnatural.

Another aspect that occurred in the answers was the theme of rules and norms. As can be seen from Example 2, one participant addressed a need for a common rule that should be given to students on whether they should use Finnish or English with their lecturers.

(2) "Usein kyllä mietin että pitäisikö puhua englanniksi ja mielestäni olisikin kiva jos
yliopistolla olisi joku yleinen ohjenuora tähän."

*"I do often think about whether I should speak English and in my opinion, it would be nice
if the university would have some common guideline to this."*

One participant reported that in the beginning of his or her studies, he or she had
been told that the students should use the same language that is used during a
lecture with lecturers outside teaching as well. This is presented in Example 3.

(3) "Fuksivuonna opetettu, että kommunikaatio tapahtuu opetuskielellä."

*"During my freshman year it was taught that communication occurs in the language of
instruction."*

Other participants did not report on such given rules, rather, that the issue was
vague. However, many of the participants discussed either silent or voiced norms
that determine languaging in student-lecturer communication. For example, many
students were under the impression that English should always be used in emails,
even though they did not necessarily use it in oral communication with lecturers. In
comparison, some participants reported that they usually use Finnish when meeting
lecturers outside of the classroom. Consequently, as many participants expressed,
English is the language they use with their lecturers in more formal contexts, such as
discussing themes that have been introduced during lectures. In contrast, for many,
Finnish is the more informal language used in discussions that are more personal in
nature, such as discussing absences from lectures, as in Example 4.

(4) "Joskus myös englannin puhuminen takeltelee ja unohtelee sanoja niin, että
vaikkapa poissaolon syystä kertominen olisi tarpeettoman vaikeaa."

*"Sometimes you stammer speaking English and forget words, which makes, for example,
telling about the reason for an absence unnecessarily difficult."*

The second open-ended question was as follows:

What kinds of emotions arise in you using English/Finnish with lecturers?

The second open-ended question provided more insight on motivations behind language choices with lecturers and reflected the answers given to the other questions. According to the results, there were distinctions in the participants' feelings towards each language. The feelings that the participants expressed to experience using English with their English lecturers seemed to somewhat more often be negative than positive. The most commonly surfacing feelings towards English use were those of artificiality and unnaturalness and relating to that, awkwardness. In addition, almost as many students stated that they feel anxiety and uncertainty towards using English with their lecturers, as in Example 5.

> (5) "Jännitys, pelko siitä sanonko oikein."
>
> *"Anxiety, the fear of whether I am speaking correctly."*

Consequently, these feelings appeared to reciprocate with feelings listed towards using Finnish with lecturers, as they were mostly positive in nature. A high number of students reported that for them, Finnish feels natural, easy or normal to use with English lecturers that also speak Finnish. In addition, for many, Finnish is a more relaxed choice of language, and feelings of safeness were reported on, as can be seen from Example 6.

> (6) "Suomi tuntuu luontevalta ja turvalliselta vaihtoehdolta oppituntien ulkopuolella."
>
> *"Finnish feels like the natural and safe choice outside classes."*

However, negative feelings over using Finnish with English lecturers also occurred, as did positive feelings towards using English. Even though a higher number of participants felt that Finnish was natural to use for them than in the case of English, many participants also felt that it was not. In consequence, many students expressed that it is English that feels natural to use for them with English lecturers. Some

students also reported that using English is "nice" or "fun", an answer that did not occur in the case of Finnish. In addition, as was already noticeable from the answers to the first open-ended question, multiple participants felt that Finnish is distinctively more informal to use with English lecturers in comparison to English.

5 DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Discussion and implications

Based on the findings of the present study, in the post-modern world where languages cannot be seen as fixed, autonomous, and separate entities (e.g. García and Wei 2013), when the students participating in this study have the choice to utilize multiple languages when communicating with their lecturers, they often do so. This seems to reflect the ideas of translanguaging - using one's linguistic repertoire for individual communicative purposes, based on context and the interlocutors' backgrounds and relationships.

A majority of the students participating in my survey reported that they do at least sometimes consciously consider whether to use Finnish or English with their Finnish-speaking lecturers of English, with 11 percent of the participants answering that they do not. Furthermore, a higher amount of positive feelings was attributed to using Finnish with lecturers of English, and accordingly, the occurrence of those feelings appeared to correlate with the volume of use of each language. Thus, although both English and Finnish appeared to be used by Finnish-speaking students of English, Finnish seemed to be the more common language used in oral communication with lecturers of English, whereas English was reported to more likely be used in emails.

However, the participants seemed to be quite clearly divided in which language they prefer to use and felt quite strongly about it - very few students expressed neutrality towards the matter. This could possibly be due to the participants' inner feelings regarding both the issue and the languages used, and, in addition, their personal identities, for as García and Wei (2013: 8) state, languaging is something through

which we construct ourselves. Furthermore, as discussed by Blackledge and Creese (2015: 21), identities may be represented in employing language resources. However, a common finding in the present study was that a high volume of participants felt that their language choices were due to others. Lecturers' and other students' language use seemed to affect the choices the most, which may be due to uncertain feelings about the norms over which language to use.

Considering these factors, as I claimed, the core idea of translanguaging can be seen as clearly presented in the results. In the examined situations, the participants seem to utilize their linguistic repertoire according to what they, as individuals and students, feel is either comfortable, convenient or natural, or, conversely, feel is appropriate in the situations. These practices appeared to be based on either or both internal and external factors.

However, it may be argued that as making sense of the world occurs in communication with others (García & Wei 2013; Pennycook 2010) and furthermore, identities may be seen as being constructed in interaction with others (Jørgensen 2008), a clear distinction cannot necessarily be made over students' choices in their languaging being fully attributed to themselves or to reasons outside of themselves. As Becker (1988, cited in García & Wei 2013: 8) has formulated, language use both shapes and is shaped by our world. Individual identities may represent themselves in utilizing individual language repertoires for personal communicative goals (Blackledge and Creese, 2015: 21). However, if we do view identities as socially constructed, how others converse with us has an effect on the formation of our identities. Thus, internal and external reasons for languaging, ultimately, can be seen as interconnected. Hence, it could be argued that the motivations for the students' language choices cannot necessarily be seen as fully innate or not, even if they seem to be based on personal factors or not. It could be argued that essentially, the language choices emerge in interaction with others in the examined contexts, and thus, all of the participants' backgrounds simultaneously affect the choices.

Furthermore, relying on the ideas of Becker (1988, cited in García and Wei 2013: 8) as language affecting and being affected by our surroundings, it could be argued that if language use is socially constructed, so are the feelings towards it. From this viewpoint, both the negative and positive feelings towards the use of each language are not fully due to the participants as individuals, rather, how mutual feelings have been built on the languages. Furthermore, as discussed by Holmes (2001), the roles assigned to certain kinds of language use are often constructed by the communities languages are used in. As Leppänen et al. (2009: 106) found out in their study, even though many younger people, which university students often are, feel natural about using English, many do not. This could also be seen from the results of the present study. In fact, as stated, language choices with Finnish-speaking lecturers of English is a matter that students do seem to consciously ponder over, which may display joint feelings of uncertainty over the issue. Furthermore, in addition to feeling unnatural using English, many reported on not being sure about the favourable code of conduct concerning language choice in the examined contexts, which may support the idea of feelings towards language use being socially constructed.

Another aspect that should be taken into consideration is that many students felt that Finnish was the more informal language that they prefer to use when discussing, for instance, personal issues. Furthemore, many students felt how acquainted they were with a lecturer to affect their choices. Knowing a lecturer, and thus, possibly feeling more comfortable interacting with him or her, seemed to cause students to use more Finnish with him or her. This is in line with Holmes' (2001) remarks on the dimensions of social distance and formality in language use. It is likely that the students that described Finnish as the language they use in more informal communication experience Finnish as the shared language of solidarity between them and the Finnish-speaking lecturers. For them, through Finnish, it feels more comfortable to express more sensitive, informal and personal issues. Additionally, those who defined English as a more formal language to use are likely to view it as a language that creates more distance between themselves and lecturers. It seems that although the participants of the present study are likely to be very competent in

English, the bond that they have to their L1 as a language of solidarity remains strong.

Earlier research seems to encourage translanguaging practices, as they have multiple advantages for an array of purposes in the academic world, whether they are related to problem solving, communication between students and staff or universities' possible objectives for multilingualism. The results of the present study seem to align with the previously discussed research within the field. In light of this, one possible implication of the present study is that if the idea of translanguaging is something that is wished to be encouraged in (Finnish) higher education, formulating a set rule over which language should be used when interacting with lecturers of English does not seem sensible, even if it could ease underlying uncertainties about language policies. As in many multilingual contexts, what interlocutors implement in the situations examined in this study is languaging, which, according to García and Wei (2013), is taking an active role in making sense of the world by making use out of one's linguistic repertoire. Although the situations considered in this study limit the implementation of that repertoire to a degree, as usually, only English or Finnish are used, it is possible in the current situation, as was apparent from my results. In other words, as a common rule for whether students of English should use Finnish or English in communication with their Finnish-speaking lecturers of English has not been decided on, to an extent, the students do have possibilities for translanguaging. Furthermore, as Pennycook (2010: 2-3) has formulated, language is one of the daily practices that construct our social being with others. Thus, choosing and using a language in the contexts that I examined in this study, according to the situation and students' individual motivations, may be viewed as a practice that constructs the social reality between university students and lecturers. Thus, as there seemed to be a surprising amount of variation and depth in the students' feelings on using either language, it may be argued that both should be able to be used in order for the students to feel as active participants in co-building the context of the university through their language practices. Furthermore, this could make students feel more comfortable within the domain.

In addition, in the Finnish National Core Curriculum (2014, see for example article 14.4.1), utilizing one's linguistic repertoire is something that is already encouraged in earlier stages of education. Thus, it could be discussed whether it should also be done in Finnish higher education. As the results of this study were able to reveal, the issue is rather authentic and relevant for students that are uncertain about the code of conduct concerning language use in the academic world. Thus, it could be beneficial to have a common guideline on language use outside classroom contexts. However, such principles would not be in line with the current understanding of language, in that they would encourage the past notions of the likes of Saussure of language as monolithic, fixed and separate systems (García and Wei 2013: 6) that undermine the impact of social contexts and the individuals that communicate in them on language use. As discussed, students have seemingly different backgrounds and identities that affect their individual language choices (see for example Blackledge and Creese 2015), and if translanguaging is to be encouraged, a common rule on the issue could undermine the effect of those individual backgrounds on languaging in the academic world.

5.2 Conclusion

To conclude, the aim of the present study was to examine language choice and languaging in student-lecturer communication for Finnish-speaking students of English within university education, outside classroom situations. I sought to discover why the participants of the study choose to use more Finnish or English with their Finnish-speaking lecturers of English, and whether these choices are meaningful to the participants. I inspected the underlying motivations behind these choices through asking students to list factors that affect their choices, in addition to feelings that arise from using either of the languages with a lecturer. Furthermore, I endeavoured to reflect and discuss what these findings mean from the perspective of translanguaging.

My research questions were:

1. Why do Finnish-speaking students of English use either Finnish or English with their lecturers of English that also speak Finnish?
2. Do the students consciously consider these choices?
3. How is translanguaging presented in these practices?

I discovered that a higher number of students participating in the study preferred to use Finnish before and after lectures, and that in the case of emails, the preferred language was English. In addition, most participants reported to at least sometimes consciously consider which language to use. The positive and negative emotions arising from using either of the languages seemed to correlate with the amount of actual use, as feelings that are more negative were associated to using English than Finnish. I endeavoured to reflect on the results through the viewpoint of translanguaging, which has not been previously done to a great extent in educational contexts outside classroom situations. I discovered that translanguaging practices did seem to present themselves in the students' language choices, as they were based on an array of individual motivations, suitable for each students' purposes. The students attributed these motivations either to themselves or to reasons outside of themselves. However, based on ideas of identity as socially constructed, I argued that these factors cannot be seen as separate from each other, as identities in themselves may be viewed as constructed in communication with others (e.g. Jørgensen 2008). In addition, I related the results to Holmes' (2001) ideas on social distance and formality affecting language choice, and discovered that the results aligned with her discussion, as the students seemed to use Finnish to signal solidarity, whereas English was often seen as constructing formality. My main implication was that as has also been indicated by previous studies within the field, translanguaging practices may be viewed as benefiting university students, even though in the case of the present study, the vagueness of the norms concerning language choice between English and Finnish did seem to cause uncertainty in the participants. Concurrently, as may be seen from the results of this study, students appear to use Finnish or

English in a dynamic manner, changing according to the user, context or the other interlocutor. I argued that in the post-modern world where languages cannot be seen as fixed, separate entities (García and Wei 2013) reserved for unchanging contexts (Pennycook 2010), translanguaging should not be discouraged within the context of higher education.

However, some improvements could have been made to the present study to receive more generalisable results, as the scope of it was somewhat limited. For example, I did not seem to sufficiently highlight the fact that when speaking of lecturers that also speak Finnish, I was referring to lecturers that speak it as their L1. This seemed to cause some confusion for some of the participants, as some of them noted that if a lecturer speaks English as his or her L1 but is still able to converse in Finnish, the students automatically choose to use English. In addition, as the extent of the present study is rather limited, I was not able to include lecturers' views on the matter. Including them in the study could have provided a more multifaceted perspective on the issue, specifically due to the fact that lecturers' language practices seemed to be the most salient factor affecting the students' choice of language. In addition, I received my data from a small-scale survey in which the participants were a rather homogenous group in a specific university. This does not necessarily offer insight on the issue from a more diverse perspective, which would be important, considering that I examined the issue from the framework of translanguaging.

On the other hand, however, this study has the possibility of raising awareness on the possibly worrying, and, perhaps, surprising issue that for many students of English, using English with Finnish-speaking lecturers feels forced or unnatural, or that they experience uncertainty using it. Through this, the present study may possibly help initiating discussion over the issue. It would seem important for educators and students to discuss what could be done to diminish the negative feelings towards using English. English students are likely to become experts within the field, or, moreover, English teachers that should be able to relieve the same feelings of anxiety towards using different languages for their students. Encouraging

students to use more English in more personal or informal communication with lecturers of English could eventually alleviate the negative feelings towards using it, as it would not be conserved for only formal, academic and professional purposes within the context of the university. Considering the ideas of translanguaging, however, this could be seen as undermining the importance of making personal and active choices in utilizing one's linguistic repertoire. However, as argued, perceptions over using certain languages can be seen as socially constructed. Thus, communities implementing certain language practices may also be actively able to change those feelings.

However, as discussed, a great deal of research has not been conducted on translanguaging between students and educators in the context of higher education outside classroom situations. Language choices and the motivations behind them may be different outside teaching due to the topics discussed, as they may be, for example, very personal. Thus, further research could raise more awareness of the topic, and, essentially, improve student-lecturer communication for a more fruitful working environment. Further research could, for example, include lecturers' perspectives on the issue. In addition, what could be examined is how students' experiences on the issue are affected by the length of their studies, and whether they change as they enter working life, in which translanguaging may still be apparent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakhtin, M. M. & Holquist, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

García, O. and Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education* [online].
Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/9781137385765

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 20–35. doi: 10.1017/S0267190514000233

Gotti, M. (2015). Code-Switching and Plurilingualism in English-Medium Education for Academic and Professional Purposes. *Language Learning in Higher Education, 5*(1), 83-103. doi: 10.1515/cercles-2015-0005

Haberland, H., Lønsmann, D. and Preisler, B. (2013). *Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Harlow: Pearson.

Ige, B. (2010). Identity and language choice: 'We equals I'. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(11), 3047-3054. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.018

Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). *Languaging: Nine years of poly-lingual development of young Turkish-Danish grade school students. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism.* Copenhagen, Denmark: University of S. Copenhagen Faculty of Humanities.

Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Kääntä, L., Virkkula, T., Laitinen, M., Pahta, P., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, J. & Jousmäki, H. (2009). *Kansallinen kyselytutkimus englannin kielestä Suomessa: Käyttö, merkitys ja asenteet*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Ljosland, R. (2011). English as an Academic Lingua Franca: Language policies and multilingual practices in a Norwegian university. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(4), 991 -1004. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.08.007

Makalela, L. (2015). Translanguaging practices in a South African institution of higher learning: A case of Ubuntu multilingual return. In C. Mazak and K. S. Carroll (eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol: Blue Ridge Summit; PA: Multilingual Matters, 11-28.

Mazak, C. and Carroll, K. S. (2017). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol: Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters. Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Milton Park, Abingdon; New York: Routledge.

Moore, E., Borràs, E. and Nussbaum, L. (2013). Plurilingual Resources in Lingua Franca Talk: An Interactionist Perspective. In H. Haberland and D. Lønsmann and B. Preisler (eds.) *Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 53-84.

Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet. 2014. Finnish National Board of Education [online]. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf. (17 November, 2019)

Van Der Walt, C. (2013). Active Biliteracy? Students Taking Decisions About Using Languages for Academic Purposes. In H. Haberland and D. Lønsmann and B. Preisler (eds.) *Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 103-122.

APPENDIX

The survey in Finnish

Kysely kielivalinnoista

1. Olen englannin kielen opiskelija Jyväskylän yliopistossa ja toteutan kandivaiheeni kyselytutkimusta koskien kielivalintoja, joita suomea puhuvat englannin kielen opiskelijat tekevät suomea puhuvien englannin kielen luennoitsijoiden kanssa. Käytän saamiani vastauksia vain tämän tutkimuksen toteuttamiseen, enkä luovuta tietoja ulkopuolisille tahoille. Tutkimus toteutetaan anonyyminä, eikä mitään henkilökohtaisia tietoja kysytä. Olisin erittäin kiitollinen, jos voisitte vastata alla oleviin neljään kysymykseen. Vastaaminen kestää vain muutaman minuutin. Vastaukset käsittelee tutkielman laatija, Jyväskylän yliopiston englannin kielen opiskelija Heidi Marttila. Lisätiedot ja mahdolliset kysymykset sähköpostitse: hejomart@student.jyu.fi.

Vastaamalla tähän kyselyyn annan luvan käyttää vastauksiani mainittuun tutkimustarkoitukseen. *

Kyllä, annan luvan ja jatkan kyselyyn.

2. Kumpaa kieltä yleensä käytät lähestyessäsi englannin kielen luennoitsijoita, joiden tiedät puhuvan myös suomea?

Ennen luentoja

Englanti

Suomi

Luentojen jälkeen

Englanti

Suomi

Sähköpostiviestein

     Englanti

     Suomi

3. Koetko yleensä näissä tilanteissa miettiväsi tietoisesti, kumpaa kieltä käyttää?

     Kyllä

     En

     Joskus

4. Minkä tekijöiden koet vaikuttavan siihen, kumpaa kieltä käytät? Miksi? Listaa alle kaikki mieleesi tulevat tekijät.

5. Millaisia tunteita sinussa herättää käyttää englannin kielen luennoitsijoiden kanssa

     englantia?

     suomea?