

A Multilingual Look into an English-medium Master's Program

Mari Turtiainen

Master's Thesis

English

Department of Language and

Communication Studies

University of Jyväskylä

Autumn 2020

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Faculty Humanities and Social Sciences	Department Language and Communication Studies
Author Mari Turtiainen	
Title A Multilingual Look into an English-medium Master's Program	
Subject English	Level Master's Thesis
Month and year November 2020	Number of pages 45 + 1 appendix
<p>Abstract</p> <p>Kansainväliset englanninkieliset opinto-ohjelmat ovat yleistyneet yliopistoissa ympäri maailman. Englanti valitaan useimmiten kansainvälisten ohjelmien viralliseksi kieleksi sen vahvan lingua franca-aseman takia. Viime aikoina englannin kielen roolia on myös kyseenalaistettu, ja katse on käännetty siihen, millainen kielenkäyttö olisi parasta kansainvälisessä ympäristössä. Tämä tutkielma tarkastelee yhtä englanninkielistä maisteriohjelmaa kielenkäytön ja erityisesti monikielisyyden näkökulmasta. Kansainvälisissä opinto-ohjelmissä sekä opiskelijat että ohjaajat tulevat usein vaihtelevista kulttuuritaustoista ja heillä on oma kielivarantonsa, johon kuuluu kahden tai useamman kielen käyttö arkielämässä. Useampia kieliä puhuvalle monikielinen kielenkäyttö on luonnollista, ja mahdollisuus omien resurssien vapaaseen käyttöön voisi olla hyödyksi myös opiskelussa. Tässä tutkielmassa selvitettiin, millä tavalla opiskelijat käyttävät muita kieliä kuin englantia opiskeluissaan, ja miten opiskelijat ja ohjaajat suhtautuvat englannin kieleen ohjauskielenä sekä monikieliseen kielenkäyttöön opinnoissa. Tutkielma toteutettiin havainnointina yhdellä kurssilla, sekä haastatteluinä kolmen opiskelijan ja kahden luennoitsijan kanssa. Tutkielmassa kävi ilmi, että opiskelijat käyttävät omia kieliään jonkin verran opiskelunsa hyödyksi, suurimmaksi osaksi lähteiden lukemisessa sekä toisinaan keskusteluissa ja ryhmätöissä. Monikielisyyden sisällyttämiseen liittyy kuitenkin käytännön ongelmia, ja sen koetaan olevan vaikeaa ympäristössä, jossa kaikilla on oma kielivarantonsa ja englanti saattaa olla ainoa yhteinen kieli. Osallistujat suhtautuivat silti monikielisyyteen positiivisesti, ja opiskelijat osoittivat toiveita siitä, että heidän taustansa voitaisiin ottaa jollain tavalla huomioon.</p>	
Keywords multilingualism, translanguaging, English as a medium of instruction, international master's program, international education	
Depository University of Jyväskylä	
Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	5
2.1. ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	5
2.2. THE MULTILINGUAL TURN IN EDUCATION	8
2.3. TRANSLANGUAGING	9
2.4. TRANSLANGUAGING IN HIGHER EDUCATION	13
3. THE PRESENT STUDY	18
3.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND AIM	18
3.2. RESEARCH SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS	19
3.3. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION	21
3.4. INTERVIEWS.....	22
3.5. DATA ANALYSIS	23
4. ANALYSIS.....	25
4.1. LANGUAGE USE IN THE CLASSROOM	25
4.2. STUDENTS' REFLECTIONS ON LANGUAGE USE.....	27
4.3. PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH-MEDIUM AND MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION.....	31
4.4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS OF LANGUAGE USE IN THE PROGRAM.....	35
4.5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY	38
5. CONCLUSION.....	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44
APPENDICES: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	46

1. Introduction

English-medium international study programs have become commonplace in higher education around the world. Growing globalization and international movement in the last decades has brought with it the internationalization of higher education as well: today, the mobility of students and staff is typical. The internationalization strategy of higher education institutions is an answer to the global movement, and its benefits include advancing the status of the institution in the global academic community, as well as attracting international, often fee-paying, students to the institution. When discussing internationalization, the language by which it is achieved is most often, in a rather implicit manner, English, because of the status of English as the global lingua franca and academic language. The role of English as the medium of instruction has been discussed in regard to how well it actually serves as *international* language among students and staff from diverse backgrounds: for example, the role of native English versus English as a lingua franca has been often discussed (e.g. Jenkins 2014). The role of English, and role of language in itself, is often taken for granted. Furthermore, the growing interest in multilingualism has also brought forward discussion of the “multilingual turn” of education (May 2013): a more diverse way of looking at the linguistic situation of education today. Because of international movement, people increasingly have more diverse backgrounds and linguistic and cultural resources at their use. Conteh and Meyer (2014) argue that the multilingual turn is based on two developments: one, the fact that most people today are multilingual and multicultural to an extent, in the context of diverse global societies; and two, the tension between diversity and inclusion in education, where multilingualism and especially minority languages are often seen as problematic rather than as a resource. In the context of higher education, the question of whether English as the de facto international language is appropriate has been raised. English-medium programs are implemented around the world, and often in places that have no or few native English speakers. This raises the question of what kind of language practices could actually benefit students that come from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and what are the ways in which their learning could best be supported. This study aims to apply a multilingual perspective on an English-medium university program.

For people with diverse linguistic repertoires, multilingual language use is often natural, and using different languages enriches their practices. Many studies have found that while the

official stance of English holds, the actual language practices in international programs might include language variation (e.g. Söderlundh 2012, Mortensen 2014). One perspective that sees multilingualism as a resource and benefit is the concept of *translanguaging*. First coined in reference to bilingual education, the concept can be applied to the diverse educational contexts of today, where multilingualism can be rather the norm than the exception. With the translanguaging perspective, the linguistic repertoire of bilinguals is not seen as separate languages, but as a one personal repertoire that consists of different linguistic features (García and Li Wei 2014). Contrasting the traditional view of bilinguals possessing two autonomous languages, and the monolingual bias in education, translanguaging takes the approach of language usage as fluid and interrelated: individuals using their full repertoires in coherent meaning-making in different contexts. Translanguaging works in the field of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, and it takes the perspective of an individual language user, with their unique linguistic repertoire. In education, translanguaging can be looked at from the point of view of translanguaging practices or translanguaging pedagogy, and studies of translanguaging have been conducted in varying educational contexts especially during the last decade. The benefits of translanguaging include that it can support both language learning and content learning, and help students to generate and discuss ideas.

Using the point of view of translanguaging as a guiding principle, the purpose of the present study is to investigate the role of multilingualism in an English-medium university program, where students and staff come from different linguistic backgrounds. This study will look into the language practices of students, students and staff's perceptions of English-medium education and multilingual education, and whether the program encourages or restricts multilingual language use. The study will, most importantly, generate knowledge about how students and staff feel about multilingual language use and education, to add into this growing topic area. Language practices often follow unconscious norms, and by making these conscious, we can uncover patterns and consider making room for different practices. With multilingual and translanguaging practices, we allow students to use their whole repertoire and width of knowledge. On the higher education level, students are competent language users and can direct their own language practices productively, and use language in ways that help their individual learning. This study takes the approach of questioning whether the English-language medium is seen to work, or whether multilingual practices and their implementation in the program are seen as beneficial. It is important to consider the value of other languages than English as an academic language as well. The study can offer practical information about current language

uses, and how students would like to use languages, thus it can offer directions for future practices. This topic area is growing, and especially concrete practices do not have long traditions or are only being imagined, and so this study aims to discover attitudes towards multilingual education, and see how multilingualism could be approached in the specific context of international English-medium programs.

2. Theoretical background

The following theoretical section addressed the conceptualizations and discusses studies into English as the medium of instruction, multilingualism, and translanguaging. These topics are specifically looked at through the lens of multilingual language practices and pedagogy, and the diversity and internationalism within higher education.

2.1. English as a medium of instruction

The rapid globalization and interconnectedness of the world has put demands on higher education as well. Universities have taken up the goal of internationalization, and the language by which this is achieved is more often than not English. Internationalization is strongly connected to the mobility of students and staff, and international and English-medium programs are established to compete on the global level and to increase quality (Jenkins 2014). International students may also pay fees to the university and so boost the economy of the university (Saarinen 2012). English as the lingua franca of the world, a common language used between people with different first languages, and the dominant language in science and academics, is adopted in non-English-speaking countries to be the language of instruction to overcome the linguistic disadvantage and attract foreign students (Jenkins 2014: 4). This trend is especially noticeable in countries where English has a strong role in society already, for example, in the Nordic countries. Finland, in proportion to the size of the higher education system, has the second most foreign-language programs in Europe right after the Netherlands (Saarinen 2012: 159). It is also notable that while the policy documents in Finnish education talk about “foreign language education” and “foreign languages” in plural, in practice the language is almost without an exception English (Saarinen 2012). Descriptions of international programs might not even explicitly mention English as the instruction language, but a knowledge of English, and most often proof of competence, is expected. Saarinen (2012: 168)

however also mentions that this implicitness might be because language is simply seen as a tool, instead of a mediator, and as such not important. Language use is taken for granted, as it is seen only as a means to access the information. Furthermore, Söderlundh (2012: 90) points out that research into internationalization of higher education usually focuses precisely on the use of English, and ignores the potential multilingualism in internationalization. English is automatically assumed to be the “international” language, even though internationalism and intercultural communication offer a strong potential for other languages too, as well as for multilingual language use.

The issue of native-standard English versus English as a lingua franca, and the question of academic English, have been discussed as well. Jenkins (2014: 11) asks why would it be that non-native English speakers are expected to replicate the native way of language use in international institutions. Furthermore, academic English is yet its own register and way of using language, with its own conventions, and even native English speakers have to learn it. As the language is not generally meant to be a target of assessment as such in English-medium programs, there are many questions related to the use of English as a lingua franca in education. Jenkins (2014) studied the English use in higher education around the world, and some points of multilingualism still came up in her study. Some members of academic staff questioned the role of English as the primary lingua franca, or brought up the benefit of staff and students knowing multiple languages, especially the local language of the university, and the overall acknowledgement of different languages (Jenkins 2014: 147). Some international students in the UK context also brought up that it can feel “unnatural” to speak English in a group of shared first language (L1) speakers, and called for more understanding of what it is like to study in a foreign language among native English speaker students (Jenkins 2014: 197). During the last decade, the attention to the multilingual potential of internationalization has grown, and the limitations of English-medium programs have been addressed more, as the discussion has developed and continues to develop.

While English holds the position of instruction language, the reality is that practices often include language variation. Söderlundh (2012), in Sweden, studied the language use on a university course which has English as the instruction language, and has a large population of local students, as well as international exchange students. Söderlundh found that Swedish has a presence in the classroom: students might briefly switch into Swedish if they feel like they cannot say what they want in English, often with explicit comment on this feeling. Furthermore,

Swedish might be used in “procedure-related talk” that has to do with the course, assignments or assessment. Noticeably, while the students speak in Swedish, the teacher often changes the answer language into English, following the official stance, and to accommodate the students in class who do not speak Swedish. However, in one instance, the teacher encouraged a struggling student to switch into Swedish; similarly, the teacher was willing to accommodate language switches in the final assignment, if students felt that they could not communicate their thoughts in English. Söderlundh (2012: 105) points out that it is often the students themselves that maintain the norm of English and are hesitant to use other languages, which is an important fact. Moreover, the company has a strong effect on the language choice: groups of people with the same first language might speak in that language, but if the groups are mixed, English is adopted as the common language.

Mortensen (2014), in Denmark, studied language use in group work settings within an international study program. The findings were similar to Söderlundh (2012): the students thought of English as the normative, standard language in international communication, even within groups that had students with L1 Danish and students that had Danish as an additional language. However, groups had different orientations to language use: one group used almost exclusively English, one group used mostly Danish or English-Danish bilingual medium, and others were somewhere between. Generally, the students mostly used English as the “working language”, and Danish in non-academic, off-topic or personal talk, which demonstrates the attitudes towards using English as the appropriate study language. Similarly, when a teacher visited one group, the communication worked solely in English. As English is the international academic language, and students are possibly used to thinking in monolingual terms of only using one language at a time, these types of norms for language use permeate the higher education world. Nonetheless, fluid usage of English and Danish was appropriated in the groups as well, which shows the changeability of language use. Mortensen (2014: 439) suggests that language choice has to be actively reshaped and modified through practice.

Programs in Finland have had little research attention so far in relation to multilingual language use. It is important to note that English-medium programs in Finland generally attract more international students than local students, and the newer the program the more international its target audience (Saarinen 2012: 165). Instead of the kind of parallel language use of English and the local language described above, no one language has the majority of first language speakers in these type of programs. It raises the question, also addressed in Söderlundh (2012:

106), of how should the language use be when there are several different language repertoires present.

2.2. The multilingual turn in education

Multilingualism is a topic that has taken up much space recently, especially in critical applied linguistics. Multilingualism can be defined in different ways and discussed in many contexts: generally, it includes concepts like bilingualism, multilingualism as the use of multiple languages on the societal level, and plurilingualism as the characteristic of multilingual individuals. These terms are often interchangeable depending on the context of use. Multilingualism, and the dynamic, hybrid, transnational repertoires of multilingual speakers have become the point of attention after globalization and increasing mobility, and the so called superdiversity, especially in urban contexts (May 2013: 1). However, it should be noted that multilingualism is not really a new phenomenon: even though it has become the topic of today, multilingualism has been always present in different communities (May 2013: 2).

Multilingualism challenges the thought of national languages, native language, the rigid views about separate languages and what language is, processes which disguised multilingual language use in the first place. But defining multilingualism is not as easy as it might seem: the question of proficiency is a central one. For example, bilingualism has traditionally been defined as the *native-like* command of two (or more) languages, but recently, a broader view on multilingualism is more common, a view that turns away from the native-like competence and instead considers, for example, proficiency in context and the usage of multiple languages in everyday life (Aronin and Singleton 2012). The languages of a multilingual person interact with each other and are often specific for a context, for example, the difference between home or family language and educational or working language are common: multilingualism entails both social and personal factors and is often tied to the environment (Aronin and Singleton 2012). However, the language use of multilinguals is connected throughout, and a simplified notion of different contexts of use is perhaps not the most useful one. There is a plethora of terms that conceptualize the fluid use of multilingual repertoires and mixing of languages, possibly the most familiar being *code-switching*, the alternating use of multiple languages in conversation, and more recent ones being terms like *code-meshing*, *metrolinguism*, *flexible bilingualism*, *transidiomatic practices*, and *translanguaging*, which is the term that will be looked at more thoroughly in the next section.

The “multilingual turn” in education is built on these notions of language users that have fluid, changing language practices. Conteh and Meyer (2014: 1-2) argue that the multilingual turn is based on two developments. On the societal level, there is recognition that most people today are multilingual and multicultural to an extent, in the context of diverse global societies. On the educational level, there is tension between diversity and inclusion, where multilingualism and especially minority languages are often seen as problematic rather than as a resource. The decisions about instruction language, teaching of languages, and language use are influenced by the sociopolitical discourses surrounding them: which languages are valued in society, how languages are used and where (Conteh and Meyer 2014: 4). May (2013) brings out the fact that even though multilingualism has been gathering attention, it has had little practical influence in areas like second language acquisition or teaching of English as a second language, and educational practices overall continue to have a monolingual bias. Tying this back to the English-medium programs discussed in the previous section, English as the international language and the dismissal of multilingualism can be seen to echo this bias. Doiz et al. (2013), in their study of a higher education institution, found that while attitudes towards globalization and internationalization were positive in regard to opportunities of mobility and exchange of scientific knowledge, there were also concerns regarding globalization leading to “one-way thinking” and the hegemony of English as the communicative language. As mentioned, the consideration of multilingual practices is gaining more space, and the opportunities as well as challenges of that are being discussed.

2.3. Translanguaging

Translanguaging is a term that has its roots in Wales, where it was conceptualised in the practice of changing receptive and productive use of English and Welsh in bilingual education (Williams 1994). Williams defined translanguaging as a natural skill for bilinguals, and conceptualized the dual language processing as children internalizing new ideas, assigning their understanding to the message/concept, and simultaneously utilizing that in their other language(s). Baker (2001) popularized the translanguaging term internationally and conceptualised translanguaging as the process of meaning-making, gaining understanding and knowledge through the dynamic use of two languages. (Lewis et al. 2013). Canagarajah (2011: 1) illustrates that translanguaging has come to mean the assumptions of integrated language system of multilinguals, and the multicompetence that they use in local practices to negotiate

communication: proficiency for multilinguals is focused on repertoire building instead of complete proficiency in each language.

García and Li Wei (2014) go beyond the whole notion of two languages, and see translanguaging as a new perspective on the language use of bilinguals, and the process of using multiple languages simultaneously. Translanguaging, as defined by García and Li Wei (2014: 14), sees the linguistic repertoire of bi- or multilinguals as *one* repertoire with *different features*. It does not separate the languages, and challenges the traditional view of bilingualism as “parallel monolingualism”, where the languages are seen working as two autonomous systems, and the traditional view of additive bi- or multilingualism where new languages are added to the repertoire. Instead, bilingualism is seen as dynamic: a process of interrelated and complex language practices. Furthermore, García and Li Wei argue that all people use *linguaging* to make meaning in different contexts by employing different features from their own linguistic repertoire or semiotic resources. Language as a system is tied to who we are, and where and how we use language: translanguaging adopts the view of sociolinguistics in that language is not separate from human action and society, as well as blending psycholinguistics by taking the individual’s cognitive point of view. García and Li Wei (2014) see translanguaging spaces as transformative, because they create new identities, values and practices, can respond to historical and present conditions critically, and advocate social change. García and Kano (2014) argue that in the global world, people need to engage in fluid language practices and use linguistic features in a way that can “travel” across spaces. Translanguaging is a term that has grown steadily and been adapted into a variety of contexts: from academics, to internet communication, to youth language, to linguistic landscapes, and so on (Canagarajah 2011: 2). In education, we can discuss translanguaging practices, the linguistic behavior and processes of individuals, or translanguaging pedagogy, the ways in which translanguaging is being implemented in the teaching practices.

Translanguaging can be used differently depending on the level of language knowledge. García and Kano (2014) studied bilingual Japanese Americans, ages 12-16, living in the US and studying in both English and Japanese. Kano implemented a translanguaging method on a course that was meant to improve students’ English essay writing, and they observed different practices that students used in their writing process. The organization of texts in Japanese and American schools differs, as well as the languages overall; the course was meant to prepare the student in writing the standard English academic essay. The students read side-by-side bilingual

texts, discussed the readings mostly in Japanese, and wrote an English essay as the final product. García and Kano found that every student translanguaged, and was aware of their own language tactics, but emergent and experienced bilinguals used the languages in different ways. Students who were not as experienced in using English, used translanguaging as a support: for example, they used the Japanese text when they did not understand English, annotated English notes with Japanese, or they read first in Japanese and then selected the needed parts from the English text. In contrast, more experienced bilinguals used their languages seamlessly together, to enhance learning or for suitability, for example, using both English and Japanese for research into topics and in the writing process, or also using English to understand Japanese. García and Kano suggest that the translanguaging pedagogy and free movement between the languages helped to overcome the differences between the languages and produce better English texts. One benefit of translanguaging is the linguistic gains: Baker (2011: 290) suggests that translanguaging can help the development of the weaker language in relation to the stronger one, leading to fuller bilingualism and biliteracy.

Furthermore, Baker (2011: 289) suggests that one of the educational advantages of translanguaging is a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter. He argues that in a monolingual teaching situation, it is possible for students to copy passages right from the textbooks or discuss the subject without fully understanding it, while with translanguaging practices, where input and output language change, the topic has to be processed more fully. This fits in with the sociocultural theory of learning, which reasons that speaking and writing mediate learning, not just language development. The sociocultural framework focuses on the social activity and dialogic interaction of learning (Martin-Beltrán 2010: 255). Martin-Beltrán (2010: 266) discusses the way understanding can “boomerang” between languages: metalinguistic analysis starts in one language, goes through another, and returns with new insight and possibly deeper analysis. Gajo and Berthoud (2018) studied knowledge construction in a bilingual university, and noted different ways of integrating languages: explaining differences between concepts in two languages on a monolingual medium lecture, code-switching during lectures by the teacher, and bilingual discussion during the lectures. In one observed situation, students were trying to find equivalent terms in French and German, and negotiated the subtle differences between the concepts in both languages (Gajo and Berthoud 2018: 862). Discussing concepts in multiple languages can deepen the understanding and offer new perspectives, as languages have different nuances, and multilingual repertoire allows to go looking for these.

These gains can also co-exist in relation to the build-up of the class: for example, if fluent English speakers and English learners are integrated into a translanguaging class that uses language in strategic ways, learners can develop their language skills while also learning the content (Baker 2011: 290). If we relate this to university studies in English-medium programs, it offers a way to think about how translanguaging in classroom talk could support especially people that are not as confident English users. Translanguaging is about the strategic use of two languages in the classroom. However, as much of translanguaging theory and pedagogy focuses on levels below the tertiary education, there has to be more consideration of how translanguaging would work on the higher level. Perhaps one could conceptualize this as the students using their languages strategically for more fluid learning practices and better understanding of content, as higher education learning is more independent and students are often already confident users of their languages. Nevertheless, the benefits of translanguaging in supporting understanding are the same in higher education as well. Rivera and Mazak (2019: 227) note how even though translanguaging might be adapted in early bilingual education, when the target language proficiency has been reached, students are then transitioned into mainstream, monolingual classrooms. Recently, translanguaging as a viable option on any educational level is a topic that has been studied more (e.g. Mazak and Carroll 2017).

However, there is also criticism towards translanguaging. Jaspers (2018), while agreeing with the pursuit of linguistic diversity, criticizes the way García and others have conceptualized translanguaging, and argues that the practice is not as transformative as it is made up to be. Jaspers notes that even a translanguaged school will probably require students to not use certain language features, while adopting new ones, e.g. academic language. Indeed, García and Li Wei (2014: 74) agree that while they advocate for translanguaging spaces, there must also be spaces in bilingual education where certain language practices are expected, because this is what the dominant society and assessment methods require. They also address that translanguaging is a *process* which usually leads to a *product* that is seen to belong to one language (García and Li Wei 2014: 70). Furthermore, they address the issues that follow from adopting translanguaging practices in education: that we would have to stop penalizing translanguaging, and completely change the way assessment is done, as it now requires students to stay within a certain language. Jaspers (2018) also suggests that the link between school practices transforming social practices, and translanguaging pedagogy as agreed and well-received by everyone is made too obvious. Studies have found that attempts of introducing home languages in bilingual education

can be met with resistance from the students because of complex societal and identity-related reasons. Baker (2011: 290) as well notes that students may prefer using their stronger language, or the one with higher status. This is why translanguaging still has its downfalls, because what is expected from speakers and how the general society requires us to use language will nonetheless affect people's opinions about language use, and mostly support monolingual practices or at least rather clearly defined situational practices and registers. It is not to be assumed that everyone would happily adopt a translanguaging perspective in education. Canagarajah (2011: 3) also criticizes the way multilingualism and monolingualism are made into a binary, where multilingual communication appears better and more diverse. It is important to remember that translanguaging is also a negotiation of meaning between communicative partners, or speaker and audience, whatever their personal linguistic repertoires are.

Furthermore, multilingual practices and inclusion in education are overall largely tied to resources. Doiz et al. (2013) researched Basque Country University, which uses Basque, Spanish, and English as instruction languages, and found that implementing multilingual language policy is very dependent on curriculum planning and resources. As optional subjects were only offered in English, there were student complaints of not being able to attend because of lack of sufficient language competence: however, it was simply not possible to offer all subjects in all three languages because of timetable clashes. The use of all three languages in offering information was also seen as a problem of practicality and resources, because translation cannot be done "halfway". There are understandably many practical problems when translanguaging, multilingual perspectives or language inclusion are trying to be achieved. Additionally, it should be noted that many students may choose an English-language program indeed on the basis of the language: because they want to learn to be more fluent English users, because it is already an easier study language for them, or they otherwise prefer it. This may be tied to the notion of English as the international language, a perspective from which it can seem like a beneficial choice in light of future working careers.

2.4. Translanguaging in higher education

The context of an English-medium higher education program is unique because it might not necessarily be a bilingual education space, but rather implicitly multilingual space where people come from different backgrounds and know different languages, and the only assumed shared

language is English. In the present study of an international study program, the multilingual definition stands. In the Finnish context, the students might know Finnish on varying levels, or might not know it yet at all when they start their studies. There are Finnish teachers in the program, but also foreign teachers that might know varying levels of Finnish. Because every student and teacher has their own linguistic repertoire and resources, a common translanguaging practice might not be possible, but rather students have the opportunity to use translanguaging in their own individual study habits, and to varying degrees in the program-wide setting, for example, in communication during the lectures. Translanguaging might not be important for language acquisition, if students are more or less fluent in English, instead, it would have other benefits that help the content learning or facilitate or develop the thinking of students. It is also difficult to set standards like languages X and Y are allowed in assignments, because that benefits only certain students, while leaving others outside, so it is arguable whether that is overall working practice. This type of practice could also not be set on a program-wide level, because the lecturers also have varying linguistic repertoires, rather it would work on a course-to-course basis. There is always the question of understandability, and a common language, because of course students and teachers need to understand each other. English, as the global lingua franca, will most likely remain this common language especially in the Finnish context, but the question is, how could we also widen the perspective on language use and accommodate multilingual, diverse repertoires. In one-to-one communication, or in a group where everyone shares also another language, the assumed standard of English can certainly be challenged. The goal is not to do away with English completely, but rather challenge the official status or 'English only' policy in international study programs, and furthermore, consciously address multilingualism and hopefully encourage students to use their whole linguistic repertoires.

Most studies into translanguaging in higher education have focused on bilingual universities, or looked at whether students take advantage of their first language in their English-language studies. Mazak and Herbas-Donoso (2015) studied the translanguaging practices in teaching in a bilingual Puerto Rican university. Spanish and English are used as the university languages, but there are no official policies in their use. The study looked at one Spanish-medium course that has an English-language textbook, and considered how the teacher took advantage of translanguaging practices in the classroom. They noted many instances where English terminology was used in the presentation slides on the lecture, or sometimes they were completely in English. So, translanguaging appeared in the discussion and explanations of the terms, and the teacher used English terms fluidly in his Spanish talk, sometimes also translating

the terms. The teacher also specifically made sure that students understood, and used translanguaging strategically to give the students access into and the benefit of the larger English-language scientific community. He felt that it was important to keep the common English-language terminology present. However, the role of English as the sole academic language was also contested by the use of Spanish as the general language in the classroom. A translanguaging space was successfully created on this course.

Rivera and Mazak (2019) researched students' translanguaging practices and attitudes in a similar setting in Puerto Rico, on a course that had English materials, and used both English and Spanish in instruction. Furthermore, the teacher allowed any language to be used in homework, e.g. an English worksheet could be completed in Spanish. Rivera and Mazak found that practices and beliefs rarely go together, and from four closely investigated students, some were even strongly against mixing languages, although all of them used English terms in their Spanish writing more or less frequently. In a more engaged translanguaging manner, Spanish questions were also sometimes answered in English, while making references to the question. Rivera and Mazak (2019: 237) argue that especially because translanguaging was seen the most in the timed final exam, having the freedom to fluidly move between languages to demonstrate knowledge in a high-pressure situation is an important advantage. However, even though students expressed opinions of supporting others using mixed language, and using code-switching themselves, most of them deemed translanguaging in education unprofessional. This shows interesting attitudes towards the monolingual norm, and the view that translanguaging is somehow not acceptable in the academic setting. Rivera and Mazak (2019) note that if students have a preset view of what they should do in the classroom, they are likely to express this belief, and while they may be against translanguaging, they might still actively use all their languages in coursework even without realizing it. Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) studied teacher beliefs and practices about translanguaging and the use of first languages in English-medium university classes in Basque Country. They found that generally teachers think that English should be the language of the classes, but they also acknowledge that English might pose problems for the students, and understandability is the main concern. Accordingly, the use of L1 came up most often in situations where it helps understanding, clarifies content, or makes students feel more comfortable in class. Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017: 174) suggest that making teachers aware of the possibility to depart from the monolingual norm might make room for more translanguaging practices.

Alzahrani (2019) studied translanguaging in the writing process of international students enrolled in an English-language program in the US. Alzahrani looked into how students use their first language in writing assignments, and found that most of the students sometimes use their L1 in brainstorming and information search, to help generate their ideas and find more material. The use of L1 showed in the writing in some non-idiomatic sentences, but the assignments were overall the same level, and the use of L1 did not have a negative impact. However, most of the students also had the attitude that L1 *has* a negative impact on the writing skills, or at least is not positive. The reason for this can be that students are often taught not to use their L1 when they study English, because using L1 is seen to have a negative transfer effect on the use of English, and lead to ungrammatical use, wrong word order or other problems; instead, students are encouraged to “think in English”. This is another good example of the underlying norms of language use, and how personal histories and teaching practices affect language use.

Canagarajah (2011) applied a translanguaging writing method on a course with both international and Anglo-American, monolingual students: the students wrote essays reflecting their own writing development and teacher identities, and commented on and discussed each other’s texts. One case was looked at more closely: a student that used English, Arabic, and other linguistic resources and idiosyncratic symbols fluidly in her essay. She used transliterated instances of Arabic, but also proverbs in the Arabic script. Notably, many of these were not immediately translated into English: rather, she discussed them in context and offered a translation only when it became relevant. She explained these choices by the language and culture being a part of her, hence why it was important to include these meanings; she also joked with some stereotypical ideas about her Arabic culture, to negotiate with the reader. The other students also interpreted the Arabic script as the writer inviting the reader to “bridge the gap” between languages and cultures by not giving the meaning away instantly. They also expressed interest in the language that was unfamiliar to them. Canagarajah (2011) illustrates that both multilingual speakers and native English-speakers were ready to negotiate the meanings of multilingual text, and that what is done by a text can sometimes be more important than what is said. Multilingual literacy is situated and performative, and if translanguaging practices are to be used, students’ orientation to text has to be challenged. However, Canagarajah discussed the issue of assessment: the translanguaged text differs from what we are used to thinking of as an academic text, and so it is not straightforward how it should be assessed. There is the question of what counts as mistake or error, and Canagarajah (2011: 22)

suggests that an error is when an intentional translanguaging choice is not effectively negotiated for meaning and so does not carry across to the reader. This is a social rather than form-based viewpoint. Mixed metaphors and non-idiomatic meanings are also a large category that relates to the use of English as the study language of multilingual students. These are often seen as errors, but that is based on the native-standard, and the question is whether that should be the way to assess texts. Multilingualism in writing and assessment remains a complex question, but Canagarajah (2011: 23) suggests that a pragmatic resolution is to take the existing conventions seriously, while looking for ways to appropriately bring in different codes and values.

Fluid language use can be very natural for multilingual speakers. Shah et al. (2019) studied language use and translanguaging in a Pakistani university among multilingual English students. During classroom discussions, the students used Pashto, their local native language, English, and Urdu, the national language of Pakistan, in instances of fluid language use that seamlessly and without pauses or hesitations moved between languages on the sentence level. No language component was separate from the others in these instances. The students, whose repertoire included all three languages, also reflected on their language use as unconscious and habitual: one student said that even though he tries to use English in the classroom, the other languages come up unconsciously. Even though the students were supposed to speak English, following its role as the instruction language, they used especially Pashto constantly in an integrative manner with English. They use the languages in the same way at home and in their everyday life too: the multilingual environment they live in leads to multilingual practices also in education. Shah et al. (2019: 27) argue that the findings show that language alteration is in no way negative or a sign of lesser competence, and this is why educational language has to be rethought too. However, this study also demonstrates how connected language use is to environment.

The above examples demonstrate how translanguaging is also a concept that needs to be taught to students if the goal is to adopt constructive translanguaging practices, and why it is necessary to acknowledge multilingual language use in a conscious way. Even if fluid language practices are natural to multilingual people, they might remain hidden if they are not paid attention to. Students have previous assumptions about how academic communication should work, and uphold norms about language use often without even noticing themselves. Translanguaging is also about students self-regulating their language and learning practices, and an opportunity for students to also employ resources that might be unfamiliar to the teacher (García and Li Wei

2014: 80-81). Especially in higher education, this taking control of one's learning and benefiting from the whole linguistic repertoire seems appropriate. The present study aims to apply this multilingual perspective on an English-medium program, and investigate language use and beliefs about language use, as well as overall perceptions of international education and multilingual language use in education.

3. The present study

The data collection methods used in this study were classroom observation and interviews. Lectures during one course were observed to get to know the program environment and see real-life practices as they unfold. As the more substantial data of this study, interviews with both students and lecturers were conducted. The data collection took place from January to March 2020 in a Finnish university: classroom observation was started first, and interviews took place gradually after that. Detailed notes of the classroom observation and transcribed interviews were analyzed qualitatively with the help of content analysis. In this section, the research questions and aim, and the research setting and participants are introduced first. Next, observation and interviews as methods and their use in this study is discussed. Finally, the data analysis process is presented.

3.1. Research questions and aim

This study applies a multilingual lens on an English-medium university program. The aim is to investigate both student and staff's language practices and attitudes towards language use in education. The research questions are as follow:

1. What is the range of languages that are used within the program, and do students want to employ their full language repertoires?
2. What are the perceptions of English-medium education and multilingual education?
3. How is multilingual language use acknowledged within the program?

Firstly, the aim is to find out students' different linguistic repertoires, and see whether these are employed in their studies, how, why, and to what extent. The aim is to discover whether English

is the only, or the preferred, communicative language in the study program, or are other languages present too. Classroom discussion and teaching, as well as student's personal study habits will be investigated. Are other languages than English present in the classroom, in group work discussion, in study materials, assignment writing, or any other aspects of studying? Furthermore, a question of how aware students are of their language use and is this something they consciously manage in their lives can be asked.

Secondly, perceptions of language use, English-medium education, and multilingual education are a central question. What are students' attitudes towards studying in an English-medium program, are there any challenges in that, and how do students conceptualize what kind of language use is expected from them in the program? Moreover, how do the lecturers orient to language use within the program? How is multilingualism conceptualized, do students and lecturers see multilingualism as beneficial and would they appreciate opportunities for multilingual language use?

Finally, the aim is to see whether there is acknowledgment of multilingual language use and the diverse backgrounds of the people present in the program. Does the program allow for multilingual practices to be employed?

3.2. Research setting and participants

The focus group of this study is an international master's degree program in the faculty of humanities and social sciences in a Finnish university. It is a two-year interdisciplinary program, 120 ECTS study credits in total, and the official language of instruction is English. The university offers several such international programs across different faculties, and their popularity seems to be growing: in 2020, as this study was made, a record amount of applications, 1722 for 242 study places, were made to the international degree programs. The program for this study was chosen on the basis that generally, in humanities, language and linguistic aspects may have a more significant role than in more technical fields, for example, and so this program was interesting to study on the basis of its composition and subject matters. The international programs generally have a low student intake, in the present program it is about 20 students. The courses in the program are offered also to other students, like exchange students and other degree students in the university, whether Finnish- or English-medium, which adds diversity in the make-up of the courses. This affects the results of the classroom

observation, as no students were excluded, but the focus of the study and interviews is on the degree students of the observed program. In the international degree programs, students need to offer proof of English competency when applying: in practice, results from one of the international language proficiency tests, such as TOEFL, IELTS, and Cambridge test. The required level may differ according to the program, but in the present program, in effect, the language level requirement is C2 or C1 in the CERF framework, so advanced English level is expected. The language requirements can also be completed by showing proof of previous English-medium degrees from certain countries. Furthermore, applicants are also interviewed during the application process.

In this study, one obligatory course from the chosen program was observed. This course acted as the focus of this study: the lecturer of the course and three degree students that also attended this course were interviewed for the study. Additionally, another lecturer that teaches in the program was asked to participate to add a second lecturer perspective. The participants' backgrounds are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. The participants

Participant	Reported languages	Finnish proficiency	Educational background*
LECTURER1	2	yes	no HE English studies
LECTURER2	3	yes	English & EMI studies
STUDENT1 1st year	3 + 1 additional	basics	some HE English studies
STUDENT2 1st year	3 + 1 additional	yes	no HE English studies
STUDENT3 2nd year	3 + 2 additional	yes	EMI bachelor's degree

* HE= higher education, EMI= English-medium program

All participants in this study are from the European region. Both lecturers have taught in the university and in the international programs for several years, so they have plenty of experience of them. They come from different backgrounds, but each are competent in both English and Finnish. Lecturer1 has not had formal English education on the higher level, but has used it

occasionally in previous studies. Lecturer2 has completed higher level English studies and done English-medium studies before. Both lecturers wrote their dissertations in English. English is their primary working language, and both say that it is very easy and natural to use, perhaps the easiest language to use for working purposes.

Out of the students, two are first year students of the program, one is second year. Two are competent in both English and Finnish, while one of them has only started learning Finnish. Moreover, each participant has their own linguistic repertoire and additional languages: each student has a repertoire of at least three languages. All students have completed different previous studies and degrees. Student1 has had some English studies on the higher level, but has not studied in an English-medium program before the current one. Student2 has not had English-medium studies before. Student3, in turn, has studied in an English-medium program on the bachelor's level too.

To respect the participants' anonymity, no one's background is discussed in more detail, as it is not strictly necessary. Instead, language use is looked at from the perspective of English, the official language of the program, and additionally Finnish, the local language of the university. Participants' first languages and additional languages are specified only if the discussion requires it.

3.3. Classroom observation

As additional data, and a way to get to know the program environment and real-life practices, classroom observation was done. The observation was what Zacharias (2012: 137) calls descriptive observation: the aim was to capture the broad picture of what is going on in the classroom, instead of evaluating or focusing on a certain element. In the observation, the goal is to note concrete actions, instead of impressions or feelings of what happens. Observations can be recorded in some way, or the observer can make notes: in this study, note taking was used. From the eight lectures total, four lectures of one course were observed. Detailed notes of the lectures were written down, both during the class and supported as more extensive notes right after the class in question. To guide the observation, the main aspects that were paid attention to were, first, the presence of different languages, and second, communicative patterns between different speakers and in different situations: lecturer–student talk, group or pair work between students, whole class discussion, and additionally off-topic talk and before/after class

talk between students or students and lecturer. The fluency of using English, different accents and other aspects in speech were noted, but no direct quotes were recorded, so any conclusions are naturally based on interpretation at the time. Furthermore, the language used in teaching, materials, assignments, etc. was noted.

The classroom observation was non-participant, so the lectures were observed as such without the observer intervening and with limitations of space and perspective of the observer. For example, sometimes all student talk was not clearly audible because of my placement in the class, but some help for this was given by the lecturer after class as comments from their perspective. The lectures were not recorded in any way, because the aim was not to capture word-for-word expressions and language use, but to observe the communicative environment and overall use of different languages. This overall approach to the observation was taken because the main content of the present study is the interviews, and the observations were a less focused support for the data collected in interviews. However, with both interviews and observation, people's reporting and actual practices can be compared, as this is a very subjective topic where people's opinions and practices might even differ. This is why it was valuable to observe the practices within the program, even as this small-scale look into the classroom communication. Understandably, on a different course and with a different lecturer, different patterns might have been present, but the lecturer interviews also added perspective to this.

3.4. Interviews

Interviews were chosen as a data collection method, because the aim is to study people's opinions, experiences and perspectives of language use. Interviews are a great way to obtain this type of qualitative data, because interviews allow for flexibility in questions and offer a conversation-like situation that is rather familiar to participants in advance (Dörnyei 2007: 143). The interviews were semi-structured, which helps the analysis by giving a frame to the interview, but allows for changes in the order of questions and space for follow-up questions in order to capture each participant's individual experience (Zacharias 2012: 99). A set of questions were written, to cover certain themes in every interview, but the order of discussion was slightly different depending on the interview. The main themes of the student interviews were 1) participants' linguistic backgrounds 2) their motivation for and feelings about studying in an English-medium program 3) the use of other languages in studying and 4) what are their attitudes toward multilingual education and would they want to use all their languages. For the

lecturer interviews, the themes were similarly 1) their own linguistic backgrounds 2) how do they orient to the use of English in the program and in their own teaching 3) what are their attitudes toward multilingual education and 4) do they see opportunities to use other languages in the program. The interview questions can be found in Appendix 1. Because the observed course's lecturer and students were already familiar, some questions could also be made based on the classroom observation, but this was a minor aspect. Mostly, outlooks from the observation and interviews were compared in the analysis stage.

As mentioned, the lecturer and three students from the observed course were interviewed: the lecturer was asked to participate and facilitate the classroom observation. An interview invitation was sent to the participants of the course, and two students volunteered; later, one more student was specifically asked to participate. Similarly, another lecturer was personally asked to participate. So, the selection of participants was not entirely random, but instead some thought could be given to include participants from different backgrounds, for example, in order to find possibly different perspectives on the issue. Three of the interviews were done in person, and two via Skype. Three were done in English, two in Finnish. This was not so much based on anyone's competence in either language, since most of the participants could communicate in both, instead the choice of language was based on situation and sometimes proposed by the interviewee, sometimes by the interviewer. The language of the interview was not seen as important to control, so long as participants were comfortable in speaking, because the focus is on the content of the interview. The student interviews each lasted about 20 minutes, and the lecturer interviews 30 minutes. The interviews were audio recorded with permission from the participants, and later transcribed focusing on content. Repairs, hesitations, most noticeable pauses, stresses and tones of voices or laughter were marked in the transcription. These kind of linguistic cues can be important in analysis, as voice recording and transcription inevitably loses nonverbal aspects of the conversation (Dörnyei 2007: 246). However, when the focus is on the content of the interview, an exhaustive transcription of linguistic features is not necessary.

3.5. Data analysis

The transcribed interviews were analysed with a process based on content analysis. In qualitative research the research questions and concepts as well as the researcher's interpretation and choices inform the data analysis, and the validity of the study emerges from logical and careful choices and categorizations (Ruusuvuori et al. 2010). Zacharias (2012: 122-124) gives

a simple framework for analysing interviews: turning them into analyzable form, transcription; reading the data several times to familiarize it; deciding on themes and categories that emerge from the data; and gathering utterances from transcripts into these categories. In content analysis, the categories used for data collection can be based on theory, or emerge from the data, and often both of these are employed. A criticism for content analysis is that the researcher can impose meaning where there is none, or give something more meaning than the interviewee might have intended (Cohen et al. 2013), but this is a critical point of qualitative research in general. There can always be differences of interpretation between interviewer and interviewee, and interviewees might not include everything they think about a topic either because they hesitate to say something or simply because they do not think to mention it in the moment. This is why during the analysis the data and different points of view have to be considered carefully, instead of getting stuck to pre-set assumptions.

In this study, themes that were looked at from the interviews were characterisations of English, use of other languages than English, and perceptions of multilingualism and multilingual education. Furthermore, the role of Finnish was looked at, because it was a topic that students brought up in the interviews, even when it was not a main focus of the interview themes as such. This way, the categorization included theory-based categories, but was also flexible to the content of the interviews. The student and lecturer interviews were coded in the same way, but because the perspectives of the interviewees differ, some differences in the analysis also naturally occurred. In characterisations of English, the way interviewees described English was looked at, e.g. academic English, and also how they relate to using English. In the use of other languages than English, the reasons for using them and situations in which they are used were cataloged. With perceptions of multilingualism, the way multilingualism is defined, and the attitudes toward multilingual education or using multilingual ways of communication in studies was looked at. Analysis notes from each interview were made, and similarities between interviews were sought. With the classroom observation notes, language use was in the center of analysis. The use of English, and instances of using other languages than English were cataloged, and the situations and conversational partners were noted. Switches between languages were also noted.

4. Analysis

The aim of this study was to record the variety of language use within the program and in students' study practices, consider the perceptions of English-medium education and multilingual education, and see whether multilingual language use is acknowledged in the program. In this analysis section, the classroom observations are presented first. Then the interviews are looked at with regard to the research questions, drawing together the students' opinions, and also relating these to the lecturer perspective.

4.1. Language use in the classroom

The classroom observations were analysed by looking at the use of different languages and the conversational situations in which these were used. Overall, English was clearly the dominant language during the course, but other languages were present in both student and lecturer talk. Most prominently, other languages were present in off-talk or before/after class talk, and in students' pair work. Again it should be mentioned that in addition to the English-medium master's program students, the course also had exchange students and other degree students present.

All of the lecturing and whole class discussions were in English, as well as the materials and assignments of the course. Notably, there was no mention of language use on the first lecture, so English is the assumed language of the course and language use is not something that has to be specified. However, at the start of the second lecture of the course, the lecturer did acknowledge language use in the way that he addressed the fact that assumedly no one in the class is a native speaker of English. This was done in relation to the course terms: the lecturer addressed that some of the specific course-related terms might be difficult, because they have been learned in native languages before and now students might have no idea what the terms are in English. This was done in association to Finnish, and on the second and third lectures, the lecturer also mentioned a term in English and its equivalent in Finnish ("this is [term] in Finnish"). This is also an interesting fact, because not everyone in the class might be fluent in Finnish. However, because of the Finnish context, Finnish is also the language that the lecturer used in addition to English. Similarly, on the first lecture there were some country-specific Finnish examples, and the lecturer used some Finnish-language political slogans, immediately freely translating them into English. On the second lecture, there was also a Finnish non-course-

related term used. The lecturer also quickly counted out loud in Finnish during one lecture, switching back to English after (“...kaksykt - twenty”). Before the fourth observed class, the lecturer was also discussing with students in Finnish, but then immediately switched into English when the lecture started. Altogether, there were occasions of Finnish use by the lecturer, even though these were most often singular words among English speech. Regarding the use of English, the lecturer had a very clear and mostly neutral way of speaking: an aspect which he also mentioned during his interview as trying intentionally to speak in a clear, understandable way which accommodates all levels of English language proficiency in the class. This could be seen during the lectures. As the course is a university-level class, the English used for example in lecture presentations was rather academic, advanced and formal. However, the presentations as well were clear and most often used whole-sentence structures, which can also add to the ease of understanding.

During first and third observed lecture, students used other languages than English in pair discussions: in addition to Finnish, two other languages were used, so four languages in sum were present during the lectures. During the second and third lectures, students also spoke in other languages in quiet off-talk during the lectures among their peers. Generally, before and after each class there was also talk among students in different languages. In contrast, whole class discussion and all questions and answers during lectures were made in English, so that really was the common language of the class. A central observation made during the third class was also that the conversational partner often dictates the language use. There were occasions where with one partner, a student used other language than English, but with another, they used English right after. Assumedly, the rule here is that those who share a first language might use that for conversation, but those who do not, use English. This can also be contested though, because there was a student whose first language is not Finnish but who for example used Finnish with me and after one class said bye to the lecturer in Finnish. Perhaps the key term here is shared languages. Furthermore, some other switches between languages could be seen too. Singular English terms were a few times code-switched into other language talk, and once a student quoted English text among Finnish-language talk. In one occasion, during a class task when a student was individually asking a question from the lecturer, the talk started in English but then switched into Finnish. Mostly, the students talked to the lecturer in English. The same four or five students often participated in the whole class discussion or asked and answered questions, and this can tell about confidence in language use, but can also simply be based on

personal communication habits. Overall, there was no explicit reference to challenges with language, but it is of course not conclusive proof.

The switches between languages, and the switches with different conversational partners, show that language use is fluid and students do, consciously or not, manage their language use. This is perhaps the most interesting question, and one that cannot be answered based on the observations only: how aware are student of their own language use? There are several reasons that can affect the language use, e.g. the official status of English as the class language, the notion of shared languages, or personal choices. These questions will be further investigated from the interviews.

4.2. Students' reflections on language use

The first research question focuses on the language use within the program and whether students do or would like to employ their full language repertoires in their studies. The interviews included questions related to the use of English as a study language, as well as questions about whether students use other languages in their studies. Translanguaging as a term was not used in the interviews, but strategies of translanguaging and multilingual language use were sought after by asking about different situations, like classroom discussion, group work, and individual assignment work, and whether students ever use other languages than English in those.

The students had different feelings about the use of English as a study language, depending on their previous experiences. Student1 expressed that she initially had some concerns about using English as a study language, as she has not used it before, and was worried that her academic English level would not be high enough. However, because lecturers within the program have talked about language use and emphasized that most of them are not native speakers of English and it is okay to make mistakes, Student1 feels more confident in her language use now. She said that English use has become very normal, especially because while she is in Finland, she needs to use English all the time in everyday life as well. In contrast, Student2 is more confident user of English because it is a language that she also uses outside of studies, but she as well specified that she does not feel that her academic English skills are the best, and wants to develop those. She has a specific motivation to study in an English-language program because of her work where she needs English. Student3, who also did her bachelor's degree in English, expressed that English is the easiest study language for her and so choosing an English-medium

program seemed natural. She also expressed that because English is so prominent in academia, as most publications are in English, she thinks that studying in English is very helpful, describing it as a “win-win situation”. Even if one would study in their native language, they would still need English. The dominant role of English in academia indeed came up in every interview as well, but Student3 had perhaps the most positive view of this, while others also had some concerns. The students are also very used to using English as the study language, as both Student2 and Student3 said that they probably could not write a research paper in their native languages with ease, especially because they are used to the terminology in English.

The students reported using other languages than English in their studies mostly in reading and occasionally in conversation. All three students said that they have read or would read references in many languages especially when it comes to writing their master’s thesis. Student1 said that she could access research papers in all her languages when she starts her master’s thesis, to have more options. Similarly, Student3 said that she sometimes reads sources in many languages when she writes assignments, because she thinks it helps to get a wider perspective on a research area, especially political issues and similar topics, which are sometimes written about differently in different countries. So, accessing literature in different languages is seen to enhance the material, to offer more options and perspectives. Student3 also said that occasionally she might check a new English word and emphasize it with a translation in her notes. Student2 as well mentioned accessing sources in different languages. Furthermore, she said that she sometimes reads about difficult study topics in her first language to check if she understands the topic better that way. She described it as additional help:

(1) “It’s not that I feel that I don’t understand what it says in English, rather it is that the topic is so difficult that I somehow wonder whether I would understand the difficult thing better when I get it in another language too” [Student2, translated]

(”Se ei oo kiinni siitä ettenkö mä kokis et mä ymmärrän mitä siinä sanotaan englanniks vaa et se on niinku se asia niin vaikee et jotenkin ajattelee et josko mä ymmärtäisin sen vaikean asian paremmin ku mä saan sen toisellaki kielellä”)

This is a very translanguaging-oriented perspective, as one of the argued benefits of translanguaging is enhanced content understanding (e.g. Baker 2011: 289). Student2 talked in several occasions of the usefulness of using different languages to think about a certain topic and had a very positive view of this type of multilingual language use. She has consciously employed a way to use her languages in a way that helps her studies. The other students as well,

though conceptualizing the reasons differently, have realized benefits that they can access if they use all their linguistic resources.

All students mentioned that they have occasionally spoken with a lecturer in another language than English that they also share, but this does not happen so often. The overall impression is that both students and lecturers might feel more comfortable speaking about study-related topics in English, as it is the official language of the program. Student3 explicitly brought up this point, saying that English, to her, feels like the “professional” language, and Finnish is more for the casual everyday communication. She also said that she feels like the lecturers as well feel more comfortable speaking about study issues in English. Similar separation of study language and off-topic language was seen in Mortensen (2014). Student1 emphasized that she might use another language with a lecturer only outside of class, so the separation of study language versus everyday language seems to be present here as well. Moreover, Student2 said that she might occasionally talk with lecturers in Finnish, regardless of whether Finnish is their first language, so she feels that there is no first language-based rule for communication, and the initiative for the language choice is based on situation.

Student1 generally speaks only in English with other students especially because that is the only common language she has with them: this notion of “common language” could be seen in her interview throughout. Contrasting that to the other students, they both said that they sometimes use Finnish in group work situations if everyone in the group speaks Finnish. With Student2, this came down to the notion of foreign versus first language, as she illustrated that if it has come up that everyone in the group speaks Finnish, English might not feel like a natural choice anymore, and the talk turns to Finnish at some point. She described that in this type of situation, it might feel “awkward” to speak English, even though she pointed out that to her, English does not really feel like a foreign language anymore as it is so present in her life. Similarly, Student1 brought up that there is the “awkward situation” of Finnish students having to speak English with each other if there is someone who does not understand Finnish present. This notion of L1 speakers being more comfortable using their first language among themselves has come up in studies as well (e.g. Jenkins 2014). It is interesting how emotionally charged the situation can be, as both students described it as awkward situation. However, this could also be seen as a perception of multilingualism: that somehow, first language always takes the first place and is more comfortable to use. In contrast, Student3, for whom Finnish is not first language but who uses it in everyday communication, also said that she has used Finnish in Finnish-speaking

groups. In a way, she accommodates to the first language rule because she is able to. Using Finnish in group work situations can also be seen as an instance of translanguaging. Because the materials and the project work itself are in English, but are talked about in Finnish among the group, this becomes a type of translanguaging practice as well. The separation between student-lecturer talk and student-student talk also comes up here: often, students speak in English with the lecturers even if they speak another language among themselves, like also seen in the classroom observations.

Furthermore, there are interesting expression of solidarity between students in language use. Student2, when speaking of the group work situation, said that when a non-Finnish speaking student is present, they of course change the language into English. Student3 said of the overall communication within the program:

(2) “I think as kind of symbol of respecting other students I have been speaking English here because I was thinking that if some other student wants to know the same information that I’m asking it would be more beneficial if I speak English” [Student3]

The students see each other and think about each other’s linguistic resources, practices and feelings. Even if Student1 felt that she perhaps complicates the situation by not being able to speak Finnish, the other students might not see it that way, but rather be happy to accommodate everyone and include people within the common linguistic practice of English. Moreover, Student2 expressed a similar consideration towards lecturers: she said that if she knows that the lecturer of the course is not fluent in Finnish, she might not choose that as a group discussion language in case the lecturer follows the class discussion.

The students’ primary study language is English, and none of the students really felt that there are problems in using English as their study language, or that they would have difficulties understanding course content. Furthermore, the students occasionally employ their other languages within their studies. All of them are used to using multiple languages in their lives, but the languages often have separated areas of usage. All three students also made a separation of academic language and everyday language, which shows that they have reflected on the language use in their studies at least on the part of English.

4.3. Perceptions of English-medium and multilingual education

The second research question addresses the perceptions of English-medium and multilingual education. The use of English and orientations towards studying in an English-medium program were explored in the interviews. Furthermore, to apply the multilingual lens, a central question of the study is what are students and lecturers' attitudes towards multilingual education, and how do they define multilingualism and multilingual language use in education. The attitudes towards using multilingual ways of communication in education was a question in both student and lecturer interviews.

The official language of the master's program of this study is English, and that is a central aspect in itself. Furthermore, the focus on academic English could be seen from every interview. Lecturer2 specified that in this program, the official language is English, which she described as a very important fact. Everything in the program needs to be in English, and for example knowledge of Finnish does not matter, which has to do with the accessibility of the program as it is an international one. From the student interviews as well it came clear that usually everything within the program works in English, although Student1 mentioned that once there was some Finnish texts as an example during a lecture, translated by the lecturer on the go. As can also be seen from the classroom observations, there are cases of using other languages, especially Finnish as the program works in a Finnish context, but these are occasional uses that can be explained with pragmatic reasons: the situational aspects will always have some effect on language use.

Lecturer2 felt that generally students' English skills are high, that it seems that for many students English has always been present in their lives as an additional language, and for some it is the natural study language as they have used it in their studies before, and so are more comfortable discussing study-related issues in English. However, of course this is not the case with everyone, as some students are perhaps only starting to use English as a study language. The specificity of English as an academic language and a special variety was emphasized:

(3) "this is a variety of English that we are all using together for work purposes and we are all learners of this variety of English" [Lecturer2]

The fact that the courses in the program include exchange students and other degree students has its own effect, as both lecturers mentioned: with exchange students, the levels of English proficiency can differ greatly. Lecturer1 also expressed some concerns about the degree students themselves, saying that in his experience, the language tests used for the application process do not always reflect real language skills in practice. Even if students pass the tests, they can have great problems with English in the everyday context of the program, so especially academic English skills. Lecturer1 as well brought up that “it’s not self-evident that academic English is the first language” for anyone. As discussed in the previous section, the students as well expressed some concerns about their academic English skills: a separate concern of being fluent enough in this specific context and variety. On the other hand, as the studies advance, students of course learn field-specific vocabulary and ways of communication, and perhaps it cannot be expected that these would be familiar beforehand in any case. Assessment was one issue that was discussed in the interviews, from the point of view of whether English is assessed as a language. Both lecturers answered that it is so-and-so: on one hand, the focus is on content and understandability is a larger concern than for example grammatical correctness, but on the other hand, language proficiency affects the understandability of text. So, language inevitably affects assessment in some ways. Students as well felt that understandability is the central concern, although Student3 also mentioned that she feels that lecturers appreciate if students speak “more academic” language.

Lecturer1 also brought up that English as a lingua franca-communication is something that students should learn to be fluent at, even describing this as a part of “hidden curriculum”. The role of English as lingua franca (ELF), a common language between people with different first languages, is notably strong in academia and also in international working life. Because many students aim for international work, where English is used as the working language, it is important for them to learn to use English with ease and correctly. This contrasted with Lecturer1 expressing a couple of times that of course the program is not a “language education”, yet still, the importance of language comes up. Lecturer2 also brought up how English is often socially conceptualized as the language of “high-quality education”, and how this can affect students’ motivation to study in an English-language program. In the international working life, a degree completed in English can work as a currency. This is why other languages might not interest students at all, if they specifically follow the position of English as the world language. The large role of ELF, especially in academia, was also critically addressed by both lecturers as well as Student2. Lecturer1 emphasized the learning of ELF communication exactly because

of the role of English in international working life, and because students have to be able to be convincing also in their language use: clear mistakes will not be overlooked just because they are not native English speakers. The perhaps negative, but realistic view is that non-native speakers have to adapt to the powerful position of English in the world. Lecturer2 expressed concern about the fact that English is becoming a hypercentral language in many contexts. Student2 as well expressed how she wished that people would not think of English in the way that “if I know English I don’t need anything else”, so English would not completely override other languages. She wished that the value of other languages would be acknowledged in education; both lecturers also mentioned that other languages than English should be allowed and fostered as languages of science.

The students’ perspectives on multilingual education were somewhat different between each participant, but they all felt positively about being able to use their own languages in education, although they did not feel that there are always possibilities for that. Student1 expressed that she would like to use all of her languages or have topics related to them in teaching, but did not see opportunities for that in this program, because there are students from many different backgrounds and everyone’s languages cannot be addressed:

(4) “I would like that it kind of matters what my languages are and that I could use them somehow but I’m not expecting that in any way cause I know that they cannot address all of our, like, wishes or backgrounds” [Student1]

Her perspective was very focused on the teaching and the practical reality of the program environment: she felt it understandable that not everyone’s individual situation can be addressed, emphasizing that she does not expect it. At the same time, she put meaning to her own individual background, and wished that it could be addressed somehow. This conflict was also addressed by Student2, who had a very positive and reflective perspective on multilingualism, but also admitted the practical situation, saying that in the formal teaching, inclusion of multiple languages is problematic because there are no conventions or traditions for that. The practical reality is a central issue in trying to include multilingual perspectives, and the point of traditions is a good one too: this is a fairly new perspective in all types of education, and the practicalities are only being invented and tested.

The question of mixing languages came up in the interviews. As discussed before, the students all feel comfortable in using English as the study language, and are used to discussing study-related topics in English. Student1 expressed couple of times that speaking about study topics in different languages, for example in class or group work, could be difficult because the terminology is learned in English:

(5) “if it’s really specific then you can’t do it even in [another language] cause you only know the words in English” [Student1]

(6) “if I would have someone to talk with in another language I wouldn’t do it cause then you would need to translate all the time” [Student1]

However, this is also a perspective that really resists language mixing. The student feels that it would be difficult, even impossible, to talk about study topics because she would need to translate English words in her head all the time, when she perhaps does not even know the corresponding word in the other language. This may also be a perspective of shared languages, because there might be an idea of the other person not understanding if code-switching is used. Pragmatic language use is built to effectively communicate a message, so Student1 perhaps feels that it is easiest to simply use English. Furthermore, Student3 also talked about a similar aspect of language use, describing multilingual language use from the point of view of fully switching between languages. In her understanding, switching between languages can be a bit “troubling”, “challenging” at first: when one has used one language for some time, and then has to switch into another, the right words can be difficult to find at first, until the language starts to flow naturally again. Both of these opinions arguably reflect the monolingual bias, and see the languages as separate entities unlike the integrated multilingual repertoire described by García and Li Wei (2014). The opinions echo the standard of using languages separately and staying within one language at a time, but also show how this can be difficult at times, when one naturally has vocabulary from different languages and uses different languages frequently during the day. Overall, Student3 talked from the perspective of the English-Finnish parallel language use of the university, saying how she finds it positive that she can use either language, both languages being in her own repertoire (although not her first language). The point of using different languages in the current program did not come up in Student3’s interview that much, because she also attends some minor studies in Finnish, and so her studies in effect consist of both English- and Finnish-medium studies, and she actually has the opportunity to use different languages in education. Her focus on switching between languages most likely comes from this

perspective of moving between languages already. Code-switching, defined as using multiple languages at the same time, was not a topic of the interviews as such, but none of the students also brought that up or considered a code-switching perspective, which is interesting. To sum up, in these perspectives multilingual language use equals moving between languages, but not using multiple languages at the same time.

Student2 had a very positive view towards multilingualism, and was the only student who also brought up criticism against the central role of English as the international language, and wished that other languages would be clearly acknowledged in education.

(7) "-- the position where [English] is placed could start to maybe change to be somehow more realistic, so I would like the idea that people would be encouraged to use their own languages"
[Student2, translated]

("-- se asema mihin se on asetettu vois ruveta ehkä vähän muuttumaan jotenkin realistisemmaksi et kyl mä tykkäisin siitä ajatuksesta että rohkaistais ja kannustettais käyttämään omia kieliä")

Again, she brought up how using different languages, like reading texts in multiple languages, can help people's thought process or open up new aspects of the subject matter. She thinks it is nicer to hear different languages being spoken than uphold the idea that everyone should speak English all the time. She also brought up how the English-medium international programs are often very separated from the Finnish-language programs, even though there could be interrelation between the program content, and if this is only based on the language, the situation could be looked at more critically. The questions of language as excluding or including came up in many interviews. The university has a Finnish-English parallel language policy, so in effect important information should be available in both languages, but this does not always happen in reality. Lecturer2 talked about this situation, saying that students and employees who know both languages might be in the most privileged position. Student3 as well mentioned that from her own experience from working as a tutor, sometimes there is not enough information available to students in English. She actually felt that the university could be a bit more English-oriented in this way. So there are multiple contrasting points of language use and inclusion.

4.4. Acknowledgements of language use in the program

The third research question deals with how is multilingual language use acknowledged within the program, and whether it is encouraged or restricted. This is answered by considering how

language use is talked about in the program, based on the opinions and experiences that came up in the interviews.

One way that language is addressed in the program is when it comes to English as the study language. Student1 brought up in her interview that lecturers often mention the non-nativeness of both students and lecturers themselves. Lecturer2 as well explained that many lecturers in the program address the language use at the beginning of courses, emphasizing that the program works with “English as an academic lingua franca and global lingua franca”. Lecturer1 as well addressed the non-nativeness during the observed course. In this way, the diverse student population is acknowledged, but nonetheless, only through the use of English. When it comes to addressing multilingualism, the situation varies a lot more. As discussed, one way that students use their other languages is in reading. Lecturer2 as well brought up that one way where students can use their whole repertoires is accessing literature and using different-language data for example in their theses. She saw this as very positive, also from the point of view that in this way, students can make research in other languages more accessible by reporting on it in English. However, this notion also illustrates the dominance of English as the scientific language. Student2 also briefly mentioned that often, there is just no literature available in her first language, and then English becomes the only option, even if she would like to access other language sources.

The two lecturers’ attitudes towards the use of other languages during lectures differed, even though with both, the point of English as a common study language came through strongly. Lecturer2 had a very positive perception, and said that especially during large courses where there are people from many different study backgrounds, she lets people use any language they wish in group work situations, as long as everyone in the group shares the language and they are able to report on the discussion in English:

(8) “Why not. I think that [students making use of any of their linguistic repertoires] is the skill we should be developing in our students instead of forcing English upon them wherever”
[Lecturer2]

She perhaps referred to the larger situation as well, the idea that students need their multilingual skills in their life in general. In contrast, Lecturer1 had a bit more negative view on the use of other languages, because of problems of reporting back in English. The impression was that he

sees the use of other languages as the easy way, and expressed that when the discussion is not had in English, sometimes students then have problems to report on it in English afterwards. However, he also felt that the master's degree students rarely use other languages, and this might be very true, because the students can be oriented to using English in the class, as was seen from the student interviews as well. The theme of English as the official study language, and the importance of shared languages, are very clear overall. Lecturer1 had a positive view on multilingualism in general, but was very focused on the practical teaching situation and felt that in this program multilingual language use would have to be a concrete point of curriculum to be of use:

(9) "Our learning objectives are elsewhere than in language, so I think it could distract if it would become one of the central points -- English is in general in this type [of program] a kind of standard choice that gives the possibility to focus on other things" [Lecturer1, translated]

("Meillä varsinaiset oppimistavoitteet on ihan kuitenkin muualla kun siinä kielessä nii sitten mä luulen että se saattas viedä sivupoluille jos siitä tulis yks keskeisistä asioista -- englanti on ylipäättään näissä täntyyppisissä ikäänku vakiovalinta joka antaa sitten mahdollisuuden keskittyä muihin juttuihin")

The description of English as the "standard choice" is very apt, but of course an alternative to a standard situation can be imagined. Student2 mentioned that she has not had any lecturer say that other languages could be used during class discussion, and even though students can of course make these decisions themselves, saying it out loud could be a good way of acknowledging and appreciating multilingual language use. However, the student and lecturer perspectives can differ here. Student2 saw that as the discussion is most often reported back in English anyway, it does not matter if it is originally had in another language: but she did not see the problems that the lecturers see, that students would then actually have difficulty reporting back in English. This can be a problem of proficiency, but perhaps also comes back to the effective use of language, and the difficulties in switching rapidly between languages discussed in the previous section.

The question of including multilingual language practices is often tied to resources and practicality. Even if multilingualism is encouraged in thought, in reality official language policies, need to be effective and understood in communication, and simple time and place constraints can affect language use greatly. However, the interviews focused a lot on the teaching, official content of studies, and classroom interaction. Students could also be actively

encouraged to use their full linguistic resources in their own study habits, but this encouragement would have to be included in the formal teaching as well.

4.5. Implications of the study

In this study, the language use was similar to many previous studies about English-medium programs: for example, the preference of both students and lecturers to discuss study-related issues in English, while possibly using other languages in everyday talk. Söderlundh (2012: 105) explains how the students themselves often hold up the norm of using English as the appropriate study language, and Mortensen (2014) describes how English is often used in study-related talk as the “working language”, while the local language of the university is used in off-topic talk. Furthermore, Söderlundh (2012) finds that groups of first language speakers might use their own language, while English is the common language between everyone, a common perspective that also came up in this study. The type of international program discussed in this study has students and staff from all over the world, so a common linguistic practice has to be established, and it is, normatively, English. However, in English-medium (EMI) programs, the language of instruction is often taken for granted. The importance of language should not be ignored: because we communicate and express ourselves through language, language affects our being and doing. Lecturer2 mentioned how language competence of course informs someone’s ability to communicate content or engage in discussion, which also affects assessment in EMI programs. There might be different opinions within different fields of study as well: Lecturer1 discussed how there are sometimes disagreements about language requirements between faculties in the university. Lecturers in technical fields or natural sciences might feel like language does not have as much of an effect, because they deal with content matter that has its separate communication ways, like equations or computational language. In the humanities, linguistic abilities are seen as more important, as content is also more dependent on reading and writing. This shows how language is a point of concern in EMI programs, even if it is not addressed as central.

The prominence of EMI programs and how they operate is also dependent on the country in question. In a small country like Finland, English is in practice the only option to attract a wider population of international students, because Finnish is a relatively rare language to know. Finnish EMI programs usually have more foreign students than local students that speak Finnish as a first language (Saarinen 2012: 165). English naturally becomes the language that students

use in their communication: one student in this study also mentioned how the Finnish students want to make sure that they switch to English whenever there are non-Finnish speaking students present. The environment is not bilingual, as it might in another country: instead, it is one with diverse people and different repertoires. This is the reason why it could perhaps be even more important to consider the language use and address it consciously.

Even though EMI programs might seem to only operate in English, in practice other languages can come up regularly within the actual communicative practices in the program. In the present study, the interviewed students were all in favor of some type of acknowledgement of multilingualism in their program, but also brought up practical considerations and issues. Language use within university programs is obviously tied to resources, as also discussed in Doiz et al. (2013): limitations of curriculum, schedule constraints, and other practical issues have an effect on how inclusive of different languages universities can be. Student2 aptly said that including multilingual communication in the formal teaching is problematic because it does not have traditions or old conventions behind it. The inclusion of multilingual ways of interaction is an emerging question. Student1 as well expressed that it is understandable that lecturers cannot address everyone's backgrounds. However, this is also an issue that is prevalent in studies of translanguaging: the idea that teachers should know all the languages that students know. Instead, the view could shift to that of students being able to use their resources freely, especially in their own study habits, even if the teachers do not share those repertoires (see García and Li Wei 2014: 80-81). Even if English stays as the official language of the program, students could benefit from an encouragement to also use their other languages or take advantage of their background in suitable ways. Student2 actively uses a translanguaging method in her study habits, where she sometimes reads on a topic in multiple languages in order to understand it better. Similarly, all students saw the opportunities in accessing sources and information in multiple languages, and how it can widen one's perspective.

However, the aim to include multilingual ways of interaction into an international university program is not a straightforward one, as it seems to inevitably become a question of ideological considerations versus practical considerations. Ideally, we can say that English should not be the exclusively used language, and say that multilingualism and translanguaging benefits everyone, but this is also a very practical issue. Students and teachers cannot opt out of the need to understand each other and be effective with language use in educational spaces. Furthermore, many students might have chosen an EMI program on the basis that the instruction language is

English, and they want to better their English or study in the international environment because they have international goals. Learning to be fluent and convincing in English might be a concern that comes with EMI programs, even if at the same time, the programs are not defined as language education. The role of English as the international language, and the common language in international academics and working life, is not something that will just change in a second. However, this is indeed the issue, and as mentioned in the analysis, the importance of other languages than English as languages of science is also central. The prestige of other languages than English can be improved by allowing them to be used in the educational space. Moreover, the hegemony of English reinforces the same, native-like, rules of language use for everyone, which does not necessarily make sense when we are using English as a lingua franca between different speakers. This affects the assessment of students as well, and might have a negative impact on those who are less fluent, or use language in a non-standard way.

Even though this study incorporates the idea of translanguaging and multilingual repertoires as integrated, it is difficult to discuss these issues without falling back to the categorization of different languages. An important facet is the fact that translanguaging is something that cannot necessarily always be seen: students use their whole repertoire even if they currently communicate in “one” language only. García and Li Wei (2014: 70) mention how translanguaging is a process which usually leads to a product that is seen to belong to one language, and how educational spaces where one language is expected also need to exist, because of the societal concerns and assessment requirements. In effect, because the larger society expects us to communicate in one language at a time, and because assessment methods need certain rules behind them, in practice we cannot just mix and match languages in any way we like. However, this does not mean that the process cannot include many languages: indeed, this already happens. For example, if the students in this study say that they discuss their English-language materials in Finnish within a group, while making the assignment that is also in English, here is already a good example of translanguaging. While the only audible language might be Finnish, the overall situation is multilingual. This kind of hidden multilingualism is already present in these programs: language use does not happen in a vacuum, but individuals bring their diverse backgrounds into situations.

In the program of this study, language use is often referred to from the point of view of using English as an academic lingua franca. A natural next step, if multilingualism would be acknowledged more, would simply be to discuss it out loud too. The view of multilingual

language use that the students in this study expressed was focused on using one language at a time, and switching between languages. This as well demonstrates how new the idea of multilingual language use or translanguaging in education is. The lack of previous multilingual practices, the bias of monolingualism, and also the practicality of communication create issues on adopting translanguaging pedagogies. It is easy to use one language and leave it at that, but language is also a powerful tool for inclusion or exclusion, which makes the questions of language, and flexibility in language use, important.

5. Conclusion

This study looked at an international English-medium university program from a multilingual point of view. English-medium programs around the world have become commonplace, but the implicit role of English as the international language has been questioned and put under criticism. Because international programs host both students and staff that come from different backgrounds and have different linguistic repertoires, the question of inclusion of multilingual ways of communication becomes relevant. This study focused on one program within the humanities, and used both classroom observation and interviews with students and lecturers to gather knowledge of language use, perceptions of English-medium and multilingual education, as well as attitudes towards and acknowledgements of multilingual language use within the program. The guiding principle was the idea of translanguaging, a view that sees multilingual repertoires as thoroughly integrated, instead of as strictly separated different languages (e.g. García and Li Wei 2014). The benefits of translanguaging in education include both language learning and content learning: by allowing students to use their full linguistic resources, we can support and enhance their learning and everyday practices.

The common language of the program in this study is English, and that is clearly the most used language. However, there were occasions of classroom discussion in other languages as well, mostly in students' group discussions. The students reported using other languages than English mostly in reading, accessing more variety and viewpoints in references, as well as occasionally in conversation. One student also spoke for the benefits of reading about topics in multiple languages, and how it can support a fuller understanding of the topics: a very translanguaging-oriented approach. In conversation, the importance of shared languages could be seen.

Conversation in other languages than English happens often between shared first language speakers, but also simply if a language like Finnish is shared with all the participants, whether first language or foreign language speakers. However, both students and lecturers seem more comfortable discussing study-related topics in English, as it is the official language of the program and the source of the terminology. A separation between English as the official language, and other languages in everyday, off-topic talk could be seen as well. Furthermore, the use of academic English was discussed by every interviewee, specifying this variety as the focus of language use within the program.

The students' attitudes towards multilingual education were positive, but in practice they saw many difficulties with it. Even though students felt positively about multilingual communication, or wished that their personal repertoire could somehow be acknowledged, they felt that in practice everyone's diverse backgrounds cannot be all addressed within the program content. The students considered the practicality and the formal teaching, and the issues of trying to include multilingual concerns. Furthermore, the students mostly defined multilingual language use as switching between languages, and one student expressed resistance to mixing languages, instead preferring to stay within English in the study environment. The lecturers had differing views on multilingual language use within the program: one would encourage students to use their languages, the other felt that multilingualism would have to be a point of curriculum to be reasonably included. Overall, every participant had a positive view on multilingualism, but the usefulness and practical applications of including multilingual communication in this program was seen as an issue.

The lecturers often address language use within the program from the point of view of English, and accommodation of non-native speakers, emphasizing that the program environment works with English as an academic lingua franca. The students also expressed concern over each other and adaptation into each other's linguistic repertoires to include everyone: in practice, this most often means using English as the all-inclusive language. The importance of English as a common language is clear, but it remains important to critically consider language use within this type of programs. The participants also voiced some criticism towards the role of English as the central lingua franca language in academics. As seen from the findings, students naturally use all their languages to some extent within their studies, but if we want to promote multilingualism it would have to be explicitly discussed and included in the teaching or the program environment. Even if English is kept as the common language, students can be

encouraged to communicate with the help of their other languages or consider points of views that they allow, as well as being free to use all their resources in their own personal study habits.

This study adds to the growing topic area of multilingual education, and offers some insights into these specific type of international university programs. The number of participants is quite small, and the focus is on one program only, so this study cannot be generalized as such. Further studies into this topic in the Finnish setting could be done in the future, also including various fields of study outside of the humanities, where linguistic orientations can be different. A focus on specific translanguaging practices and strategies could also be taken. One important topic that also came up in this study is the perspective of language as inclusion/exclusion. When universities have parallel language use of local language and English, those who know both languages are in the most privileged position. In practice, there can be many situations where language becomes a barrier, even without meaning so. This was not a central topic as such in the present study, but it is a meaningful point of view into the linguistic situation in international education. The choices we make with language are not just arbitrary, but have a real impact on people's everyday lives.

Bibliography

- Alzahrani, T. (2019). Investigating translanguaging practices and attitudes of international students in higher education at an American university. *Arab World English Journal*, 1: 1, 118-128.
- Aronin, L. and Singleton, D. M. (2012). *Multilingualism*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1-28.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Conteh, J. and Meier, G. (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Doiz, A. and Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices. In Mazak, C. and Carroll, K. S. (Eds.) *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol; Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J. (2013). Globalisation, internationalisation, multilingualism and linguistic strains in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38: 9, 1407-1421.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gajo, L. and Berthoud, A. (2018). Multilingual interaction and construction of knowledge in higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21: 7, 853-866.
- García, O. and Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O. and Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In Conteh, J. and Meier, G. (Eds.) *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language and Communication*, 58, 1-10.

- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18: 7, 641-654.
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010). The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing bilingual language learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal*, 94: 2, 254-277.
- May, S. (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge.
- Mazak, C. and Herbas-Donoso, C. (2015). Translanguaging practices at a bilingual university: A case study of a science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18: 6, 698-714.
- Mazak, C. and Carroll, K. S. (2017). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol; Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Mortensen, J. (2014). Language policy from below: Language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35: 4, 425-442.
- Rivera, A. J. and Mazak, C. (2019). Pedagogical translanguaging in a Puerto Rican university classroom: An exploratory case study of student beliefs and practices. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 18: 3, 225-239.
- Ruusuvuori, J., Nikander, P. and Hyvärinen, M. (2010). *Haastattelun analyysi*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Saarinen, T. (2012). Internationalization of Finnish higher education — is language an issue? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2012: 216, 157-173.
- Shah, M., Pillai, S. and Sinayah, M. (2019). Translanguaging in an academic setting. *Lingua*, 225, 16-31.
- Söderlundh, H. (2012). Global policies and local norms: Sociolinguistic awareness and language choice at an international university. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2012: 216, 87-109.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for second language education: A coursebook*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Pub.

Appendices: interview questions

Appendix 1. Interview questions

A. STUDENT INTERVIEWS

1. Language background: your languages, when/how have you learned them, which languages have you used in education?
2. Why did you want to study in this program / in an English-medium program / in Finland?
3. How do you feel about the use of English as a study language?
- Are there problems in using English in studies: is the use of English effortless or do you feel like you are still learning it? How are problems solved?
4. Does the program teach e.g. academic writing skills or other practicalities, or is English a non-issue?
5. Do you feel that your language is being assessed, is this good or bad?
6. Which languages are used in studies and in which frequency: do you use other languages than English?
- on lectures or in groupwork, making notes on lectures, talking with the teacher, talking with shared L1 speakers vs. others, to understand course content, writing assignments, reading sources...
7. How do you feel about the compulsory Finnish course / does knowledge of Finnish matter?
**originally an additional question*
8. Would you want to use all your languages in your studies? Why/why not?
9. Do you see opportunities to use other languages than English? Should there be ones?
10. Would the idea of a multilingual course be interesting (e.g. writing multilingual essays)?
**in your own languages*

B. LECTURER INTERVIEWS

1. Your own background: languages, teaching experience, etc.
2. Have you studied English or in English yourself?
3. How is it like for you to use English in your teaching/work?
4. The instruction language in the program is English but are there any other mentions of language use on the university level?
5. Do you assess language on course work?
6. What do you think about the students' English level?
7. Are there ever any other languages present in the studies?
8. Do you think other languages should be used / do you see opportunities for multilingual language use?
9. Do you think students would take on these opportunities or do they want to use English?