

Bilingual aspirations: Students' language learning practices in bilingual bachelor's degrees at the University of Helsinki

Dragana Cvetanović†, University of Helsinki
Heini Lehtonen, University of Helsinki
Åsa Mickwitz, University of Helsinki
Auli Toom, University of Helsinki

This paper examines students' practices in becoming bilingual experts. Students study in bilingual bachelor's degrees (Finnish-Swedish) at the University of Helsinki. The research questions are: 1) What practices do the students engage in to promote language and content learning? 2) How are language ideologies and perceptions of language learning reflected in student practices? 3) How do learning environments, including teachers' practices, guide and regulate students' practices towards bilingual expertise? The data consist of observations during the lessons as well as interviews immediately after the lessons. The data were analysed qualitatively. The main theoretical concepts are content-based language learning, bilingual expertise, language ideologies and the learning environment. The analysis shows that many students pro-actively seek opportunities to enhance and practise their "weaker" language. However, students' language ideologies, attitudes, and perceptions of what it is to 'know' and 'learn' a language affect the practices they engage in. In this context, the different status of Finnish and Swedish in the society plays a role as well. The students call for student-centred, engaging teaching methods that offer a safe environment in which to practise one's expert voice in different languages. The students are mostly content with the language support offered by the Language Centre, but the timing of the support is not always ideal. Integrated language and content courses with co-teaching were mentioned as a desirable practice.

Keywords: *language learning practices, bilingual education, language ideology, learning environment*

1 Introduction

The multilingual turn in applied linguistics (e.g. May, 2013) has challenged the monolingual norm, and as a result, has promoted enhanced research on bilingual education and multilingualism in university settings. Bilingual degrees and students' learning practices have been explored from various perspectives: such as, from the point of view of classroom evaluation practices (Crooks, 1988), students' use of technology in practices for language learning (Viberg & Grönlund, 2017, Hadiyanto et al., 2021), learning practices among culturally and linguistically diverse students (Garcia, 1991), and exchange students' language learning practices (Szabó & Dufva, 2020). This article explores situated language learning practices among emergent bilingual students studying in a bilingual bachelor's degree programme in Swedish and Finnish at the University of Helsinki.

The topic of content-based language learning approaches has been of scholarly interest for decades (Nikula et al., 2016), and it is now an established form of education in bilingual education, immersion and content-based instruction (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2014). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has developed a relatively established set of practices. Coyle, however, points out that there are "no fixed models which pre-determine how CLIL will develop" (2013, p. 245). According to her, the "dual focused approaches" encourage cross-disciplinary engagement in learning processes in general, language learning practices, bilingualism, inter-cultural awareness, and bi-literacies (Coyle, 2013). Coyle (2013) also points out that there is a demand for more evidence of classroom practices that demonstrate the effectiveness of learning practices in terms of content, linguistic and intercultural competence. Our project, of which this paper is a part, has been cross-disciplinary to some extent: its questions touch upon applied linguistics as well as university pedagogy.

Less research has been published on students' perceptions of content and language integration than those of teachers (Nikula et al., 2016). Students' perspectives on CLIL have been explored mostly outside higher education: Hüttner et al. (2013) argued that CLIL students have more confidence in using English than those learning outside the CLIL context. Coyle (2013) explored a sense of achievement among the CLIL students. Research on the content-based instruction (CBI) and immersion studies has shown that learners demonstrate equal or higher performance levels in subject matter learning compared to peers learning in their first language (Day & Shapson, 1996). To develop research on student perspectives on content and language integrated learning further, this study focuses on emergent bilingual students' language learning practices.

In accordance with its societal responsibility to educate experts in both national languages of Finland (Sylvén 2017; 2024), the University of Helsinki initiated TvEx¹ bilingual programmes in 2014. Bilingual programmes are offered in eight academic disciplines and taught in Finland's two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. The goal of the TvEx programmes is to educate experts who can use both Finnish and Swedish in their professional life. In practice, TvEx students are not studying in isolation of the globalised and international communities, where plurilingual expertise is a necessity for most people (Ylönen, 2015; Jalkanen, Almonkari & Taalas, 2016). Multiple language competence is typically a prerequisite more than a demand in the contemporary job market (Mickwitz et al., 2020). Some scholars even claim that monolingualism is a new kind of illiteracy in modern societies (Ndhlovu, 2015).

TvEx can be completed in ten Bachelor's programmes/fields of study (law, chemistry, physics, science teacher, biology, molecular life sciences, environmental sciences, environment and food economy, agriculture). TvEx students are taught by content teachers who usually teach in their stronger language, although they are expected to be fluent in the other national language too. The TvEx programme approach to learning surely has something in common with the numerous content-based language learning approaches, but mostly it has its own peculiarities, challenges and contents as an

educational reality, and so we consider it to be an idiosyncratic case of language and content learning in higher education.

In the following sections, we will first present the background to the TvEx programmes and tackle the core theoretical framework for our analysis, whereafter we present the findings of the analysis.

1.1 Context of the study and the concept and conceptlessness of TvEx

Finland is a bilingual² nation with two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. Approximately 5.1 percent (2023³) of the population speaks Swedish. The University of Helsinki is officially bilingual (Finnish/Swedish) and is tasked with training an adequate number of individuals proficient in Swedish to meet the country's needs. In addition, the use of English as the global academic lingua franca has intensified on all levels at the University of Helsinki as well.

TvEx, which is an abbreviation of Swedish *tvåspråkig examen* (bilingual degree), was initiated in the mid-2010s by the Swedish Affairs (Svenska ärenden) at the University of Helsinki, which is responsible for the support and development of Swedish-Finnish bilingualism. An expert group, established at the University in 2007, was tasked with creating a concept for bilingual degrees. This novelty was well synchronised with the paragraph in the Strategic plan for the University of Helsinki 2010–2012 (2009, p. 50) that stressed the promotion of a multi-language environment for the students. The concept of TvEx was based on a model of bilingual degrees that was applied and set into practice at the University of Freiburg in Germany.

Even if Finnish and Swedish have equal status at the University of Helsinki, Finnish is the main and high-status language, and in most situations, the “default” language (Lindström, 2012). Swedish is the language of instruction and examination at all levels, but to a limited extent. Also, for most Swedish-speaking students, Finnish is an every-day language, used in several contexts of their life. Many identify themselves as bilingual. The Finnish-speaking students' skills in Swedish are generally lower (Mickwitz et al., 2021). They have learnt Swedish as a second language at school, but they have not necessarily had a lot of practice in using the language.

Accordingly, the official purpose of TvEx is to educate bilingual experts in a range of fields to ensure that there will be enough Swedish speaking expertise in Finnish society. However, because it is also an important language policy issue, Tvex is a way to increase the number of students in Swedish speaking bachelor's programs and thus to assure the status of Swedish as an academic language at the University of Helsinki (Saarinen, 2020). While the idea of TvEx has been comprehensive and synchronised with the ongoing academic and global trends, a more detailed strategy for learning and teaching has not been made. The programme still relies much on the enthusiasm of the teaching staff at the faculties and their solutions to (re)-organise their teaching according to the TvEx frames. CLIL, or any other similar teaching strategy as a theoretical and methodological reference, has not been chosen as a possible model to work with, although the developers of TvEx were inspired by bilingual practices in the University of Freiburg.

TvEx was created as a teaching programme for students to gain bilingual expertise, and to be able to work in bilingual and multilingual environments. Not only students, but teachers too, benefit from a certain 'TvEx adjustment', as they are challenged to reflect and develop their teaching practices to meet the need of linguistically diverse teaching groups and multilingual students.

1.2 Aims and research questions

In this article, we focus on the students' perspective on their learning practices. We explore students' approaches to learning language and disciplinary content in the TvEx

programmes. We study the language learning practices that the TvEx students engage in during their individual processes of simultaneously becoming fluent in the disciplinary content as well as in the other (weaker) language they are studying in, Finnish or Swedish. Our aim is to shed light on TvEx students' experiences of their language learning practices, and to explore how language ideologies shape students' practices, as well as in how the learning environment supports students' learning processes to become bilingual experts in their own fields of study.

Our research questions are:

- 1) What practices do the students engage in to promote language learning simultaneously with content learning?
- 2) How are language ideologies and perceptions of language learning reflected in student practices?
- 3) How do learning environments, including teachers' practices, guide and regulate students' practices towards bilingual expertise?

In the next section, we will present a theoretical background on language learning practices and bilingual expertise. The following section analyses how learning environments stimulate students' practices.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Language learning practices and bilingual expertise

With language learning practices, research in general refers to practices undertaken by students to improve their language skills in their weaker language (Jalkanen et al., 2012; Richards, 2015). However, for this study, we take a broader perspective and refer to language learning practices as all actions taken by the learner, including the physical and psychological learning environment, to build bilingual expertise (Van Lier, 2004, Jalkanen et al., 2012). We approach learning from the learners' point of view, focusing on the practices (cf. Coyle, 2013). Although we focus on student practices, we acknowledge the teachers' role as being important, since they often set the didactic contract for how students can and should act in the classroom in terms of both language and content (cf. Brousseau et al., 1997).

Students' language learning practices are intertwined with their goal of becoming bilingual experts. When discussing bilingual expertise, we refer to the students' ability to establish a sense of belonging and a social identity in both language groups, alongside theoretical and practical language and content skills (Norton & McKinney, 2011). This is particularly important for Finnish-speaking students, who in many cases have had little or no contact with the Swedish-speaking part of the Finnish society before entering higher education.

In applied linguistics and pedagogy, there is a growing understanding that language and communication skills are not and should not be acquired separately from substance knowledge and skills (Jalkanen et al., 2012). This is based both on the socio-cultural notion of language and its implications for language learning and teaching (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007) as well as on the importance of so-called generic skills and professional skills in higher education (Jalkanen et al., 2012; Tuononen, Parpala & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2019).

In accordance with the socio-cultural language learning theories, we view bilingual expertise as a form of action that is socially constructed (Van Lier, 2004; Jalkanen, Pitkänen-Huhta & Taalas, 2012), rather than seeing language as a monolithic 'object'.

Every speaker's linguistic skills – often referred to as repertoires – are partial and multifaceted (Blommaert & Backus, 2013; Busch, 2012).

The clearest implications for language learning and teaching are first that a native-like competence in any language is an abstraction, and not a rewarding goal for a learner (Rampton, 1995; Cook, 1999; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008). Second, when language is regarded as action and practices, it is best learnt by engaging in the practices and activities with the right affordances (Van Lier, 2004). The role of the teacher, then, is to scaffold the students' learning process, that is, help the students reach the zone of proximal development (ZPD). ZPD refers to the space between what the learner is capable of doing unsupported and what the learner cannot do even when supported (Van Lier, 2004; Vygotsky, 1978).

Language skills and substance skills are intertwined in learning; to become an expert, one needs to learn the language and the communication norms of the field (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In other words, when studying specific subjects, students learn to master the subjects' specific discourse, as well as to use languages as a resource for meaning making and for participation in various communities of practice (Wenger, 1999). To be literate in mathematics, for instance, one needs to be able to know not only figures and facts, but to be able to participate in the experts' discourse communities (Roth & Tobin, 2007; Solomon, 2008). Their learning occurs through the dialogue and interaction with other members of their community of practice (Wells, 1999). Language, contents and meaning making are thus mutually constitutive: learners need opportunities to engage in oral and written discourse in their classroom community in order to create their own understanding of the subject domains (Tan, 2011). TvEx students need to acquire an emerging professional expertise that includes academic literacy and profession-specific language and communication skills in both Finnish and Swedish – and in the transnational, international and global academic spaces undoubtedly also in English and possibly in other languages (Ylönen, 2015). For the TvEx students, scaffolding should involve opportunities to communicate in both Swedish and Finnish in engaging learning environments.

2.2 Language ideologies and the learning environment

When aiming at a change in pedagogical and linguistic practices, it is crucial to understand the language ideologies that guide the choices of teachers and students. Whenever a form of language is constructed as proper or improper, correct or false, bad or good, broken or complete, language ideologies are at play. Language ideologies are attitudes toward and evaluations of language(s) and their speakers (Woolard, 2020; Kroskrity, 2010). One of the more persistent language ideologies in educational institutions is the monolingual norm (Jonsson, 2017), described as the naturalised mindset and state, where monolingualism of both individuals and institutional interaction of the community is seen as a default setting (cf. Ndhlovu 2015). In this setting multilingualism is treated as an exception, or even as an imperfect state that should be avoided (Blackledge, 2008; Canagarajah, 2013). Multilingualism is welcome only as a form of parallel monolingualism, where two or more languages co-exist without interference, interaction, or mixing (Heller, 1999; Jørgensen, 2008). The idea of parallel monolingualism describes the current relationship between Finnish and Swedish in many domains of the Finnish society, including the University of Helsinki (Slotte-Lüttge, From & Sahlström, 2013; Sylvén, 2017; Lehtonen et al. 2023).

The monolingual bias has received attention in sociolinguistics (Auer, 2007), applied linguistics, and in research on second language acquisition (SLA) more specifically (Kachru, 1994; Ortega, 2019). The change in mindset has been labelled as already mentioned as “the multilingual turn” (Ortega, 2019; May, 2013; cf. the social turn in SLA, Block, 2003). Its implications include that diverse repertoires and communities are

considered to be ‘normal’, and the monolingual native speaker is no longer the ideal of language education. Furthermore, the turn implies that multilingual interaction is examined on its own terms and not based on the monolingual norm (Auer, 2007). Despite the ideological changes in applied linguistics and language education, the attitudes of speakers and the norms in institutional spaces change slowly. Participants adapt to institutional norms: people are simply used to the fact that it is a custom to use only one language during the lectures, or for the course work.

Language ideologies materialise in norms and attitudes, and their relationship to institutional and educational practices is dialogical: language ideologies are circulated and enhanced yet modified in educational institutions in and through practices (Gal, 2006; Kroskrity, 2000). In educational research, the settings in which interactions aimed at learning take place are called the learning environment. For this study, we define learning environments as the physical settings, psychological factors and social relationships that are available to learners. A crucial part of the learning environment is the teacher, and one of the more significant factors affecting students’ learning in content and language learning settings are the linguistic practices of content teachers (Guo, Tao & Gao, 2019; Cenoz & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015). The language awareness of the teachers (Andrews & Svalberg, 2017) affects their beliefs of why and how language should be used. Thus, language ideologies, attitudes, and norms define the learning environment (Lehtonen et al., 2023). An ideal learning environment is student-centered, realistic and effective, and it should also encompass a physical environment which reflects the way the knowledge will be used (Hill & Hannafin, 2001; Honebein, Duffy & Fishman, 1993). TvEx programmes aim to provide what some scholars call an authentic learning environment (Herrington, 2005), meaning that language skills “are accumulated” when the students actively use their second language when studying (Vänskä & Mickwitz, 2021).

The learning tasks that students perform during a course are arguably the crucial aspect of the design of any learning environment. Ideally, such tasks should comprise well-defined activities that have real-world relevance (Lombardi & Oblinger, 2007). Lombardi and Oblinger (2007) also suggests that the students should use multiple sources and perspectives, forcing themselves to choose relevant information from the irrelevant. Students should also collaborate with each other during the courses and in the real world and if needed, they should approach the subject from interdisciplinary perspectives.

3 Data collection and method

The data for this study consist of lecture observations and 14 semi-structured retrospective interviews (*stimulated recall*, Gass & Mackey, 2000; Stough, 2001; Vesterinen, Toom & Patrikainen 2010) with 15⁴ students (one interview included two students) conducted during 2018–2019. Six students were Finnish-speaking and nine were Swedish-speaking. We first contacted all TvEx students based on a list we received from the university. Some students were willing to let us observe their lessons and interview them. To recruit further interviewees, we contacted teachers and asked for permission to come to observe their lectures. In the beginning of the lectures, we inquired if there were any voluntary TvEx students we could interview after the lesson. We interviewed the students right after the 90-minute lectures we observed, so we could discuss their incentives for involving in certain practices on the lectures. The observation inspired some of the questions in the interviews, but the interviews (and not the observations) serve as main data for the analysis in this paper. Three of the four authors of this paper (Cvetanović, Lehtonen and Mickwitz) took part in the observations and conducted the interviews.

We were interested to hear what the students did during and outside lectures, how they responded to the teaching and to teachers’ practices, and what kind of teaching

material was or was not used during the lectures. We asked the students what practices they applied in learning language through learning the content and asked them to share their experiences regarding the language support provided by the Language Centre at the University of Helsinki.

All the interviews were transcribed verbatim⁵ by an outsourced professional company and then coded by the authors using Atlas.TI software. The data were then subjected to the inductive method in the form of qualitative content analysis (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014). The researchers shared the task of analysing the interview data, and each one preliminarily coded the text independently. Having read the transcriptions closely, the researchers discussed the directional codes that should be used in the subsequent reading of the data and agreed on how to define the extra codes. In the follow-up discussion, we reviewed the first results of the coding, and then checked the reliability of the coding categories by comparing the individual analyses, and in some cases reconciling them. The reflective statements were discussed in varying amounts of detail. All coding disagreements were resolved to ensure a common interpretation of the reflective statements in question.

This paper as well as the data are part of a larger research project and its data set. The data of the whole project consist of a questionnaire to students as well as interviews with teachers, students and the language support professionals⁶.

4 Findings

This section presents the findings of students' language learning practices, the ideologies affecting these, as well as the role of the learning environment.

4.1 Students' language learning practices

Although content courses that students attend during TvEx programmes are neither considered nor organised as language learning courses, several student practices that foster the development of bilingual expertise are observable in the data. These include:

- listening, taking notes
- interacting in small groups
- employing online dictionaries, Google and other tools/materials
- asking for peer support
- using the weaker language during free time in various ways
- taking Swedish courses/utilising the official language support
- asking clarifying questions

It is evident that many of these practices (if not most) are common parts of higher education learning processes, whereas some are more typical in language learning. Our analysis reveals that some of these practices are more supported by the learning environment (and by the teachers) than others. In addition to the practices occurring during the lectures as well as activities directly related to learning assignments, TvEx students engage in out-of-classroom activities that support language learning. They read newspapers or books in their weaker language or participate in student activities in their weaker language, to gain the feeling of belonging in social groups speaking their weaker language. In fact, some students described the informal interaction as being crucial for becoming bilingual experts: after gaining some sense of belonging in student groups in their weaker language, they felt more confident in using the weaker language in the lectures and learning assignments (Mickwitz et al., 2021).

Usually, the students perceive terminology as the most challenging area of language learning, although many of the Finnish-speaking students express the pressure exerted

by trying to “get the grammar right”. The following example illustrates how one student makes use of dictionaries and online materials, as well as peer support. However, their quest to develop bilingual expertise is not limited to classroom practices or assignments directly related to studying.

Example 1.⁷ Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = student, I = Interviewer

I: In what way, what is the most challenging? Is it the vocabulary or the grammar or...?

A: Probably the vocabulary is the most challenging. To me, in a way I know the grammar pretty well, but maybe then one also develops, one's own pressure that all grammar must be correct and then I use way too much time with that although I have already made a point although not every single grammar issue is correct. But, yes surely it's the vocabulary. Especially if it is like this, specific terminology.

I: What do you use, what tools do you use for it?

S: A MOT dictionary. [An online dictionary offered by the university.]

I: And Google and all these probably too..?

S: Yes.

I: Yes, the internet, yes.

(- -)

I: What other language support do you get or what, how do you develop your language skills in Swedish other than being at lectures and reading these, or writing these texts in Swedish. Do you have some, a friend Swedish-speaking friend or..?

S: I mainly read literature in Swedish, and I have been listening to podcasts in Swedish and have been considering a subscription for HBL [Hufvudstadsbladet, the main Finnish daily newspaper in Swedish].

I: [laughing]

S: But I do not get to speak that much otherwise. But I have been speaking with other TvEx students that we could just decide for a time when we only speak Swedish.

I: Between each other although you are Finnish speakers?

S: Yes.

I: Did you do it?

S: No. [Laughing] But we have a good plan.

In accordance with many other interviewees, this student expresses hesitation about asking the teacher for clarifications, and in general, they admit that the amount of oral practice in the weaker language remains small. It is, however, worth pointing out that this student, together with their peers, has also considered initiating discussions in Swedish, which is their weaker language.

In predominantly teacher-lead lectures, the main activities, at least for the Finnish-speaking students during Swedish-speaking lessons, remain listening and comprehending. The following example draws the picture of a usual learning practice during a lecture: the student experiencing challenges with listening and comprehending is trying to find a solution while simultaneously trying to take notes.

Example 2. Interview. Translated from Finnish. I = Interviewer. S = Student.

I: Well, how did you feel about this lecture from the point of view of understanding, did you understand, were you able to keep up... (- -)

S: Well generally [this topic] is pretty detailed but linguistically I do understand. It takes a lot of concentration and taking notes possibly becomes a secondary thing, because processing the language is so much slower and maybe this lecturer spoke quite fast. (- -).

(- -)

I: What do you do then, if there's a situation that you don't really understand or you struggle to keep up with the lecture?

S: I usually write some words down for myself in the margins of the notebook. And then I check them in the vocabulary at once or later on. Sometimes I have even asked a question during the lecture, although I then usually have to prepare my question carefully, because I want to ask the question in Swedish of course, and then I try to keep up at the same time and then it happens that the topic has kind of changed already.

In our interviews, the question of whether the students ask the teacher for clarification if they do not understand, and in which language, aroused lengthy discussions. As in the example above, in the following example, the student describes the difficulties faced when asking clarifying questions in the weaker language. They feel that they need such a long time to formulate a question that the moment has passed by the time they are ready.

Example 3. Interview. Translated from Swedish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

I: (- -) if there's something you don't understand, is there, is it easy in those situations to ask a question, or is it hard? I mean now there was just one student who asked a question-

S: It is hard. Absolutely. It is nothing I would do. Like I feel really uncomfortable if I am to ask question. I would need to feel super certain about a subject [to ask a question]. In that case, I should have read the things we were supposed to read for the lecture, and you know, I should be familiar with the subject we are discussing (- -). Then I would feel better asking a question, because then I know that it's not just about opening a book and finding the answer there.

Some TvEx students feel anxious about their practical use of their weaker language. Speaking Swedish stresses Finnish students, especially when they are in the company of native speakers of Swedish (Mickwitz et al., 2024). These emotions, behaviours and systems of beliefs related to language learning are known as *foreign language anxiety* (FLA) (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Speakers experience FLA because they are unsatisfied with their level of communicative competence in the foreign language and thus, they rate their competence as inadequate, especially if compared to other speakers (Ewald, 2007).

4.2 Language ideologies affecting student practices

Our data show that practices were often organised according to the monolingual norm (Jørgensen, 2008; Jonsson, 2017) as well as ideal conceptions of native speakers as the ideal outcome of language learning. However, some students also describe a flexible position about language learning and competence.

The monolingual norm has proven to be persistent in academia (Mazak & Carroll, 2016; Saarinen & Rontu, 2021) and this also applies to the University of Helsinki. Even though the university is officially bilingual and, according to its Language Principles document, “flexibly trilingual” (Language policy of the University of Helsinki 2014), referring to that Finnish, Swedish, and English may be used parallelly or simultaneously. However, the practices are often parallel monolingual: there are spaces in which Finnish is the expected norm, and there are spaces in which Swedish is the expected norm (From, 2020), as reflected in the following example:

Example 4. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S= Student, I = Interviewer.

- I: (-) Well how, is it common then that teachers... Or how do the teachers normally deal with it if one suddenly changes to Finnish in a Swedish-speaking lecture? In your opinion... Now here [in this lecture] both the teacher and leader of the calculation exercises, no, or they answered only in Swedish and listened but do teachers deal with this differently or...?
- S: Well, it depends a lot on how much the teacher knows about this TvEx or (-) degree. If they are aware that something like this exists and that possibly a part of the students study for that degree then it is completely normal to speak Finnish occasionally.
- I: Right.
- S: If the teacher is not aware of that, they might as well be surprised if one starts speaking Finnish since they don't expect other than Swedish-speaking students in a lecture in Swedish.

The student describes that using Finnish in a Swedish-speaking lecture might be “surprising”, since the teachers only expect Swedish-speakers to be present in a Swedish-speaking lecture. This can be seen as an example of prevailing ideologically monolingual space that From and Sahlström (2017) have described as *svenska rum*, a ‘Swedish space’. There are certain practices and spaces that have special importance in preserving the minority language Swedish at the university, and acting against the expected norm is not encouraged. Teachers’ awareness is described as a crucial factor. Many students point out that the teachers are not aware of the fact that they are teaching a linguistically asymmetrical group (see section 4.3).

Similarly, ‘coming out’ as a Swedish speaker in a monolingually Finnish space is not unproblematic either. In the following example a Swedish-speaking student explains that they have never asked a question in Swedish in a Finnish-speaking lecture, first, because they do not necessarily expect the teachers to know enough Swedish, and second, because they do not wish to “stand out” as a Swedish speaking Finn.

Example 5. Interview. Translated from Swedish. S = Student, I = Interviewer. Bolding by the authors.

- I: Have you ever posed a question to a teacher in Swedish [in a Finnish-speaking lecture]?
- S: Nope. I have never done it.

I: Why not?

S: Because I think, which might be very bad, **I assume that the teachers do not speak Swedish**, very few do. And yes, and then there are those who can speak and I could ask them but there is also that thing that **one does not like to always stand out you know**. One would not like to be the one who, in the classroom full of people of your own age, one does not like to be the one Swedish-speaking Finn. You don't want to be, I don't want to be labelled so, and it is not about that I could not ask in Finnish, later it has become more of a habit for me to ask in Finnish and, in the way that everyone understands and that it is not like, yeah, I don't know. I could have done it but maybe it didn't feel comfortable. It has become a habit in a way. But, for example, at one course I will give my presentation with another fellow student in Swedish, **and no one will understand a thing**. But we will do it anyhow, because **it probably feels better to do it together and to speak Swedish instead of being the only one standing out of the crowd speaking in Swedish**.

The student describes the sensitiveness of becoming a representative of the minority language Swedish in a monolingually Finnish majority language space. Even though the majority of academic staff as well as university students in Finland are expected to, at least to some extent, understand and speak both languages, the student does not feel comfortable in relying on the Swedish competence of the teachers nor the peers (Solin & Pienimäki, 2020). For the students, it feels less awkward to act according to the Finnish normativities, than to "stand out" as a Swedish speaker. However, with another Swedish-speaking student, giving a presentation in Swedish feels better, but even then, the interviewee believes that "no-one is going to understand anything". The student describes a normatively monolingual Finnish learning environment where Swedish cannot really be included as a language of purposeful learning (cf. Lehtonen & Møller, 2022).

It becomes evident that enhanced language awareness is needed to establish pedagogical practices that transform the monolingual normativities and lower the threshold to include both (all) languages in classes. The teachers' linguistic awareness is crucial, and the students' language attitudes and interpretations of the linguistic norms affect their practices. Students also differ in how much they get stuck in singular words: some students, such as the student in the following example, attempt to understand every word all the time in both languages:

Example 6. Interview. Translated from Swedish. S = Student.

S: (- -) I need to search for the corresponding words in Swedish myself. **I need to constantly, I constantly translate in my head while I read**. And of course, one does develop really fast although it is quite tough in the beginning. So, you sit there without any vocabulary list that would have been given to you by someone, like, here it is, the terminology in Swedish and the most relevant words or something. I have been sitting for many hours and gone through many dictionaries wondering what the right terminology in Swedish would be. The way I see it, there is no support in these matters from the university.

Getting stuck in finding the right translation for every word is time-consuming, requires a lot of energy, and might make it harder to form an understanding of the topic as a whole, or experience the flow in learning. Sometimes, students display a different, more holistic mindset, such as the student in the following example. The student says she does not focus on language learning as such, but the learning of concepts, even in the weaker language, happens as a 'by-product' when taking notes.

Example 7. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

- I: Did it feel like you studied in two languages? Like, every evening or afternoon when you went home you knew that “you need to learn this terminology in both Swedish and Finnish”? (- -)
- S: No, I didn’t experience it as if I was learning terminology. Taking notes is what I do. The terminology just came along. But like, I did not write any word lists. Or, at some point I did collect difficult verbs-
- I: [laughing]
- S: a list. I mean all those really odd ones that I cannot get any grip of. Such as phrase verbs or verbs with a preposition and then some ordinary word and then-

In this example, the students’ view of bilingual expertise is functional and partial: they do not have to reach an ideal level in the weaker language nor know every word in both languages, as long as they are able to engage in learning and progress.

In the following section, we discuss how the learning environments support the students when they are constructing their bilingual expertise.

4.3 The role of the learning environment in supporting bilingual expertise

One element essential for students’ language learning practices is the learning environment, and one aspect of the learning environment is the dynamics between teachers and students in bilingual settings. Previous research has shown that this is among the main features of successful bilingual education (Flores, 2001), especially when it comes to teachers’ epistemological beliefs and attitudes about bilingualism and bilingual education.

4.3.1 Teacher and peer support for emerging bilingual expertise

As stated in the previous section, not all teachers teaching TvEx groups are aware of TvEx students’ linguistic needs in the lectures and after the lectures. While this is also an issue of language ideologies, as discussed in 4.2, the problem lies in how learning environments really are perceived by the students. Learning goals in content-based language learning are not shaped by the instructions or expertise of linguists, which might result in uncertainty among students about which language or languages they should study or communicate in.

Example 8. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

- I: Right. Have you somehow, sometimes when you started studying or so, have you agreed on some, a kind of rules or common somehow...? Have you had any discussion about which language to use when or...?
- S: Nothing specific. It is just usually expected that the language of teaching is also used for communication. But, in principle, you can switch [languages] if you feel like it. I: I see. And then, do teachers usually then... Or how do teachers then usually react if one changes to let’s say Finnish in a Swedish-speaking lecture? In your opinion...Now here during the calculation exercise both teacher and, no, or the teacher answered in Swedish only and listened but do teachers react to these situations differently or?

- S: Well, it depends a lot on how much the teacher knows about this TvEx or (-) studies. If they are aware that something like this exists and that some students study it, then it is quite normal to sometimes speak Finnish.

The student in the previous example states that there are no common “language agreements” on which language to use and when. The student argues that in general one is ‘expected’ to use the language of teaching, but that there is in principle a possibility to switch from one to another language according to one’s own feelings. Answering the question about the teachers’ reaction to interrupting in another language, this student raises the important question on the significance of teachers’ awareness of multilingualism among the students.

The TvEx teachers’ most common way to scaffold second language learning is to offer word lists and translations for the key terminology. Generally, terminology is recognised as a form of expertise closely related to linguistic competence, and in many fields, learning the terminology requires specific attention. Some teachers provide the students with terminology lists to help them navigate terminology in their exams.

Example 9. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

- I: How did these teachers help you and was there any difference between the teachers in the way they help you in the lectures so that you could then, you could understand and follow this lecture?
- S: Mm, well, a few teachers gave us these kinds of vocabularies. But you don’t have the time to look at them while you need to follow the lecture at the same time and get the whole picture. They might have helped more when one needed to write something. Then of course, well sometimes somebody says some specific words in Finnish, or in the lectures there might have been some Finnish words in the parentheses. Not the most relevant words though. [laughter] Those words that are practically the same in Finnish and Swedish. Then, you’re like, I would probably know what natural selection means, I would have guessed it, [laughter] anyhow but, it is nice that the teachers try to help. And then of course, there is ...
- I: Was the help, was it, was the support good enough, or would you need more support during lectures?
- S: It was enough for me for the biggest part. Maybe somehow kind of like when, for instance when we went through the different parts of the cell, and then you know those things in Finnish and then there are a million terms that somehow do not find their right place in the brain. In a way, an introduction to the terminology would have been good to go through in the beginning of the course, that could have been useful.

During the lecture observations while gathering data, we noticed that TvEx students often rely on peer knowledge; students ask a friend sitting next to them for a translation of or explanation to what the teacher has said. These short discussions occur often in the students’ stronger language. Peer support in learning or peer learning as Ashwin (2003) defines it, is a generic concept, which refers to situations in which students support each other in educational settings. Peer support is an important dimension in learning (Bold, 2008). Our interviewees express a realistic need to get more opportunities for linguistically scaffolded peer interaction during classes.

Example 10. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

I: Which one or what kind of work would in your opinion make taking part in Swedish speaking lectures easier?

S: Well at least from the perspective of how to learn Swedish best, well it is where the students are involved or at least it would improve one's own language output quite a bit. Now here I learn to listen, or I hear and comprehend Swedish, and I also write my notes in Swedish and add some words in Finnish. But, pedagogically, if you would really like to support learning the language, which probably would be the ultimate goal, then initiating the discussion, even forcing it a bit, ripping the answers out would work.

If using the weaker language for peer interaction in group learning assignments is not intentionally scaffolded by the teacher, students tend to form the groups so that they only need to interact with peers who have a similar language repertoire or background.

Example 11. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

I: About the formation of groups in lectures. Is it so, if the teacher wants you to discuss in groups, how does forming the groups work? Do you Finnish-speaking students always want to be together or how does it, [laughter] or how do you like it, like what do you...?

S: It might come easier, or maybe there is less pressure to speak if one's Finnish-speaking [in a group of Finnish-speaking students]. But of course, there is on the other hand a temptation to speak Finnish.

I: Do you speak Finnish then?

S: Maybe not, well sometimes. Yes. [laughter] But lately, we have tried to speak more Swedish, or only Swedish.

I: But if you can form those groups by yourselves, you would always form them with Swedish-speaking Finnish-speaking students together?

S: Mm, well yes.

In this excerpt, the student clearly expresses an orientation towards trying to practise the weaker language in a lecture given in that language. However, if the language issue and the formation of the groups is not explicitly addressed, the students tend to draw on their stronger language. Discussing the substance in a language other than the language of teaching could be seen as a translanguaging practice, as a form of mediation skill (Lopez, Turkan, & Guzman-Orth, 2017) and beneficial for deep learning. What seems to be missing in these situations is an awareness of the learning outcomes and the purpose of singular group assignments, from the point of view of language competence. In some assignments, the students could be guided and scaffolded to practise plurilingual interaction and their weaker language, whereas in some, they might be encouraged to reflect on the substance in another language than the language of teaching, in this case their stronger language. In this excerpt, as well as in our data in general, the students seem to be unsure of whether it is beneficial or harmful to make use of their plurilingual repertoire or whether they should stick to one language at a time.

4.3.2 Language support by the Language Centre

The TvEx students are entitled to a certain amount of external language support provided by the University Language Centre. Some interviewees mention the opportunities in TvEx programmes for students to write an essay in their weaker language and get them commented on by a language teacher. After this round of language improvement, the essay is sent to the content teacher to be evaluated based on the assessment criteria of the course. In the following example, a Finnish-speaking student describes the need for language support when working on a joint writing task with Swedish-speaking students, expressing that it is not the responsibility of the peers to “correct” their text:

Example 12. Interview. Translated from Finnish. Student = S, I = Interviewer.

- I: So the students might need some language support, language check, because it doesn't feel nice at all that one is in a group with two Swedish-speaking people, and one must take one's own essay which may not reach the level it should, and like, include it in the joint essay without any language check. And then you're like sorry could you correct this for me [laughter]. Although it's not their job.

The students have been satisfied with the opportunity to receive language support, which brings a more 'native sense' to the text. However, from the pedagogical point of view, this kind of 'proofreading service' does not seem to be the best way to support the emergent bilingual expertise, if the students are not required to reflect upon the feedback from language teachers

While students appreciate the language support from the Language Centre, the support is not always available at the ideal time concerning the content learning. However, there are some examples of the courses in which language and content learning are integrated in an appropriate way: the language teacher works in small groups during lectures in which content is taught. This kind of integrational work during lectures, is described in the following example by the student as an ideal model for language learning:

Example 13. Interview. Translated from Finnish. S = Student, I = Interviewer.

- I: Yes. I was just going to ask you if there is anything, any ways to kind of lower the threshold or are there situations or courses or teachers that make it feel easier somehow?
- S: Yes that, we have that, that [course], where our compulsory Swedish studies are incorporated, like there we basically have a Swedish lecture every Monday. And there we discuss, the teacher gives us like discussion exercises and questions and such and based on those we can discuss in pairs or in groups of three, four. And those times in my opinion the threshold of speaking Swedish is really low.
- I: But is it then with the teacher of the course or with the Swedish language teacher?
- S: Swedish language teacher.

Although language support should be an integral part of all TvEx programmes, it fulfils only the basic needs of students' learning goals in the current settings. The problem is more systemic; understanding of a different type of collaboration between content and language teachers or teaching is yet to be discussed and applied⁸.

5 Conclusions and discussion

Focusing on the students as emerging bilingual experts in the TvEx programmes, we have explored the connections between students' language learning practices, language ideologies, and learning environments. According to our findings, the TvEx students seem to be expecting more structured TvEx programmes than what they currently tend to get. TvEx programmes seem to be relying on the "automatism" of bilingualism in Finnish society (Sylvén, 2017), and thus their structure tends to lack a set of more specific linguistic and pedagogical instructions for students to be guided in all the phases of their bilingual studying. Moreover, linguistic competence is not verbalised as a central learning outcome of the programmes. Consequently, language learning is expected to occur automatically, as a "side effect" of content learning (Lyster, 2007; see also Vänskä & Mickwitz 2021). Language teaching and support becomes largely the responsibility of the University of Helsinki Language Centre. It could be argued that there is a discrepancy between the learning objectives (bilingual expertise), the pedagogical choices (mainly monolingual content courses) and the actual practices.

In this study, RQ1 was centred on the practices the students engage in to promote language learning simultaneously with content learning. TvEx studies do not follow a specific language/multilingual pedagogy model, and they mainly consist of content courses in different languages that are not organised as language courses by language teachers. However, the students engage in several practices, independent of the teachers' pedagogical choices, to acquire bilingual expertise. They listen and take notes, employ online tools, and engage in interactions in their weaker language outside classes (see also Lilja et al., 2023).

In RQ2, we aimed to describe language ideologies and attitudes toward language learning in the content studies reflected through students' practices. When it comes to TvEx, we can speculate about two sides of the same language ideology: the monolingual norm among Finnish-speaking teachers and students and a monolingual norm among Swedish-speaking teachers and students. In our view, the concept multi-monolingualism (Cruz-Ferreira, 2010: 3) is related to the concept of Swedish spaces (*svenska rum*, From & Sahlström, 2017), as it indicates that multilingualism often refers to the use of different languages in separate, closed, spaces. Due to a long history of linguistic binarism in Finland (Östman & Mattfolk, 2011; Sylvén, 2017), there are also some fixed linguistic attitudes regarding what is perceived as a correct monolingual norm in various situations. Our data clearly point this out, too. Regarding TvEx, the different status of Finnish and Swedish in society are mirrored in students' attitudes toward the two languages, and there are several ideologies at play. Due to the majority-minority relationship, the Finnish and Swedish speakers differ both in their attitudes towards the other national language (Finnish or Swedish) as well as in their competence in it (cf. Moring et al., 2013). This affects the ways in which they see themselves as speakers or learners of the other language (see also Mickwitz et al. 2024). Language ideologies affect practices: Cherishing an ideal picture of a 'native-like' speaker might make the student afraid of making mistakes, especially when speaking. Similarly, aiming to understand every new word might hinder the student from gaining a holistic picture of the topics.

Finally, in our RQ3, we raised the question about the learning environments and the way they guide and regulate students' practices when moving towards the aspirational bilingual expertise. Classroom activities are mostly led by the pedagogical practices set by the teacher (Tan, 2011), where students are given the option to work in the smaller groups, asking questions and discussing with each other. Teachers involved in the TvEx programmes are expected to teach disciplinary content with a linguistically oriented approach (Jalkanen & Nikula, 2020). From the students' perspective, one of the main sources of support for them would be if teachers acknowledged the linguistic diversity of the learning environment at the beginning of the courses and lectures. This would

make it easier for students to pose questions in a more relaxed manner, without the fear of making mistakes or slowing down teaching with interruptions. This easy practice of discussing the circumstances would create a more inclusive space, and thus, a more encouraging learning environment. Scholarly work on CLIL, which we introduced as a possible point of comparison in the introduction, has shown that the explicit focus on the target language is a rare event (Llinares & Dalton-Puffer, 2015). In TvEx, focus on language is oriented towards mastering the lexicon and the terminology of the discipline. Language support is organised separately, and its focus is mostly on gaining written proficiency in the weaker language. There is little pedagogical focus on scaffolding the students to develop their expert communication in their weaker language or through translanguaging (García, 2011; Canagarajah 2013; Jonsson 2017; Mazak & Carroll 2017, see also Mickwitz et al. 2021).

During the lecture observations while gathering data, we noticed that TvEx students often rely on peer knowledge; they ask a friend sitting next to them to help them with translation or an explanation. These short discussions are often done in a student's stronger language. Peer support seems to be an alternative solution in learning at the lectures, and it is shown to be an important one too (Bold, 2008). Peer learning, as Ashwin (2003) defines it, is a generic term which refers to situations in which students support each other in educational settings. He defines two ways that peer learning supports students' academic proficiency: supplementary instruction and peer support. As seen in our examples, supplementary instruction in the case of TvEx is intuitively used by the students when they feel the need of immediate support in comprehending the lecture and in being able to follow it. Supplementary instruction is defined as experiences that students are involved in to gain from the learning processes. It is also related to the feelings of social and situational belonging in academic settings, with a major impact on learning proficiency.

Lyster and Saito (2010) argue that opportunities for contextualised practices are effective catalysts for continuing language development. If the learners' objective is to gain literacy in their own subject in their weaker language as well as bilingual expertise and professional competencies (cf. Jalkanen & Nikula, 2020), bilingual learning should be more student-centred and expertise-oriented. Most importantly, our results call for integrative pedagogy of content and language expertise as well as supporting the students in finding their own plurilingual voice both inside and outside classrooms.

Funding

We would like to thank Svenska kulturfonden i Finland for the funding of the Pedamo project.

Endnotes

1. (*Tvåspråkig examen*) is an abbreviation for bilingual degrees in Swedish. Finnish abbreviation for the same program is KaTu (*kaksikielinen kandidaatin tutkinto*) is less used among students and teachers.
2. De facto, Finland is a multilingual country.
3. https://stat.fi/tup/suoluk/suoluk_vaesto_en.html
4. One of the interviews was conducted with a pair of students, others individually.
5. The transcriptions are not phonetic nor interactional. They mainly follow Finnish or Swedish orthography and writing conventions.
6. <https://www.helsinki.fi/sv/projekt/pedagogik-och-spraklig-diversitet-i-tvasprakiga-examina>
7. The interviews were conducted in Swedish or Finnish (depending on the preferred language of the student) by the authors and transcribed by an outsourced company. The

analysis was conducted on the data in the original languages. The excerpts of the examples have been translated from the original Finnish/Swedish by the authors. Please note that the translations are not always literal, but we have tried to convey the idea behind the idiomatic expressions of Finnish or Swedish. Some hesitations and repetitions etc. might have been simplified to make the example easier to follow. The quotations in the original language are in the Appendix. The data were anonymised. The students represent several fields of study, but we have not mentioned their bachelor programs to protect their anonymity.

7. The PEDAMO project has produced guidelines for teachers for teaching linguistically asymmetrical groups (Cvetanović et al. 2024), see <https://sway.cloud.microsoft/Dfc-brkIPjESHTouv?ref=Link>.

Disclosure statement

The author declared no conflict of interest.

References

- Andrews, S. & Svalberg, A.M.L. (2017). Teacher Language Awareness. In Cenoz, J., Gorter, D., May, S. (eds) *Language Awareness and Multilingualism. Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Boston: Springer, Cham.
- Ashwin, P. (2003). Peer Support: Relations between the context, process and outcomes for the students who are supported. *Instructional Science*, 31(3), 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023227532029>
- Auer P. (2007). The Monolingual Bias in Bilingualism Research, or: Why Bilingual Talk is (Still) a Challenge For Linguistics. In: Heller M. (eds) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach. Palgrave Advances in Linguistics*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230596047_15
- Blackledge, A. (2008). Language ecology and language ideology. In A. Creese, P. Martin and N. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 9: Ecology of Language (pp. 27–40). Springer
- Block, D. (2003). *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrrwd8>
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. (2013). Superdiverse Repertoires and the Individual. In Saint-Georges, I.D., Weber, J.J. (Eds.) *Multilingualism and Multimodality. The Future of Education Research*. Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-266-2_2
- Bold, C. (2008). Peer support groups: Fostering a deeper approach to learning through critical reflection on practice. *Reflective Practice*, 9(3), 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940802207022>
- Brousseau, G., Balacheff, N., Cooper, M., Sutherland, R., & Warfield, V. (1997). *Theory of Didactical Situations in Mathematics: Didactique des Mathématiques, 1970-1990* (1st ed., Vol. 19). Springer.
- Busch, B. (2012). The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33(5), 503–523, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams056>
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge
- Cenoz, J., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2015). Learning through a second or additional language: Content-based instruction and CLIL in the twenty-first century. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000921>
- Coyle, D. (2013). Listening to learners: an investigation into “successful learning” across CLIL contexts. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 244–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777384>
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717>

- Crooks, T. J. (1988). The Impact of Classroom Evaluation Practices on Students. *Review of Educational Research*, 58(4), 438–481. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543058004438>
- Cruz-Ferreira, M. (2010). *Multilingual norms*. Peter Lang.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A., Lorenzo, F., & Nikula, T. (2014). “You Can Stand Under My Umbrella”: Immersion, CLIL and Bilingual Education. A Response to Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter (2013). *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu010>
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. (1996). *Studies in immersion education* (Vol. 11). Multilingual matters.
- Ewald, J. D. (2007). Foreign language learning anxiety in upper-level classes: Involving students as researchers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 122–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb02857.x>
- Flores, B. B. (2001). Bilingual education teachers’ beliefs and their relation to self-reported practices. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(3), 275–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2001.10162795>
- From, T. (2020). ‘We are two languages here.’ The operation of language policies through spatial ideologies and practices in a co-located and a bilingual school. *Multilingua*. 39 (6). 663–684. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2019-0008>
- From, T. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Shared Places, Separate Spaces: Constructing Cultural Spaces through two National Languages in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. 61(4). 465–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2016.1147074>
- Gal, S. (2006). Migration, Minorities and Multilingualism: Language Ideologies in Europe. In *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices* (pp. 13–27). Palgrave Macmillan UK
- Garcia, E. E. (1991). The Education of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students: Effective Instructional Practices. UC Berkeley: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved 01-10-2024 from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2793n11s>
- García, O., (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gass, S. M. & A. Mackey. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second languages research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Guo, Q., Tao, J., & Gao, X. (2019). Language teacher education in System. *System*, 82, 132–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.001>
- Hadiyanto, H., Failasofah, F., Armiwati, A., Abrar, M., & Thabran, Y. (2021). Students’ practices of 21st century skills between conventional learning and blended learning. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 18(3), 07. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.3.7>
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. Longman.
- Herrington, J. (2005). *Authentic learning environments in higher education*. Information Science Publishing.
- Hill, J. R., & Hannafin, M. J. (2001). Teaching and learning in digital environments: The resurgence of resource-based learning. *Educational technology research and development*, 49(3), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504914>
- Honebein, P.C., Duffy, T.M., Fishman, B.J. (1993). Constructivism and the Design of Learning Environments: Context and Authentic Activities for Learning. In Duffy, T.M., Lowyck, J., Jonassen, D.H., Welsh, T.M. (Eds.) *Designing Environments for Constructive Learning*. (pp.87-108) Springer.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327317>

- Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 267–284.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777385>
- Jalkanen, J., Almonkari, M. & Taalas, P. (2016.) Viestintä- ja kieliopintojen kehittäminen kansainvälistyvissä korkeakoulutuksessa. [Developing language and communication studies in international higher education.] *Yliopistopedagogiikka* 23(1), 14–16.
- Jalkanen, J., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., & Taalas, P. (2012). Changing society - changing language learning and teaching practices?. In M. Bendtsen, M. Björklund, L. Forsman, & K. Sjöholm (Eds.), *Global Trends Meet Local Needs* (pp. 219–241). Åbo Akademi. Reports from the Faculty of Education.
<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-201304161445>
- Jalkanen, J., & Nikula, T. (2020). Redesigning the Curriculum to Develop Multilingual Academic Literacies: An Analysis of Language Conceptualizations. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language Perceptions and Practices in Multilingual Universities* (pp. 113–135). Palgrave Macmillan
- Jonsson, C. (2017). Translanguaging and Ideology: Moving Away from a Monolingual Norm. In B. Paulsrud, J. Rosén, B. Straszer and Å. Wedin (eds): *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education* (Vol. 108), (pp. 20–37). Multilingual Matters.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual Linguaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710802387562>
- Kachru, Y. (1994). Monolingual bias in SLA research. *TESOL quarterly*, 28(4), 795–800.
- Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied linguistics*, 29(4), 645–671.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn022>
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Regimenting languages. Language ideological perspectives. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.). *Regimes of language. Ideologies, politics, and identities*. (pp.1–34). School of American research advanced seminar series. School of American Research Press.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies – evolving perspectives. In Jaspers, J., Östman, J., & Verschueren, J. (Eds.). *Society and language use* (pp.192 - 211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Language Policy of the University of Helsinki (2014.) Helsinki: Unigrafia.
<https://blogs.helsinki.fi/centrumcampus/files/2015/04/kieliperiaatteet.pdf>
- Lantolf, J. & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning. In B. vanPatten & J. Williams (eds.), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 201–224). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lehtonen, H., & Spindler Møller, J.S. (2022). “We just want the language tone”: When requests to use minority languages lead to interactional breakdown in multilingual classrooms. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2022(275), 65–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2021-0053>
- Lehtonen, H., Cvetanović, D., Mickwitz, Å., & Toom, A. (2022). Opetus ja oppiminen Helsingin yliopiston kaksikielisissä kandidatinnoissa (TvEx) – kieli-ideologia näkökulmia. *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta : Kieliverkoston verkkolehti*, 13(5). Retrieved <https://www.kieliverkosto.fi/fi/journals/kieli-koulutus-ja-yhteiskunta-lokakuu-2022/opetus-ja-oppiminen-helsingin-yliopiston-kaksikielisissa-kandidatkinnoissa-tvex-kieli-ideologia-nakokulmia>
- Lehtonen, H., Ahlholm, M., Suuriniemi, S. & Tiermas, A. (2023). Monikielisen toimijuuden tukeminen koulun toimintayhteisössä. [Supporting multilingual

- agency in the community of practice of the school]. In A. Pitkänen-Huhta, K. Mård-Miettinen & T. Nikula (eds.), *Kielikoulutus mukana muutoksessa*. [Language education engaging in change.]. *AFinLA-teema*, 16, 180–201. Jyväskylä: AFinLA.
- Lilja, N., Eilola, L., Jokipohja, A.-K., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2023). Aikuisten kielenoppijoiden vuorovaikutuskompetenssin kehittyminen luokkahuoneen ulkopuolisissa oppimisympäristöissä.[Adult learners' interactional competence and its development outside the classroom]. In A. Pitkänen-Huhta, K. Mård-Miettinen & T. Nikula (eds.), *Kielikoulutus mukana muutoksessa*. [Language education engaging in change.]. *AFinLA-teema*, 16, (pp.104–123) .
- Lindström, J. K. (2012). Different languages, one mission? Outcomes of language policies in a multilingual university context. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, Language and the International University* (216), 33–54.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2012-0038>
- Llinares, A., & Dalton-Puffer, C. (2015). The role of different tasks in CLIL students' use of evaluative language. *System (Linköping)*, 54, 69–79.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.05.001>
- Lombardi, M. M., & Oblinger, D. G. (2007). Authentic learning for the 21st century: An overview. *Educause learning initiative*, 1(2007), 1–12. <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2007/1/authentic-learning-for-the-21st-century-an-overview> [Read 21.11.2024.]
- Lopez, A. A., Turkan, S., & Guzman-Orth, D. (2017). Conceptualizing the use of translanguaging in initial content assessments for newly arrived emergent bilingual students. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2017(1), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12140>
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. John Benjamins
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Interactional feedback as instructional input: A synthesis of classroom SLA research. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, 1(2), 276–297.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/lia.1.2.07lys>
- May, S. (2013). *The multilingual turn*. Routledge.
- Mazak, C. & Carroll, K. (2016). *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies*. Multilingual Matters
- Mickwitz, Å., Cvetanović, D., Lehtonen, H., & Toom, A. (2020). Preparing for the modern multilingual workplace. *EAIE Forum, Summer Forum*, (pp.34-36). Retrieved <https://www.eaie.org/our-resources/library/publication/Forum-Magazine/2020-summer-forum.html>
- Mickwitz, Å., Lehtonen, H., Cvetanović, D., & Toom, A. (2024). “My Goal is to Talk Like a Native”: Emergent bilingual students' use of language learning strategies. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1401.01>
- Mickwitz, Å., Lehtonen, H., Cvetanović, D., & Toom, A. (2021). Towards bilingual expertise - evaluating translanguaging pedagogy in bilingual degrees at the university level. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 11(1), 195–217.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2021-2012>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis : a methods sourcebook / Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, Johnny Saldaña*. (3. ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Moring, T., Godenhjelm, S., Haapamäki, S., Lindström, J., Östman, J. O., Saari, M., & Sylvén, J. (2013). Language policies in universities and their outcomes. The University of Helsinki in a Northern European context. In A.-C. Berthoud, F. Grin & G. Lüdi (Eds.). *Exploring the Dynamics of Multilingualism: The DYLAN project*, (pp. 299–322). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Ndhlovu, F. (2015). Ignored Lingualism: Another Resource for Overcoming the Monolingual Mindset in Language Education Policy. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 35(4), 398–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2015.1087365>
- Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A., & Lorenzo, F. (2016). More than content and language: The complexity of integration in CLIL and bilingual education. In Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P. & Smit, U. (Eds.) *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education* (pp. 1 – 26. Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In Atkinson, D. (Ed.) *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp.73–94). Routledge.
- Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the Study of Equitable Multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 23–38. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45172039>
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. Longman.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). The changing face of language learning: Learning beyond the classroom. *Relc Journal*, 46(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214561621>
- Roth, W. M., & Tobin, K. (2007). Aporias of identity in science: An introduction. In W-M. Roth and K. Tobin. *Science, Learning, Identity*. (pp.1–10). Sense Publishers.
- Saarinen, T. (2020). Tensions on Finnish constitutional bilingualism in neo-nationalist times: Constructions of Swedish in monolingual and bilingual contexts. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.) *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities*, (pp.85–111). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saarinen, T., & Rontu, H. (2021). What about Swedish?: Internationalisation, Societal Responsibility and National Languages in Finnish Higher Education. In Apelgren, B., Eriksson, A., & Strömberg Jämsvi, S. (Eds.). *Language Matters in Higher Education Contexts*. (pp.53–70). Brill.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., From, T., & Sahlström, F. (2013). Tvåspråkiga skolor och lärande - en debattanalys. [Bilingual schools and learning - an analysis of a debate]. In L. Tainio, & H. Harju-Luukkainen (Eds.), *Kaksikielinen koulu – Tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi = Tvåspråkig skola-Ett flerspråkigt Finland i framtiden*. [A bilingual school - a multilingual Finland in the future] (pp.221–244). (Kasvatustieteiden tutkimuksia; No. 62). Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura.
- Solin, A. & Pienimäki, H-M. (2020). Monikielisen viestinnän haasteet kansainvälisessä yliopistossa.[Multilingual challenges in an international university]. *Kieliverkosto*. <https://www.kieliverkosto.fi/fi/journals/kieli-koulutus-ja-yhteiskunta-maaliskuu-2020/monikielisen-viestinnan-haasteet-kansainvalisessa-yliopistossa>
- Solomon, Y. (2008). *Mathematical literacy: Developing identities of inclusion*. Routledge.
- Stough, L. (2001). Using stimulated recall in classroom observation and professional development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA, April 10–14, 2001. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457214.pdf> [Read 22.11.2024.]
- Sylvén, J. (2017). Helsingfors universitet – en tvåspråkighet i förändring. *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta* 8 (5). Retrieved <https://www.kieliverkosto.fi/fi/journals/kieli-koulutus-ja-yhteiskunta-lokakuu-2017-2/helsingfors-universitet-en-tvasprakighet-i-forandring>
- Sylvén, J. (2024). *Svenskan vid Helsingfors universitet : språkpolicy, attityder och realiteter / Jenny Sylvén*. Helsingfors universitet. [Doctoral dissertation, Institutionen för Nordiska språk].
- Szabó, T. P., & Dufva, H. (2020). University exchange students' practices of learning Finnish: a language ecological approach to affordances in linguistic landscapes. *Language teaching in the linguistic landscape: Mobilizing pedagogy in public space*, 93–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55761-4_5

- Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811401153>
- Tuononen, T., Parpala, A., & Lindblom-Ylänne, S. (2019). Graduates' evaluations of usefulness of university education, and early career success - a longitudinal study of the transition to working life. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(4), 581–595. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1524000>
- Van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: a sociocultural perspective*. Kluwer Academic.
- Viberg, O., & Grönlund, Å. (2017). Understanding students' learning practices: challenges for design and integration of mobile technology into distance education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 42(3), 357–377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2016.1088869>
- Vesterinen, O., Toom, A., & Patrikainen, S. (2010). The stimulated recall method and ICTs in research on the reasoning of teachers. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 33(2), 183–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2010.484605>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Vänskä, H., & Mickwitz, Å. (2021). "Det är kämpigare att lära sej på finska": Millaista on ruotsinkielisten opiskelijoiden saama finskan kielituki ja miksi sitä tarvitaan. *Yliopistopedagogiikka*, 2020(1). Retrieved 30-10-2024 from <https://lehti.yliopistopedagogiikka.fi/2021/06/02/det-ar-kampigare-att-lara-sej-pa-finska/>
- Wells, G. (1999). Language and education: reconceptualizing education as dialogue. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 135–155. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719059919007X>
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge university press.
- Woolard, K. A. (2020). Language ideologies. In J. Stanlaw (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology*. (pp.1–21). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ylönen, S. (2015). The Position of Finnish and Swedish as well as Other Languages at Universities in Finland. In F. Vila & V. Bretxa (Eds.), *Language Policy in Higher Education: The Case of Medium-Sized Languages*. (pp.64–102). Multilingual Matters
- Östman, J-O., & Mattfolk, L. (2011). Ideologies of standardisation: Finland Swedish and Swedish-language Finland. In T. Kristiansen, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*. (pp.75–82). (Standard language ideology in contemporary Europe; No. 1). Novus.

Appendices

Appendix 1.

The quotes in the original language

Example 1

- I: Millä, mikä on se haastavinta? Onks se sanasto vai onks se se kielioppi vai..?
- S: Varmaan sanasto on oikeesti haastavinta. Kyl mul, silleen kielioppia tunnen aika hyvin mut ehkä sit siin tulee jotenkin myös, oma jotenkin paine että pitää saada ne kaikki kielioppijutut oikein ja sit mä käytän siihen ihan liikaa aikaa vaikka se pointti tulis sieltä esiin vaikka nyt ei oiskaan, joka ikinen kielioppijuttu ihan kohillaan. Mut joo kyl ennemmin sanasto. Varsinkin just ku on tällast, aika spesifii sanastoo.

- I: Mitä sä käytät, mikä apuvälineitä sä käytät siihen?
 S: MOT-sanakirjaa.
 I: Ja siis nää Google ja kaikki nää varmasti myös..
 S: Joo.
 I: Joo. Netti, joo.
 S: Joo. Netist (kyl).
 (- -)
 I: Mitä muuta kielitukea sä saat tai mitä, millä tavalla sä kehität ruotsin kielesi muuten kuin sä oot luennoilla ja sit sä luet näitä, tai sä kirjoitat näitä, tekstejä ruotsiksi. Onks sulla joku, ystävä ruotsinkielinen ystävä tai..
 S: Lähinnä luen ruotsinkielistä kirjallisuutta ja sit mä oon myös kuunnellu podcasteja ruotsiks, ja sit mä oon harkinnu et vois tilaa HBL:än.
 I: [naurahtaa]
 S: Mutta, ei kyl hirveesti tuu puhuttuu muuten. Mut kyl mä oon sit just muiden tvexareiden kaa puhunu että vois vaan silleen, ottaa jonkun ajan että tällöin puhutaan nyt vaan ruotsii.
 I: Niin keskenään vaikka te ootte suomenkielisiä?
 S: Niin.
 I: Oletteko tehneet sen?
 S: Ei. [naurua] Mutta hyvä suunnitelma on.

Example 2.

- S: No siis joo ylipäätään [kurssin aihe] on aika semmosta yksityiskohtasta mutta kielellisesti kyl mä ymmärrän. Se vaatii tosi paljon keskittymistä ja sitte mul jää ehkä se muistiinpanojen kirjoittaminen jää vähemmälle, koska se kielen prosessointi on niin paljon hitaampaa ja ehkä tää luennoitsija puhu aika nopeesti (- -)
 (- -)
 I: (-) No mitä sä teet sitten, jos sulla tulee semmonen tilanne että et oikeen ymmärrä tai on vaikee pysyä kärryillä?
 S: Yleensä mä kirjoitan jotain sanoja ittelleni ylös sillei sinne johonkin mun vihkon reunaan. Ja sitten mä tarkistan ne sanakirjasta joko siinä samalla tai sitten jälkikäteen. Ja sitten joskus mä oon kans ihan kysynyt sit luennolla, et yleensä mun pitää sit taas valmistella tosi paljon sitä mun kysymystä koska mä haluan tietenkin kysyä sen mun kysymyksen ruotsiks ja sitten mä yritän pysyä perässä siinä et sitten se aihe ei oo tavallaan jo vaihtunut.

Example 3.

- I: Tycker du att det finns, att om det, är nånting du int förstår, finns det en, är det lätt i den där situationen att ställa en fråga eller är det svårt? Jag menar nu var det bara en som ställde en fråga-
 S: Svårt. Absolut. Jo att int är det nåt jag sku göra. Att jag känner mej hemskt obekvämt, med att jag sku ställa en fråga. Att då upplever jag att då sku jag ha jätte-jättebra koppi på det där område. Att då sku jag ha läst det där vi ska ha läst till föreläsningen och vet du att jag sku va insatt i det där ämne, för att på nå sätt känna att nå men okej att jag vet att, eller så upplever jag på någo sätt. Att då har jag lättare att ställa en fråga för då vet jag på riktigt att men okej att det är int sånt att jag öppnar boken och det står svare där vet du.

Example 4.

- I: Niin niin. No miten, onks se tavallista että opettajat sit.. Tai miten opettajat sitten suhtautuu siihen jos vaihtaakin vaikka ruotsinkielisellä, luennolla suomeen, yleensä? Sustako.. Nyt tässähän sekä opettaja että, laskuharjoitusten pitäjä, ei, tai sit vastas vaan ruotsiksi ja kuunteli mutta suhtautuuko opettajat siihen eri tavoin tai..?

- S: No se riippuu aika paljon siitä et kuinka paljon opettaja tietää tästä TvExistä tai (-) opinnoista. Jos ne on tietosii että sellanen on ja että mahdollisesti osa opiskelijoista suorittaa tätä ni silloin se on ihan normaali puhuu välillä suomeksi.
- I: Aivan.
- S: Jos opettaja ei oo tietonen he saattaa hyvinki hämmästyä miks sä yhtäkkii puhut suomee ku ne ei odota et ruotsinkieliselle luennolle tulee muita ku ruotsinkielisii.

Example 5.

- I: Har du nånsin ställt en fråga till professorn på svenska?
- S: Nä. Det har jag int.
- I: Varför int?
- S: För att jag, utgår från att, vilke kanske är jättedåligt men jag utgår ofta från att professorerna int, kan svenska för dom, ganska få kan. Och ja, och sen finns det nog dom som kan också och jag sku ju kunna fråga dom men det är nånting också med det där att man vill int allti sticka ut vet du. Man vill int vara den där som, är i en klass full av människor i din ålder, så vill du int allti va den där finlandssvenska. Int vill du, int vill jag få den stämpeln att, och det är int det att jag int sku kunna fråga på finska, så det har sen kanske blivi mera en såndärn sak att jag, hellre frågar jag på finska och li-, och på det vise att alla förstår och att det int är sådär, ja jag vet int. Jag sku nog kunna gör det men det, har int bara kännats sådär kanske heller det bekvämt. Det har blivi också sen sådär. Men att till exempel det s-, nu i en kurs så kommer jag nog att hålla en presentation med en annan svenskspråkig, och vi kommer å hålla den på svenska, och då kommer ju ingen att förstå nånting. Men vi kommer nu ändå å gör det för att det, känns kanske också bättre sen att vara två, och prata svenska iställe för att man är den där ena utprickade som, nu drar det på svenska.

Example 6.

- S: Nä för jag måste själv leta upp dom där svenska motsvarigheterna. Jag måste ju konstant, när jag läste konstant översätta i mitt huvve det där jag läser. Och såklart man utvecklas ju otroligt snabbt också med det men att det är ju jävligt tungt i början. Att, där sitter du och du har ingen ordlista som nån sku ha givi till dej att här är, terminologin på svenska och dom mest relevanta orden eller såhär. Att du fi-, jag har suttu hemskt många timmar har jag satt på det att jag sitter själv och försöker luska ut med diverse ordböcker att va blir rätt terminologi här på svenska. Att, det är, det finns int, det där stöde kommer int sen från uni-sidan där, anser jag.

Example 7.

- I: Tuntuiko siltä että sä opiskelit kahdella kielellä? Siis jokainen ilta kun sä, tai iltapäivä kun sä menit kotiin sä tiesit että "no nyt on pakko oppia näitä käsitteitä ruotsiksi sekä suomeks"? (- -)
- S: Ei. Emmä, kokenu opettelevani käsitteitä. Mä kirjoitan niitä luentomuistiinpanoja. Ne käsitteet tuli siinä mukana sitten. Mut et emmä tehny mitään sanalistoja. Tai, siis jossain vaihees mä keräsin vaikeita verbejä-
- I: [naurahtaa]
- S: .. listaa. Siis kaikkia sellasia tosi kummallisii, mist ei saa mitään otetta. Semmosii fraasiverbei tai semmosia mis on joku prepositio ja sit joku tavallinen sana ja sit-

Example 8.

- I: Nii just. Ootteks te jotenki, joskus ku te ootte alottanu nää opiskelut tai näin ni ootteks te sopinu jotkut, tämmöset pelisäännöt tai yhteiset jotenki..?

Onks teillä ollu joku keskustelu tästä et mitä kieltä käytetään millonki tai..?
 S: Ei erityisemmin. Sitä vaan yleensä odotetaan et sillä kielellä kun se opetus järjestetään ni sil kielellä puhutaan. Mut et, kyl sitä periaattees voi vaihella sen mukaan ku tuntuu.

- I: Niin niin. No miten, onks se tavallista että opettajat sit.. Tai miten opettajat sitten suhtautuu siihen jos vaihtaakin vaikka ruotsinkielisellä, luennolla suomeen, yleensä? Sustako.. Nyt tässähän sekä opettaja että, laskuharjoitusten pitäjä, ei, tai sit vastas vaan ruotsiksi ja kuunteli mutta suhtautuuko opettajat siihen eri tavoin tai..?
 S: No se riippuu aika paljon siitä et kuinka paljon opettaja tietää tästä TvExistä tai (-) opinnoista. Jos ne on tietosii että sellanen on ja että mahdollisesti osa opiskelijoista suorittaa tätä ni silloin se on ihan normaali puhuu välillä suomeksi.

Example 9.

- I: Millä tavalla nää opettajat, auttoi teitä ja oliko eroja opettajien välissä että millä tavalla nää opettajat auttoi teitä luennoissa että sä pystyit sitten, pystyisit ymmärtämään ja seuraamaan tätä luentoa?
 S: Mm, no siis, parilta opettajalta sai tämmösiä sanalistoja. Mut eihän niitä ehdi siinä katella kun tavallaan, samalla pitäis kuunnella sitä luentoo ja saada siit se kokonaiskuva. Et ne sit ehkä ennemmin jos ite kirjoittaa jotain niin, autto siihen. Sit tietysti siis, no joskus jotkut sano sitten jotain niin kuin yksittäisiä sanoja suomeks, tai sitten niin ku luennolla siel saatto olla joskus jotain suluissa sit suomenkielisiä sanoja. Ei ehkä kovin relevantteja sanoja kylläkään. [naurahtaa] Et just semmosia mitkä suomeks on sit käytännös samoja ku ruotsiks. Niin sit on silleen et, joo ehkä mä nyt tiedän mikä toi luonnonvalinta on, mä oisin ymmärtäny sen tosta, [naurahduksia] muutenkin mutta, ihan kiva että tälleen, yritettiin auttaa. Ja sit tietysti siis-
 I: Oliko se auttaminen, oliko se, se tuki tarpeeks hyvin tai tarpeeks hyvä tai oliko s-, olisitko tarvinnut enemmän tukea luennoissa?
 S: Kyl se mulle suurimmaks osaks riitti. Ehkä siis jotenkin silleen semmonen niin ku, vaikka just et kun käytiin solun eri osia, ja sitten osaa ne asiat suomeks ja sit tulee miljoona termii jotka ei vaan jotenkin löydä sitä oikeeta paikkaa siel aivoissa. Tavallaan semmonen et, tietty semmonen terminologian käynti siinä et ne ois ollu, niin sitä ois ollu vähän enemmän siinä alkupuolen kurssista, niin se ois ehkä ollu, tarpeen.

Example 10.

- I: No kumpi sun mielestä tai minkälaiset työtavat sun mielestä helpottais sitä ruotsinkieliselle luennoille osallistumista?
 S: No ainaki se jos ajattelee siltä kannalta et missä oppis parhaiten ruotsia, niin se on se missä osallistetaan opiskelijoita tai ainakin se oma se kielen tuottaminen parantuis tosi paljon. Että tossahan mä opin kuuntelemaan tai kuulen ja ymmärrän ruotsia ja mä kirjotan mun muistiinpanot myös ruotsiks ja joitakin sanoja täydennän suomella. Mut pedagogisesti jos haluis tukee tosi paljon sitä kielen oppimista, mikä ehkä ois se ultimaattinen tavote niin, sitten se semmonen keskustelun herättely ja tavallaan vaikka vähän silleen väkisellä, se niitten vastausten irtirepiminen ois silleen toimivampi.

Example 11.

- I: Ryhmien muodostaminen luennoilla. Onks se jos opettaja haluaa että te keskustellette ryhmissä, miten se tapahtuu se muodostaminen? Lait-, haluatteko olla suomenkielisten opiskelijoiden kanssa aina yhdessä vai miten se, [naurahduksia] tai miten sä haluat itse, että mitä sä..?
 S: Kylhän se ehkä helpommin tulee, tai jotenkin on ehkä vähemmän paineita puhua jos on, suomenkielinen. Mut kyl sit siinä toisaalta taas tulee kiusaus puhua suomee.

- I: Puhutteko suomea silloin?
 S: Ei ehkä, no välillä. Joo. [naurahtaa] Mut kyl nyt ollaan yritetty puhua enemmän ruotsia, tai lähinnä ruotsia.
 I: Mutta, siis jos te saatte muodostaa ne ryhmät itse, te meette aina ruotsinkie-, suomenkielisen opiskelijoiden kanssa, siis yhteen (niissä)?
 S: Mm. No joo.

Example 12.

- S: Et opiskelijat ehkä tarvii jotain kielitukee, kielen tarkastusta, koska ei tunnu yhtään kivalta et on kahen ruotsinkielisen kanssa ryhmässä, jossa sit joutuu laittamaan oman esseensä joka, jonka taso ei ole ehkä se mitä pitäis, niin sinne tavallaan yhteisen esseen osaks, ilman mitään kielen tarkastusta. Ja sit on silleen et anteeks voitteks te korjata tän mulle. [naurahduksia] Vaikkei se oo niitten tehtävä.

Example 13.

- I: Joo. Mä ajattelinkin just kysyä että onks semmosia, millä sitä kynnystä tavallaan vois madaltaa tai onks semmosia tilanteita tai kursseja tai opettajia joissa se tuntuu jotenkin helpommalta?
 S: Joo toi, meillä on toi, se [kurssin nimi], niin siihen kuuluu tavallaan se meidän pakollinen ruotsin opiskelu, niin siellä meillä on joka maanantai on ruotsin tunti ihan. Ja sit siellä me keskustellaan, opettaja antaa just jotain keskusteluharjoituksia ja kysymyksiä ja semmosia ja niiden perusteella sitten voidaan pareittain tai kolmen–neljän hengen ryhmissä silleen keskustella. Niin sillen mun mielestä on just tosi matala kynnys puhua ruotsiks.
 I: Mut onks se, sen kurssin opettajan kanssa vai sit ruotsinopettajan kanssa?
 S: Ruotsinopettajan kanssa.

Transcription key

- , short pause
 ... interrupted or unfinished turn
 wor- word interrupted
 (-) word omitted
 (- -) section omitted
 (word) unclear
 [brackets] additions by the transcriber/authors
 [course] the name of a specific course removed and replaced by a general noun with by the authors

Received May 9, 2024
 Revision received October 4, 2024
 Accepted October 16, 2024

