

9

Language Ideologies Regarding English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education: Insights from Flanders and Finland

Frank van Splunder

9.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with language ideologies concerning English-medium instruction (EMI) in Europe's higher education institutions. EMI is one of the most noticeable but unplanned consequences of higher education reform in Europe. The Bologna Declaration (1999) aimed to internationalize higher education, resulting in the construction of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA 2010–20). Although the intention was to respect the diversity of languages and cultures, English emerged as the preferred language, including its use as a medium of instruction. Moreover, the increasing use of English is informed by neoliberal discourses on globalization (Fairclough 2006; Block et al. 2012). To put it rather bluntly, globalization favours English (Fishman 2006, p. 323).

Even though English is often perceived as an opportunity or a necessity, it is also seen as a threat to other languages and cultures (e.g.

F. van Splunder (✉)
University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016
E. Barakos, J. Unger (eds.), *Discursive Approaches to Language Policy*,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-53134-6_9

205

Leppanen and Pahti 2012). In general, however, the use of English in higher education remains largely unproblematic (Saarinen 2014), including the variety of English which is to be used. Yet, there is a strong bias—particularly in education—towards native speaker and standard language (often conceptualized as UK or US English), even though these terms are highly problematic and rarely questioned (Seidlhofer 2011, p. 5). This bias may be observed both in learners and in teachers of English, who often regard UK or US English as the only ‘correct’ English (van Splunder, 2016).

My case study is based on a comparison between the use of EMI in Flanders and Finland, two regions characterized by a similar linguistic profile but different language ideologies and practices. In both areas, language is a sensitive issue, and the *official* language (Dutch in Flanders) and the dominant *national* language (Finnish in Finland) have been constructed as the essence of national identity (see Sects. 9.4 and 9.5). Moreover, these languages have been set off against another language: French in Belgium, and Swedish in Finland. On the other hand, the language issue tends to be less problematic in countries such as Sweden or the Netherlands, which have been discursively constructed as monolingual countries (see Ihalainen and Saarinen 2014 for Finland and Sweden, and van Splunder, 2015 for Flanders and the Netherlands). The complex negotiations between national and/or official languages occupying the same discursive space can also be observed in other multilingual countries such as Luxembourg or Switzerland (see Kremer and Horner, Chap. 7, Weber, Chap. 8, and Flubacher, Chap. 10, this volume).

The analysis in this chapter is based on governmental and institutional language policies regarding English/EMI and other languages (including the national/official and regional languages). Even though language policy is increasingly being studied as a ‘process phenomenon’ (see Barakos, Chap. 2), the focus in this chapter is on texts (i.e. the ‘surface’ level) rather than on actual language practices (the way people use language in a particular context or situation). The rationale for focusing on the surface level is the seminal importance of texts as ‘sites of struggle’ (Wodak 2009, p. 35; see also Bourdieu 1991) in which different discourses and ideologies are contesting for dominance (for instance, in language legislation). As observed by Blackledge (2005, p. vii), arguments travel along ‘chains

of discourse' until they gain legitimacy (i.e. they become law). Discourse can be understood as 'a complex bundle of [...] interrelated linguistic acts' (Wodak 2006, p. 175). Thus, seemingly evident notions such as national, official or minority language are conceptually constructed in texts (for instance, in legislation), where they reveal dominant language ideologies (see Ihalainen and Saarinen 2014). In my analysis, I take a social constructivist view which regards language policy as essentially a discursive process.

The aim of this research is to analyse language ideologies and discourses regarding EMI in the context of the internationalization of higher education in Europe. The analysis draws on a plurality of critical methods, including language policy research (Ricento 2006) and discourse analysis (Reisigl and Wodak 2009). The research questions addressed in this chapter are 'What are the underlying beliefs (ideologies) regarding the national or official language(s), English and other languages in Flanders and in Finland?' and 'How are these beliefs *naturalized* (i.e. granted legitimacy) in governmental and institutional policies?' The chapter is outlined as follows: after a brief discussion of language ideologies and EMI in Europe, I will compare Finland and Flanders regarding their linguistic profile and socio-historical context, the use of English as a medium of instruction and the respective language policy at three distinct levels (national, institutional and a comparison of a Finnish and a Flemish university).

9.2 Language Ideologies

In this section, I will conceptualize what I mean by language ideologies, after which I will focus on ideologies regarding EMI. By ideologies, I mean implicit or unconscious beliefs or assumptions which shape values, norms and policies. As pointed out by Tollefson (2006, p. 47), these beliefs and assumptions are naturalized and thus contribute to hegemonic practices in institutions (for instance, universities). My focus is on language ideologies which have been particularly important in nation-building (see Anderson 1983; Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990; see also Schieffelin et al. 1998). Whereas language ideologies deal with how an issue (for instance, EMI) is talked about in discourse, language practices

are concerned with how it unfolds in a particular situation (like in an institutional context).

The discourse on EMI reveals several ideologies. In their research on English in Nordic universities, Hultgren et al. (2014, p. 12) distinguish 'internationalist' and 'culturalist' discourses. Whereas the former aims to make one's nation internationally competitive (for instance, in university rankings), the latter is committed to safeguarding the national culture. In a similar vein, I distinguished four major 'bundles' of ideologies (van Splunder 2014), which can be presented in a more or less dichotomous way:

- * essentialism versus instrumentalism
- * monolingualism versus bilingualism; multilingualism
- * correct versus communicative language; standardization
- * territoriality versus personality

These dichotomies should be understood as continua rather than rigid categories, reflecting the complexities, fluidities and mobilities of social life. The ideology of essentialism holds that there are insoluble links between language and identity (May 2005, 2006), while instrumentalism regards language as a mere tool (i.e. an instrument to communicate). A 'monoglot ideology' (Silverstein 1996) rests on the belief that a society is (or should be) monolingual. Likewise, bilingualism and multilingualism can be regarded as ideological conceptualizations (such as the belief that a country is bilingual, even though it is characterized by monolingual or multilingual practices). According to the ideology of standardization (Ricento 2006, p. 20), there exists a 'correct' language which should be used as a standard. This ideology conflicts with the ideology which regards language merely as a tool for communication. The ideologies of territoriality versus personality deal with the links between language, people and territory. The ideology of territoriality holds that individuals should adapt to the language of a given territory, while the ideology of personality states that individuals have the right to use their own language (Cartwright 2006, p. 203). As I will discuss in this chapter, the ideologies of essentialism, monolingualism/multilingualism, standardization and territoriality are prevalent in Flanders, while Finland is

characterized by instrumentalism, bilingualism/multilingualism and the personality principle. It should be noted that these ideologies hardly ever occur in a 'pure' form and are mitigated depending on various factors, including one's age or background (e.g. older Flemish lecturers tend to have more essentialist attitudes than their younger colleagues—see van Splunder 2014).

The discourse on EMI reveals that teaching in English has consequences for one's 'own' and other languages as well. In summary, current language policies in Finland and Flanders deal with:

- ✦ 'promoting' (protecting, defending) the *national* language(s);
- ✦ introducing an *international* language, which in practice means English;
- ✦ an increasingly *multilingual* and *multicultural* environment.

EMI can be seen as an opportunity (to open up to the world) or a necessity (as the 'national' language is not a world language), but also as a threat. Metaphors of war (as in the concept of 'language struggle') and the *topos* of threat (Wodak and Meyer 2009, p. 75) are prevalent in the discourse on EMI (van Splunder 2014; Leppänen and Pahta 2012). Phillipson (1992) regarded English as a 'killer language', replacing and displacing other languages, for instance, in higher education. Today, most universities have embraced English as their language of wider communication, but action has been taken to safeguard the national or official languages. The latter is particularly salient in language-sensitive contexts such as Flanders or Finland, as will be discussed in the next section.

9.3 English-Medium Instruction in Europe

EMI is on the rise all over Europe, although it is more prominent in the north than in the south of the continent (Wächter and Maiworm 2008; Wächter 2014). Universities in the Nordic countries (Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Finland) are in the forefront in the process of *Englishization* (Hultgren et al. 2014, p. 1), together with universities in the Netherlands, which have switched to English for most of their

postgraduate teaching (Brenn-White and Van Rest 2012, p. 6). The situation in Europe varies from country to country, and the overall picture is rather complex as language can be managed at several levels (i.e. language in general, not just English). The following *language management levels* can be distinguished:

- * Supra-national
- * National
- * Regional
- * Institutional
- * Sub-institutional
- * Individual

Supra-national language management is not very common and is not always operationalized. An example is the European Union with its 'one-plus-two policy' (i.e. the promotion of learning two additional languages apart from the national or official language). The policy does not appear to be very successful, as in most European countries, English is the only foreign language which is widely taught and learned (European Commission 2012, p. 12). Another example of supra-national language management is the Dutch Language Union between the Netherlands and Flanders regarding the use of Dutch and English in higher education. In spite of a common language policy, language practices in the Netherlands and in Flanders appear to be very different, as Flanders is far more reluctant than the Netherlands to introduce EMI (see van Splunder 2015).

The Nordic countries have adopted a policy of *parallellinguism* (Danish: *parallelsproglighed*): the parallel use of several languages. The term *parallellinguism* was coined around the turn of the century ('probably in 2002', as pointed out by Hultgren et al. 2014, p. 10). Parallellinguism is often applied in higher education, where the national language can be used in parallel with another language, usually English. This policy has been recommended in policy documents at national as well as supra-national level (see Hultgren et al. 2014, p. 10). As stated by the Nordic Council of Ministers, '[n]one of the languages abolishes or replaces the other, they are used in parallel' (Declaration on Nordic Language Policy 2007, p. 93). According to Kuteeva, however, parallel language

use 'largely remains an unoperationalised political slogan' (Kuteeva 2014, p. 333; see also Björkman 2014).

Whereas most countries manage language on the national level, other countries have devolved the issue to the regional level. The latter appears to be the case in federalized countries such as Belgium or Spain. From a linguistic point of view, Belgium may be regarded as 'two states in one' (Edwards 1985, p. 84), with Flanders increasingly asserting itself as a quasi-autonomous region, carrying out its own language and other policies. At the same time, close ties have been set up between Flanders and the Netherlands, resulting in a joint language policy.

Institutions may have their own language policies as well. This is the case in, for instance, the Nordic countries and in the Netherlands. Likewise, sub-institutional bodies (such as faculties or departments) may have their own language policies, and even every single person has their own language policy as one constantly has to manage one's language use in a particular context. As a result, every single person can be regarded as a *language manager* (Spolsky 2004, p. 8; 2009, pp. 4–5). The language practices resulting from one's personal language management reflect underlying language ideologies (Tollefson 2006). As may be inferred from the examples, perhaps the most common type of language policy is a combination of various management levels.

The next section focuses on the linguistic profile of Finland and Flanders, as well as the growing importance of EMI in Finnish and Flemish universities.

9.4 Finland and Flanders (Belgium) Compared

9.4.1 Linguistic Profile and Socio-historical Context

Finland and Belgium are both bilingual countries in that the use of two major languages, as a result of historical developments, lies at the core of the present states. Yet, bilingualism—which may be considered as an ideological conceptualization—has been operationalized in entirely different ways. Due to the internationalization and growing marketization of

higher education in Europe, English is emerging as an additional medium of instruction (see Smit and Dafouz 2012; Hultgren 2014), but the language is increasingly present in other domains too. As can be observed in other countries, Finland and Belgium are becoming linguistically and culturally more diverse, as a result of which multilingualism is on the rise.

With a population of 5.4 million, Finland recognizes Finnish (90 %) and Swedish (5.4 %) as *national* languages. Swedish is spoken mainly in the coastal areas in the south and south-west, and in Åland, between Finland and Sweden. Even though Belgium (population 11.1 million) has three *official* languages, the two main languages are Dutch (56 %) and French (38 %), which are spoken in clearly defined areas in the north (Flanders, bordering the Netherlands) and in the south (Wallonia, bordering France). Both languages are official in the central Brussels area, even though French is clearly dominant. German is spoken by a small minority (0.70 %) in the east of the country, bordering Germany. The use of the word Dutch instead of Flemish as the official name of the language spoken in Flanders is a conscious political decision as it stresses the linguistic unity with the Netherlands. As pointed out by Dalby (2002, p. 117), the language was labelled Flemish in the 1830s as using the name Dutch 'might give a foothold for a possible separatist movement' in Belgium, which had gained its independence from the Netherlands in 1830.

The nineteenth-century 'language struggle' in both countries can be characterized as a dispute between two languages in which the *majority* language (Finnish in Finland, Dutch in Belgium) was actually suppressed by the *minority* language (Swedish in Finland, French in Belgium). While the majority's language lacked prestige (it was commonly described as a 'peasant language'), the minority's language was associated with high culture and education. Thus, it was the language of *upward social mobility*. That is, the minority language spoken by the ruling classes was a prerequisite for social and educational advancement. As a result, higher education was in the minority language. Finland has only narrowly escaped *Swedishization* (Coleman 2010, p. 53). The same holds for Flanders, which escaped *Frenchification* (Witte and Van Velthoven 1999, p. 55). The language struggle, embedded in the Romantic nationalist movement, eventually led to the gradual recognition of the majority

language in domains which, for a very long time, had been reserved for the minority language (such as higher education). It should be noted that the language strife became part of a larger-scale power struggle, which was exploited by 'outsiders' (see below) to support their own cause.

The notion that language is the essence of the nation remains very much alive today both in Finland (Kirby 2006) and in Flanders (Deprez and Vos 1998). Yet, the linguistic landscape has become far more complex as the traditional dichotomy between two languages has been challenged by other languages, in particular minority languages ('internal' as well as 'external' minorities, due to new waves of migration) as well as English, which is gaining importance in all domains (for instance, as a medium of instruction in higher education). The present linguistic situation cannot be understood without considering the historical sociocultural context, to which I will briefly attend below.

Finland was a part of Sweden from the twelfth until the early nineteenth century, a legacy reflected in the prevalence of Swedish as an official language in Finland (Kirby 2006). Swedish became the dominant language of the nobility, administration and education in the seventeenth century, while Finnish was the language of the peasantry, clergy and local courts. As a result, the educated class was almost entirely Swedish-speaking. Sweden ceded Finland to Russia after they lost the Finnish War, and Finland became an autonomous Grand Duchy within the Russian Empire (1809–1917). The Russian Revolution prompted the Finnish Declaration of Independence (6 December 1917). Before independence, the 1870s saw the emergence of a strong nationalist movement in which the Finnish language played an important role as a nation-building tool. Finnish achieved equal status with Swedish in 1892, which was later confirmed in the 1919 Finnish Constitution. In today's Finland, Finnish has attained a dominant status, and the language issue has lost its inflammability (Saarinen 2012, p. 168). The Universities Act (see below) deals with the language issue in teaching.

Throughout history, the area called Belgium today has been overrun by all major powers (including Spain, Austria, France and Germany) due to its central position in Europe. Belgian independence from the Netherlands in 1830 created linguistic tensions between Dutch (at that time often called Flemish to make it look different from the language

spoken in the Netherlands) and French. Like Swedish in Finland, French was the minority language in Belgium, but it was also the language of high prestige. As French was the language of the elite, it served as the language of higher education. The oppression of the majority language led to the rise of Flemish nationalism, which has established strong links between language and identity in Flanders. Dutch achieved equal status with French in 1898 (see, e.g. Deprez and Vos 1998).

One of the main demands of the Flemish Movement was the *Dutchification* of higher education in Flanders in order to create a Dutch-speaking elite. Although attempts had been undertaken before the First World War, Dutchification was realized as late as 1930. The Flemish demand had been met during the war by the German occupiers as part of their *Flamenpolitik* (the exploitation of the linguistic problems in Belgium, and the positive discrimination towards the Flemings and their language). The Council of Flanders (wartime activists under German protection) declared Flemish Independence in 1917, the same year as Finnish independence was declared. However, the Council collapsed in 1918, when the Germans surrendered (Deprez and Vos 1998, p. 17). In Finland, too, the internal language issue was used by outsiders to further their own cause. When Finland became part of the Russian Empire, the Tsar made Finnish equal to Swedish, thus weakening the influence of the Swedish elite. Later on, the policy of *Russification* (1899–1905, 1908–1917) aimed to increase the use of Russian in Finland. Finnish as well as many Swedish-speaking Finns (who were cut off from Sweden) were in favour of the national Finnish cause as they feared Russian domination (Coleman 2010, p. 49).

Unlike Finland, Belgium is based on the ideology of monolingualism. Bilingualism was rejected by the French-speaking elite, which did not want the majority language to be inflicted upon the whole country, as a result of which monolingual areas were created in 1932 (Cartwright 2006, pp. 200–3). Belgium has had fixed language boundaries since 1963, reflecting the principle of territoriality (Nelde et al. 1992). This was possible as Belgium consists of more or less clearly defined monolingual areas, which is less the case in Finland. Moreover, the two dominant autochthonous linguistic groups are more evenly matched in Belgium

than in Finland. The ideology of monolingualism does not account for bilingual and multilingual practices.

Belgium became a federal state in 1993, based on the notions of Communities (linguistic entities) and Regions (economic entities; see below). As a result, Flanders pursues its own language policy in educational and other matters. The value of comparing Flanders and Finland from a language policy perspective lies in the fact that, in both regions, the official or national language has been constructed as the essence of one's identity. This language is set off against the 'other' language (i.e. the former dominant language) as well as against English, today's dominant language in various domains, including higher education. The remainder of this chapter will focus on language policies in Flanders and Finland regarding EMI.

9.4.2 English-Medium Instruction in Finland and Flanders

One may observe similar discourses regarding EMI in Finland and in Flanders. On the one hand, English has been conceptualized as a necessity in today's higher education. That is, English is the way to gain access to an increasingly international and market-oriented academic context. In this market, both Finnish and Dutch may be regarded as deficient. On the other hand, English may be perceived as a threat for one's own language, which needs protection. Overall, significant differences may be observed between political and academic discourses. Political discourses take place in a political context (e.g. parliamentary debates, legislation), whereas academic discourses are confined to an academic context (e.g. faculty meetings and Codes of Conduct set by the university authorities). In populist political discourse (True Finns, Flemish Interest), the prevalence of one's own language and identity is emphasized, whereas academic discourse tends to be more pragmatic regarding other languages. Moreover, English is increasingly used for learning and teaching purposes. For instance, the number of textbooks and courses in English has increased significantly in the last decades (Wächter 2014). Interestingly,

the language debate in Finland and Flanders is not only concerned with English as the 'other' language, but also with the 'other' language in Flanders and Finland (French and Swedish, respectively).

After the Second World War, the international orientation of Finnish academics shifted from Germany (and German) to the English-speaking world (Saarinen 2014). Today, Finland is in the vanguard of teaching through English. It hosts the second largest (after the Netherlands) number of programmes in English (Wächter and Maiworm 2008; Wächter 2014), often euphemistically referred to as 'foreign language' programmes. Approximately two out of three Master's programmes are currently in English (Saarinen 2014, p. 13). EMI is a means to attract foreign students and scholars to Finland, which is more or less 'isolated' (geographically as well as linguistically) from the rest of Europe. Finnish is 'promoted' as a language of science while at the same time acknowledging the importance of English. Yet, EMI is not entirely unproblematic. The perception that Finland *goes English* is attributed to the 'supremacy of the Anglo-American world' (Leppänen and Pahta 2012, p. 12) and the view that Finns abandon their own language and culture. Concerns have also been raised over 'bad English' (e.g. a thick accent) spoken in Finland (Leppänen and Pahta 2012, p. 12). Yet, EMI has received surprisingly little public attention in Finland, in spite of the large amount of English-medium teaching in Finnish higher education. Instead, the language debate focuses on the position of Swedish as a mandatory language in education. Thus, Swedish (and not English) occupies the discursive language policy space in Finland (Ihalainen and Saarinen 2014).

In today's Flanders, French hardly occupies the discursive language policy space it used to occupy before Belgium became a federal state. Moreover, English has replaced French as the *de facto* second language. Most Flemish academics regard English as their first academic language (van Splunder 2014). In contrast to Finland, where public attention for EMI is rather low (Saarinen 2014), the issue has led to lively debates in the Flemish media and in politics. Although attitudes towards EMI appear to be as positive as in Finland, serious objections have been raised (mainly by right-wing Flemish nationalists). Overall, politicians and academics conceptualize EMI in entirely different ways. While political discourses have

to be understood in a Flemish or Belgian context in which Dutch is confronted with French, academic discourses operate in a European and international context in which Dutch is confronted with English. Due to the sensitivity of the language issue, Flanders has imposed restrictions on the use of English (and other foreign languages) as a medium of instruction (see Sect. 9.5.2). Moreover, measures have been introduced to monitor the medium of instruction (including obligatory language tests for anyone teaching in a language other than his/her mother tongue). These measures reflect an ideology of standardization, that is, the prevalence of a normative tradition and a belief in 'correct' language. Indeed, the Flemish monoglot ideology (Blommaert 2006, p. 243) clashes with today's demand for more English and increasing multilingualism and multiculturalism.

9.5 Language Policy in Finland and Flanders (Belgium)

This section discusses selected governmental and institutional policies. The comparison will concentrate on the following levels of language policy:

- * National level: Finnish versus Belgian Constitution
- * Institutional level: University policy in Finland versus Flanders
- * University level: Jyväskylä versus Antwerp

The discussion is based on the view that the discursive construction of 'us' and 'them' (in other words: *sameness* vs. *otherness*) lies at the core of discourses of identity and difference (Wodak 2009). I discuss the way certain languages are referred to in the discourse on EMI to construct sameness or otherness, and how this reflects the ideologies discussed earlier (Sect. 9.2). The following questions are addressed: Which languages reflect sameness, which reflect otherness? Which referential strategies are used to construct sameness/otherness? What are the names or labels given to these languages? Which characteristics are attributed to these languages?

9.5.1 National Level

The Constitution reflects the dominant language ideologies regarding the languages spoken in both countries. The Finnish Constitution is based on the concept of *national* languages (Finnish and Swedish) and the right to use one's own language (either Finnish or Swedish, reflecting the personality principle). The Constitution has provisions for minority languages and Sign Language as well. Section 17, which discusses the right to one's language and culture (Constitution of Finland 1999), states:

- “ The national languages of Finland are Finnish and Swedish.
- * Everyone has the right to use his or her own language, either Finnish or Swedish, before courts of law and other authorities, and to receive official documents in that language, which shall be guaranteed by an Act. The public authorities shall provide for the cultural and societal needs of the Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking populations of the country on an equal basis.
- * The Sami, as an indigenous people, as well as the Roma and other groups, have the right to maintain and develop their own language and culture. Provisions on the right of the Sami to use the Sami language before the authorities are laid down by an Act.
- * The rights of persons using sign language and of persons in need of interpretation or translation aid owing to disability shall be guaranteed by an Act.

The Finnish Constitution and the ensuing Language Act (1922, 2004) are based on the principle of *state bilingualism* (Finnish + Swedish). In spite of the country's bilingual status, Finland is overwhelmingly Finnish-speaking (Saarinen 2012, p. 158). Legally, Finnish and Swedish have an equal status, yet there is a tendency to downgrade Swedish to a minority language status (for instance, in parliamentary debates). Discursively, Finnish and Swedish are framed as the only mother tongues (Saarinen 2014, p. 134). Although the Sami, the Roma and 'other groups' are given particular rights, they are not explicitly named as minority groups/languages (Ihalainen and Saarinen 2014). The same holds for speakers of Sign Language (spelled sign language in the Constitution, which somehow sets

it off from other languages, whose names are capitalized). Moreover, the latter group is associated with disability ('persons in need of') rather than with minority. Thus, language and language rights should be understood in the formal context of Finnish state bilingualism rather than individual linguistic identities (Ihalainen and Saarinen 2014).

In Belgium, the ideology of *monolingualism* has been institutionalized. The Belgian Constitution is based on the concept of 'regional' languages (implying there are no national languages as in Finland) and on the territoriality principle (the language depends on the area in which one resides). Since 1994, Belgium has been reconceptualised as a federal state, as a result of which two entirely different views had to be reconciled: the Flemish demand for language-based Communities (reflecting Flemish language sensitivity) and the Walloon demand for area-based Regions. Thus, the Constitution reveals conflicting discourses on language, resulting in a highly complex compromise, as illustrated in the following extract (Constitution of Belgium 1994):

- * Art 1—Belgium is a federal state, composed of Communities and Regions;
- * Art 2—Belgium consists of three Communities: the Flemish Community, the French Community and the German-speaking Community;
- * Art 3—Belgium consists of three Regions: the Flemish Region, the Walloon Region and the Brussels Region;
- * Art 4—Belgium consists of four linguistic areas: the Dutch-speaking language area, the French-speaking language area, the bilingual Brussels-Capital area and the German-speaking language area.

Whereas the Flemish Community and the Flemish Region overlap and constitute the Dutch-speaking language area (Flanders), this is not the case across the linguistic border, where the French Community and the Walloon Region (including both the French- and the German-speaking language area) are different entities. The way these communities and regions establish their identities is beyond the scope of this chapter. Languages other than the official languages are not even mentioned in the Constitution, and thus made invisible. Unlike Finland (Saarinen 2014, p. 134), Belgium has

not ratified the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages as this might disrupt the sensitive equilibrium between the official languages. As a result of the process of devolution, Sign Language is a regional matter in Belgium. In Flanders, Flemish Sign Language (which, unlike the spoken and written language, is different from Dutch Sign Language) was officially recognized by the Flemish Parliament in 2006.

9.5.2 Institutional Level

As pointed out by Saarinen (2014, p. 127), universities are fundamentally international but, at the same time, national institutions in that they play a crucial role in nation-building. This section discusses the policy on the national and regional languages as well as on other languages in higher education. The latter is related to the internationalization of higher education and the increasing use of English as a medium of instruction.

In Finland, the Universities Act (558/2009) (2014) states that the language of instruction depends on the university. As a result, most universities have Finnish as a medium of instruction, while three use Swedish and four use both languages. At the same time, provisions can be made for languages other than Finnish or Swedish (mainly English). According to Section 11 on the languages of instruction and examination (Universities Act 2009),

1. The languages of instruction and examination in the University of Helsinki, the Academy of Fine Arts, Sibelius Academy and the Theatre Academy shall be Finnish and Swedish. The language of instruction and examination in Aalto University shall be governed by the provisions on the language of instruction and examination of its constituent Schools in Section 9 of the Universities Act of 1997 (645/1997). The language of instruction and examination of Åbo Akademi University, Hanken School of Economics and the Swedish School of Social Science of the University of Helsinki shall be Swedish. The language of instruction in other universities shall be Finnish.
2. In addition, the university may decide to use a language other than that referred to in subsection 1 as a language of instruction and examination.

The Belgian/Flemish law is stricter than the law in Finland, reflecting the fact that Belgium/Flanders has a long tradition of top-down language regulation. Unlike Finland, the language of instruction does not depend on the university but on the region in which the university is based. Article 4 (Law Concerning Language Regulation in Education 1963) states:

The language of education is Dutch in the Dutch-speaking language area, French in the French-speaking language area, and German in the German-speaking language area.

The law clearly reflects the territoriality principle, the purpose of which was to settle the deteriorating language dispute. After severe clashes in the 1960s, the university of Leuven/Louvain (situated in Flanders) was split into two universities: one Dutch-speaking (Leuven), the other French-speaking (Louvain-la-Neuve, relocated in Wallonia). Thus, Belgium was discursively and effectively reconstructed as consisting of clearly defined monolingual areas.

Due to the process of federalization, Flanders has set up its own educational policy. The 2003 Decree (Flemish law) explicitly states that 'Dutch is the language of instruction at all Flemish universities and university colleges' (Flemish Decree Concerning Language Regulation in Higher Education 2012, Article 91.1). Yet, the Flemish Government allows for the use of languages other than Dutch as a medium of instruction 'to increase internationalization and student mobility' (Government Memorandum 16 July 2010). In practice, however, 'languages other than Dutch' means English. Very few courses—if any—are taught in French or other languages. The 2012 Decree concerning Higher Education in Flanders imposes several restrictions regarding courses taught in languages other than Dutch. For instance, maximum 18.33 % of all Bachelor's programmes and maximum 50 % of all Master's programmes in Flanders may be taught in English (or in any other foreign language), except programmes set up for students from abroad, which may be taught entirely in English. There are many more restrictions and exceptions, reflecting conflicting discourses concerning language (see van Splunder 2014, for a more detailed account).

In Finland as well as in Flanders, legislation concerning EMI refers to programmes in 'other' languages rather than to English-language

programmes (e.g. 'a language other than that referred to in subsection 1' [Finnish or Swedish] or 'languages other than Dutch'). Thus, English is made invisible, even though it is clearly dominant, and the terms 'other' and 'foreign' are conflated with English. Moreover, the term English is implicitly reduced to British or American English, thus excluding all other varieties of English. In other words, English is assumed to be Inner Circle English (Kachru 1985), including the use of Anglo-American paradigms, testing systems (such as Test of English as a Foreign Language [TOEFL] or International English Language Testing System [IELTS]) and teaching materials (van Splunder, 2016). This focus on Western hegemonic varieties of English is taken for granted and has received surprisingly little public attention.

9.5.3 University Level

University language policy reflects language policy 'from above' (Finnish Universities Act, Flemish Higher Education Decree), but at the same time, universities negotiate their own policies. Language legislation is stricter in Flanders than in Finland, and the role of universities as language policy-makers is more limited. Moreover, Flemish universities have stricter language policies than Finnish universities as they have to comply with strict government regulations. In this section, I will discuss some elements of language policy developed by a Finnish and a Flemish university. The University of Jyväskylä (15,000 students) in Central Finland has its origins in the first Finnish-speaking teacher training college in Finland. The University of Antwerp (20,000 students) is situated in the northern and Dutch-speaking part of Belgium. The key concepts regarding language policy at both universities are internationalization, the promotion of one's own language and other languages (which, in practice, means English), and societal multilingualism and multiculturalism.

As stated by the University of Jyväskylä, the university's language policy aims to 'promote the University's internationalization' (University of Jyväskylä Language Policy 2012; see also Language Policy Action Plan 2012–2013). Although the university's language of instruction, examination and administration is Finnish in compliance with the Universities

Act, the university can also decide to use other languages in research and instruction. Echoing the personality principle, individuals have the 'legal right' to use Finnish or Swedish in administrative matters which concern them. The university's *working languages* are Finnish and English, which has been provided for by Subsection 2 of the Universities Act: the university may use languages other than Finnish. Moreover, faculties and departments can use those languages that are 'strategically significant' for them, which, in most cases, will be English. On the other hand, the university stresses the importance of Finnish in an international and multi-lingual/multicultural academic environment. Finnish is regarded as 'the cornerstone of our international university'. Therefore, it is important to develop Finnish as a language of science, including the promotion of publishing in Finnish in order to avoid domain loss. The university's language policy echoes Nordic *parallellinguism* (parallel language use, see Sect. 9.3), which may be called a pragmatic approach based on the university's needs.

The University of Antwerp's *Code of Conduct Regarding the Language of Instruction* (version 2013–2014) has been set up in compliance with the requirements of the Flemish government. The 'internationalization strategy' is mentioned in the very first sentence of the text. The Basic Principles state that the university has to consider 'the most appropriate language of instruction', although it can only do this within the 'legally determined boundaries' set by the Flemish government. Echoing the 2012 Decree, the main part of the text states that 'Dutch is the language of instruction' (Article 2). It also stresses the importance of Dutch as 'a language for scientific research and academic education'. Apart from Dutch, 'an international language' can be used. In practice, however, English is the only international language used as a medium of instruction at the university. The text also refers to the importance of other languages and cultures, which are increasingly present in today's university population, but the text does not provide any further details.

In summary, whereas the Jyväskylä language policy can be considered bottom-up policy (the university decides), the Antwerp language policy is clearly top-down (the government decides). In the latter case, the university can only act within the strict boundaries set by the Flemish government. In both universities, teaching in foreign languages is mainly

confined to English, which is usually referred to as the 'other language' (i.e. other than Dutch in Flanders or Finnish in Finland). Even though the word English remains largely absent in the texts discussed, the language features prominently in the universities' curricula. Yet, as a result of government and university policies which either promote or restrict the use of English, it can be argued that EMI is more prominent in Jyväskylä than in Antwerp.

9.6 Conclusion

In Flanders as well as in Finland, language has played a seminal role in the construction of a national identity. In both cases, the majority language (Dutch in Belgium and Finnish in Finland) was oppressed by the minority language (French in Belgium, Swedish in Finland), which served as the language of prestige and higher education. Today, the language dispute has largely been settled, and the majority language has become a language of prestige and learning as well. The former dominant language is still discursively present as the 'other' language in a national context, whereas in an international context, English has become the 'other' language. Yet, Flanders is far more reluctant than Finland to introduce English as a medium of instruction in higher education. This may be due to the fact that Finland was established as an independent nation-state in 1917, while Flanders can be regarded as an emerging nation-state.

Discourse analysis reveals how language policy concerning EMI in higher education in two particular regions (Flanders and Finland) is constructed through underlying language ideologies and can be understood in terms of identity management (i.e. the manifestation of sameness and otherness in legislation and university regulations). The focus on referential strategies, and the naming or labelling of languages in particular, shows how relations between languages are constructed in discourse. Languages can be made 'invisible' in that they are not named explicitly or in that they are defined in terms of otherness.

The discursive approach to language policy applied in this chapter focused on the notions of sameness and otherness with regard to languages used in higher education. The discussion aimed to reveal how 'us' and 'them'

are being constructed in government and university legislation regarding the medium of instruction, and which underlying language ideologies may be detected. In Flanders, sameness is expressed by the only *official* language (Dutch), which has been constructed as the essence of Flemish identity. The name Dutch rather than Flemish is used to express sameness with the language spoken in the Netherlands. The study shows that the underlying ideologies are monolingualism and territoriality (i.e. the belief in clearly defined monolingual areas). These ideologies are mainly prevalent in political discourse and less in language practices, which are often multilingual. In Finland, too, the dominant *national* language (Finnish) has been constructed as an essential part of Finnish identity, and Finns are 'immensely proud of their language' (Coleman 2010, p. 55). Official state bilingualism clashes with monolingual reality, and the personality principle is not always taken for granted in a country which is overwhelmingly Finnish-speaking. Overall, Finland is characterized by a pragmatic approach towards language, as can be observed in its parallel language use (the use of whichever language is most needed) in higher education.

Otherness can be expressed from a national and from an international perspective. From a national and historical perspective, French is constructed as the 'other' language in Flanders, even though it does not have an official status anymore and it is on the verge of becoming a *foreign* language. Languages other than Dutch (including minority languages) are not named and thus made invisible. The latter does not hold for Sign Language, which is officially recognized in Flanders. In Finland, Swedish is the other national language, but its current position reflects that of a minority language. Within the minority languages (a term which is avoided), a hierarchy may be observed. In terms of otherness, the Sami are defined as an indigenous people and their right to use the Sami language is mentioned explicitly. This is not the case for the Roma and 'other people' (a term which explicitly refers to their otherness). At the bottom of the hierarchy are the people defined in terms of disability (implicitly including people using Sign Language).

From an international perspective, English is constructed and perceived as the dominant other language both in Flanders and in Finland. English is often made invisible in that it is explicitly referred to as a 'language other than' the official or national language. Although in populist

discourse English is sometimes referred to as a threat, in academic discourse it is welcomed as a tool for the internationalization of education.

While English plays a powerful role in higher education in Europe, the concomitant marketing of English and the commodification of education are hardly ever questioned in the neoliberal discourse on internationalization. EMI is a political issue in European universities as it opens up new avenues but at the same time challenges the position of the national, regional and minority languages. The issue is particularly salient in language-sensitive regions such as Flanders or Finland, and deserves special attention in future research.

Acknowledgements I would like to express my gratitude to Taina Saarinen (University of Jyväskylä) for providing insightful information on language policy issues in Finland. In addition, I would like to thank the editors, Elisabeth Barakos and Johnny Unger, for providing critical feedback on earlier versions of this chapter.

References

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Revised ed.). London: Verso.
- Björkman, B. (2014). Language ideology or language practice? An analysis of language policy documents at Swedish universities. *Multilingua*, 33(3–4), 335–363.
- Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Block, D., Gray, J., & Holborow, M. (2012). *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language policy and national identity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 238–254). Malden: Blackwell.
- Bologna Declaration. (1999). Retrieved from: http://www.magna-charta.org/resources/files/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION.pdf
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brenn-White, M., & Van Rest, E. (2012). *English-Taught master's programs in Europe: New findings on supply and demand*. New York: Institute of International Education.

- Cartwright, D. (2006). Geolinguistic analysis in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method* (pp. 194–209). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coleman, M. C. (2010). You might all be speaking Swedish today: Language change in 19th-century Finland and Ireland. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 35(1), 44–64.
- Constitution of Belgium. (1994). Retrieved from: http://www.senate.be/doc/const_nl.html
- Constitution of Finland. (1999). Retrieved from: <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990731.pdf>
- Dalby, A. (2002). *Language in danger. How language loss threatens our future*. London: Penguin.
- Declaration on Nordic Language Policy. (2007). Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Deprez, K., & Vos, L. (Eds.) (1998). *Nationalism in Belgium. Shifting identities 1780–1995*. London: Macmillan.
- Edwards, J. (1985). *Language, society and identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- European Commission. (2012). First European survey of language competences. Final report. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/language-survey-final-report_en.pdf
- Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Finnish Universities Act. (558/2009). Retrieved from: <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2009/en20090558.pdf>
- Fishman, J. A. (2006). Language policy and language shift. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method* (pp. 311–328). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Flemish Decree Concerning Language Regulation in Higher Education. (2012). Retrieved from: <http://docs.vlaamsparlement.be/docs/stukken/2011–2012/g1655-6.pdf>
- Flemish Decree Concerning the Restructuring of Higher Education in Flanders. (2003). Retrieved from: <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/edulex/database/document/document.asp?docid=1>
- Flemish Government Memorandum. (2010). Retrieved from: http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/integratie/VR_2011_1507_MED.0393_Hervorming_hoger_onderwijs.pdf. Accessed 30 June 2014.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hultgren, A. K. (2014). English language use at the internationalised universities of Northern Europe: Is there a correlation between Englishisation and world rank? *Multilingua*, 33(3–4), 389–411.
- Hultgren, A. K., Gregersen, F., & Thøgersen, J. (Eds.) (2014). *English in Nordic universities. Ideologies and practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ihalainen, P., & Saarinen, T. (2014). Constructing “language” in language policy discourse: Finnish and Swedish legislative processes in the 2000s. In M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen, & T. Saarinen (Eds.), *Language policies in Finland and Sweden. Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons* (pp. 29–56). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirby, D. (2006). *A concise history of Finland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuteeva, M. (2014). The parallel language use of Swedish and English: the question of “nativeness” in university policies and practices. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(4), 332–344.
- Law Concerning Language Regulation in Education. (1963). *Wet houdende taalregeling in het onderwijs*. <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/edulex/database/document/document.asp?docid=12391>
- Leppänen, S., & Pahta, P. (2012). Finnish culture and language endangered – Language ideological debates on English in the Finnish Press from 1995 to 2007. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, & T. Räisänen (Eds.), *Dangerous multilingualism: Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality* (pp. 142–175). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- May, S. (2005). Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 319–347.
- May, S. (2006). Language policy and minority rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method* (pp. 255–272). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nelde, P., Labrie, N., & Williams, C. H. (1992). The principles of territoriality and personality in the solution of linguistic conflicts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(5), 387–406.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 87–121). London: Sage.

- Ricento, T. (Ed.) (2006). *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Saarinen, T. (2012). Internationalization of Finnish higher education — Is language an issue? *IJSL*, 216, 157–173.
- Saarinen, T. (2014). Language ideologies in Finnish higher education in the national and international context: a historical and contemporary outlook. In A. K. Hultgren, F. Gregersen, & J. Thøgersen (Eds.), *English in Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices* (pp. 127–146). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskity, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1996). Monoglot “standard” in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In D. Brenneis & R. Macaulay (Eds.), *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology* (pp. 284–306). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: Gaining insights into English-medium instruction at European universities. *AILA*, 25, 1–12.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method* (pp. 42–59). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Universities Act, Finland 558/2009. (2014). Retrieved from: <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2009/en20090558.pdf>. Accessed 30 June 2014.
- University of Antwerp Code of Conduct Regarding the Language of Instruction. (2013–2014), Retrieved from: <https://www.uantwerpen.be/images/uantwerpen/container1163/files/Gedragscode%20Onderwijsstaat%20RVBOK.pdf>. Accessed 30 June 2014.
- University of Jyväskylä Language Policy. (2012). Retrieved from: <https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/strategia/en/university-of-jyvaskyla-language-policy-2012>
- University of Jyväskylä Language Policy Action Plan. (2012–2013), <https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/strategia/en/Universityofjyvskyllanguagepolicyactionplan2012.pdf>
- van Splunder, F. (2014). Negotiating multilingualism in Flemish higher education. In J. W. Unger, M. Krzyżanowski, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Multilingual encounters in Europe’s institutional spaces* (pp. 221–242). London: Bloomsbury.

- van Splunder, F. (2015). A tale of two countries. Diverging policies on English-medium instruction in the Netherlands and Flanders. In B. Wilkinson & M. L. Walsh (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher education: From theory to practice* (pp. 89–98). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- van Splunder, F. (2016). Varieties of English in an international academic context. In *Proceedings of the VSTS Colloquium, 2014*. Leiden: Leiden University Repository, p. 15–26.
- Wächter, B. (2014). The European map of English-taught programmes in 2014: Results of a new ACA study. Paper presented at the ACA, Brussels, 4 December 2014.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). English-taught programs in European higher education. The picture in 2007. In *ACA papers on international cooperation in education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Witte, E., & Van Velthoven, H. (1999). *Language and politics. The Belgian case study in a historical perspective*. Brussels: VUB University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2006). Linguistic analyses in language policies. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method* (pp. 170–193). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action. Politics as usual*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.