WP6: Languages and Linguistic diversity

Online questionnaire results:

WP6 had 43 respondents (of 83 possible participants = 52% sample size) from different countries representing a range of educational institutes. The countries which responded were Belgium, Holland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Poland, Ireland, United Kingdom, Spain, France, Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Turkey

Summary of questionnaire results and conclusions

A questionnaire concerning language policy and usage in European academic courses covering the marines sciences, directed towards both undergraduate and postgraduate courses, was first drafted, by the WP leader before being modified after consultation with AQUA-TNET partners at the Core group meeting in Gent June 2006, and put online by AquaTT on the network's secure website.

A variation of this questionnaire was put to student participants at the AquaTT student Workshop in Galway in November 2006, with the purpose of discovering student knowledge and usage of online language courses and a print version of this is also found in Section B.

Raw data from the online questionnaire were collected and initially analysed by AQUATT before being considered in detail by WP partners at the Barcelona Workshop in March 2007. These first raw results of the questionnaires had been circulated to participants prior to the workshop. The online questionnaire had 27 responses, though one of these could be seen to be not relevant as this respondent had not answered any of the questions. This had not been taken into account in the first analysis of the data, and this meant that all the statistics were not accurate. In addition, it was also clear that the data presentation and analysis did not take into account in a comprehensible way, all the acceptable but negative responses to those questions that had been signalled as inapplicable. It was decided, after a close look at the figures, that it was literally impossible to come to any clear conclusions because of the format of the data presentation and that the best thing to do was to print out 20 copies of the questionnaire in Word format, and to ask 20 participants from different educational organisations to complete them on the spot. Once this had been done, it was possible to return to the raw online data and try to make valid conclusions.

1. Do you have international exchanges?
100% of respondents (i.e., more than 50% of the network) stated that their institution did have international exchanges. This is particularly interesting in the light of the responses concerning the institutions' language provision for those very international exchanges.

2. What language is used for course delivery at the host university?
30% of respondents stated that only English was used for course delivery in their institution, and since the survey was anonymous, it was not possible at this stage to identify which non-native-English universities preferred to use English rather than the native language for course delivery. 21% of respondents' courses used English as well as the native language for course delivery: Czech, Slovak, Danish, Spanish, Norwegian, Polish, German, and Icelandic. However, a large number of institutions (37%) used only the native language for course delivery and these native languages were Danish, Spanish, Norwegian, Polish, Turkish, Czech, German, French, Dutch, Swedish and Slovak.
This could lead us to conclude that 12% of respondents were native English speakers.

Comments from respondents: *Most courses are given in the native language, but where there are English-speaking students, the courses are given in English to meet their needs.*

3. Does your institution require a language qualification as pre-mobility requirement?
39% of respondents stated that a language qualification was not a pre-mobility requirement. This figure in itself need not be disquieting, as a language qualification is not usually held to be necessary in a scientific degree course.
Of the 61% of institutions which did require a language qualification, only 9% required a formal certificate. 5% required a knowledge of Spanish, 3% required knowledge of basic Polish, 3% required knowledge of basic French. The remaining 41% required a knowledge of English at varying levels of fluency.
Comments: *Students must be proficient in English; must have sufficient command of English; must have IELTS score of at least 6.5; must have TOEFL or IELTS.*

4. **Are language courses/modules provided in the host university for exchange students?**
60.5% respondents replied positively, 21% said that was no language provision, and the remainder (18.5%) did not know.

5**. If language courses/modules are provided, how is the language course/module delivered?**
The format of this question appeared to confuse some of the respondents, and this was further compounded by the fact that they did not seem to be familiar with language teaching methods.

tutor led classroom delivery:	43% of YES respondents
self instructional course:	15.5% of YES respondents
self instructional course online:	7.5% of YES respondents
self instructional course language laboratory:	7.5% of YES respondents
tutor-led language laboratory:	4% of YES respondents

Comments: *We have separate facilities for science and arts students. Language courses are provided in the arts faculty buildings. Language laboratories are also regarded as belonging to faculties other than science faculties.*

6. Do you participate in transnational joint courses?
Since quite a few respondents are known to participate in one of the few transnational joint courses that exist in the aquatic sciences, the answers to this question are necessarily skewed. On the other hand, their answers reveal a deficiency of language provision that is almost certainly the pattern throughout Europe. 44% of respondents participate in transnational joint courses compared to 56% who do not.

7. If you participate in transnational joint courses, what language(s) are used for course delivery at the host university?
65% of YES respondents used English only (these include native language speakers), while 46% of YES respondents combined English with the national language, and 36% of YES respondents made use of the national language only,

8. If you participate in transnational joint courses, what language(s) are used for course delivery at the receiving university?

9. Does your institution require a language qualification as pre-mobility requirement?
18.5% of respondents stated that there was no such requirement, while 23% of the sample did stipulate the need for an actual language certificate, with 18.5% stipulating that this should be a recognised certificate in English language.

10. Are language courses/modules provided in the host university for joint course students?
79% of respondent institutions did provide such courses, whereas 21% did not provide language tuition for their joint course students.

11. If language courses/modules are provided, how is the language course/module delivered?

tutor led classroom delivery:	21% of YES respondents
self instructional course:	10.5% of YES respondents
self instructional course online:	10.5%% of YES respondents
self instructional course language laboratory:	10.5% of YES respondents
tutor-led language laboratory:	10.5% of YES respondents

12. Do you have international work placements?

56% of respondents responded positively, as against 37% of respondent insitutions which did not organise international work placements.

13. If you have international work placements, does your institution require a language qualification as pre-mobility requirement?

37% of YES respondents did not specify a language qualification as a pre-mobility requirement. Most YES respondents (71%), however, specified a knowledge of English, rather than a qualification, with 8.5% specifying French, 4% Dutch and a further 4% Spanish.

14. Are language courses/modules provided in the host university for work placement students?

66% of YES respondents provide language courses for work placement students, as compared to 36% of YES respondents who do not provide language courses. This may indicate that institutions are aware of the explicit linguistic needs of students in the actual workplace.

15. If language courses/modules are provided, how is the language course/module delivered?

However, this latter assumption is probably no more than that, given the ignorance shown as to the actual teaching methods employed for such language provision.

tutor led classroom delivery:	4.5% of YES respondents
self instructional course:	2% of YES respondents
self instructional course online:	2%% of YES respondents %
self instructional course language laboratory:	2% of YES respondents %
tutor-led language laboratory:	2% of YES respondents.

16. Is your institution aware of the new EUROPASS?

60% of respondents stated that their institutions had no knowledge of the new 5 part EUROPASS, while a minority (40%) claimed knowledge of this major new European initiative.

17. If your institution is aware of the new EUROPASS, which part does it use?

EUROPASS Diploma Supplement:	57% of YES respondents
EUROPASS Certificate Supplement:	43% of YES respondents
EUROPASS CV:	28.5% of YES respondents
EUROPASS Language Passport:	14% of YES respondents
EUROPASS mobility:	42% of YES respondents

The low level of awareness is further highlighted by the low level of usage. The Diploma Supplement, which was not formerly part of EUROPASS, but which has been extensively promoted in higher education as an integral part of the Bologna Process, has the highest usage rate, but still only by 57% of YES respondents. However, the relatively high rate of awareness of the EUROPASS Certificate supplement, which is targeted purely at vocational education, makes it very likely that some respondents have not idea what the Certificate supplement really is and have confused it with the Diploma Supplement. In that case, we have 100% of our YES respondents who do use something that they know is called a Supplement of some sort. The very low level of awareness of the European Language Passport is further indication, if anything further is needed, that languages for mobility are very low down in the pecking order .

18. Do you have an international office?

88% of respondents do have such an office, with only 12% claiming not to have one.

19. Does your institution give financial help for mobility?

A high 72.5% of institutions do provide financial help for international mobility, although in many cases this help is linked with the ERASMUS programme.
25% of respondent institutions do not provide any help; 2.5% did not answer this question.

20. In your opinion, in which areas is there the greatest need for specific language provision?

Undergraduate level	30% of respondents
Postgraduate level	30% of respondents
Work placement level	10% of respondents
No answer	30% of respondents

Those respondents with exchange students of engaged in joint courses are evenly divided and see their own students' level of need clearly. But many respondents show by their non-response, that they have not thought at all seriously about this question.

21. In your opinion, at which levels is there the greatest need for specific language provision?

Basic level	18% of respondents
General level	49% of respondents
Specialised sectoral level (ie aquaculture)	33% of respondents.

The question was not very well phrased in its use of language teaching concepts. It is clear that respondents did not really understand the difference between General (for all purposes) and Specialised sectoral level (Language for specific purposes). However, a case can be made for noting that 51% of the sample opted for both basic and specific level, which is what the PESCALEX language modules aim to provide.

Conclusions
These will be written after the Annual Event in Crete and the discussions with the Work Package 6 group and the Validation Group.