



22 May 2020

DE VERENGELSING: INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER
EDUCATION AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF LANGUAGE
POLICY AT UTRECHT UNIVERSITY


Written by: Tanisha Wetsteen

Student number: 5636426

BA English Language and Culture

Supervisor: dr. Deborah Cole

Second Reader: dr. Koen Sebregts



Abstract

Internationalization has grown over the last two decades and especially higher education (HE) institutions have implemented this in their scripts. As a tool of internationalization, English has been playing a bigger and bigger role in these institutions and, in many cases, language policies have been revisited. Not everyone is content with these changes and media outlets are full with stories about the deterioration of the quality of higher education, however not many stories and studies have looked into the influence of internationalization and use of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) on students and their educational performance. This thesis focused on students' perception of internationalization and language policy in higher education institutions, especially Utrecht University. In this student-based research students have been asked to share their views and experiences in order to find out if EMI affects grades and educational performance. The results showed that students mostly agree with their university's language policy as long as use of English is well-grounded. It has also been shown that teachers' proficiency could cause distraction among students, but at the same time it has not been proven that this leads to lower grades or to poorer educational performance.

Acknowledgements

Before you lies my bachelor thesis "*De Verengelsing: Internationalization of higher education and students' perception of language policy at Utrecht University*", which has been written as a part of the graduation process for the BA English Language and Culture at Utrecht University in 2020. I could not have done this all by myself so therefore I would like to thank the following:

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor dr. Deborah Cole, who has been extremely helpful and supportive throughout this whole process and has 'lent me her brain' when needed.

I would also like to thank my family who have kept me motivated throughout the current time and provided me with a stable environment.

Lastly, I would like to thank all of the students who have participated in this research and were kind enough to share their thoughts and opinions on the subjects of internationalization and language policy of our university. This study would not have existed if it were not for their generous contribution.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
Table of Contents	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Internationalization and Higher Education	5
1.2 Depiction of internationalization in Dutch media	6
1.3 Present Study	7
2. Theoretical Background	9
2.1 The Bologna Process	9
2.2 Internationalization in higher education: language policies	10
2.3 English-medium teaching in European higher education	13
3. Methodology	17
3.1 Research Question	17
3.2 Research Design	17
3.3 Data Collection	18
3.4 Data Analysis	22
4. Results	23
4.1 Quantitative Analysis	23
4.2 Qualitative Analysis	26
5. Discussion & Conclusion	29
6. Limitations & Future Research	32
References	34
Appendices	38
Appendix A - Questionnaire	38
Appendix B - Coded Data	45
Appendix C - Frequency Tables	50
Appendix D - Descriptive Statistics	57

1. Introduction

1.1 Internationalization and Higher Education

During the last decades, globalization and internationalization have been growing across the globe, and especially in higher education (HE) (Tudor, 2004; Wächter, 2004; Altbach and Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2011). The terms seem similar, but when drawing out definitions of these phenomena, it becomes clear that they are linked to each other. Researchers have described them as “[i]nternationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization,” (de Wit, 2011, p. 243). When it comes to higher education, the term ‘globalization’ has been replaced by ‘internationalization’ during recent years, or as de Wit (2011) describes it: “the term [internationalization] tends to be used for any supra-regional phenomenon related to higher education (...) and/or anything on a global scale related to higher education characterised by market and competition” (p. 243).

The English language plays a large role in the process of globalization, on the one hand being a product, but also being its instrument (Malakhov, 2015). With the knowledge that globalization influences the world of internationalization, the English language is also used as a tool for internationalization in higher education, e.g. through language policy. In higher education, internationalization generally refers to universities seeking to “participate in a knowledge-based society and in aiming for a commercial, scientific or linguistic edge within a broader context of globalization” (Moore, 2017, p. 289). This motivation seems based on one way of getting on the market by using a powerful language, such as English for knowledge and language acquisition for enhancing the curriculum with international content (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Another definition of internationalization in higher education is stated as “strengthening the international dimensions of education in order to make students more

competent” (Breetvelt, 2018). The English language is thus used in higher education and language policies as a tool for gaining competence on the international market, as so it is described.

1.2 Depiction of internationalization in Dutch media

Internationalization of higher education is a hot topic amongst the Dutch media. A great deal of newspaper articles have been written on this subject, and over all, their comments are not very positive. Out of the non-English speaking countries in the EU, the Netherlands uses English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) the most at their universities (Huygen, 2017). The argument given most often by the media for internationalization of higher education institutions is always to attract more international students and with this cash in more money (Huygen, 2017). Scholars, however, give another argument; the University of Twente and Maastricht University say that internationalization has been going on for decades and that this is needed if the Netherlands wants to be a knowledge-based economy (Bouma, 2018a). The same two universities, together with for instance Eindhoven University of Technology, have changed their universities’ language policy to a mostly English oriented policy. One argument against the internationalization of HE is deterioration of the Dutch language. Beter Onderwijs Nederland (2018, 2018a) states that universities harm their students’ Dutch by giving courses in English rather than Dutch. There has not yet been research which looks into the impact of EMI on the Dutch proficiency of students, which makes this discussion quite difficult. However, scholars are not worried that EMI has a negative influence on the Dutch of students, because they still live in The Netherlands, have Dutch friends and are also exposed to Dutch through different media (Bouma, 2018). These scholars do not think that students’ Dutch will be harmed too much by EMI, but on the other side the Dutch proficiency of

students has not improved either (Bouma, 2018). To demonstrate against language deterioration caused by *verengelsing*, Beter Onderwijs Nederland (BON) (2018, 2018a) has set up a petition, which was, in just a few days, signed by over 6000 people. BON also arraigned both Maastricht University and University of Twente because of switching medium of instruction from Dutch to English, while the law says this can only be done on justifiable grounds. Ingrid van Engelshoven, Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science, has not responded to the accusations of Beter Onderwijs Nederland. She proposed, however, to broaden the rules and current law regarding the switch of language of instruction from Dutch to English (Samsom, 2017). Another argument against internationalization and therewith switching the medium of instruction from Dutch to English is the English proficiency of Dutch lecturers. Keuzegids Universiteiten 2018 stated that Dutch students are not happy with their Dutch lecturers' English proficiency. Anneke Panella, who is a teacher and author, said that Dutch peoples' English is far better than that of people from, for instance, Southern Europe, but it is still not sufficient. She states that being able to master the English language on a professional level is crucial to bring across details and nuance to the information a teacher is giving students. When a teacher is not able to do this in English, that is a pity for both students and teachers (Kleinjan, 2017).

1.3 Present Study

While a lot of information can be found on the thoughts behind a need for internationalization and how the media depict it, little has been studied in the area of the actual consequences of this phenomenon from a linguistic point of view. This paper will look into internationalization and language policy as an instrument in Dutch universities, especially focusing on Utrecht University. University students are exposed to the internationalization of

their university on a daily basis. Therefore, the present study aims to find out what students' perceptions are regarding the internationalization and language policy in a Dutch university context and how this might influence their educational performance. By listening to students about their language policy preferences, we can react to the negative sides, and perhaps be looking at alternatives.

The setup of this thesis is as follows: First, a theoretical background is given which explains the origin of internationalization in European HE and language policies. Secondly, a literature analysis is performed to find out what has already been studied in the field of EMI in European HE and on how this might influence educational performance amongst students. The current research is then introduced and explained in the methodology section. Following that are the results, discussion, conclusion as well as the limitations of the current study together with recommendations for future research.

One last thing to note is the translation choices which have been made in this paper. With regard to reading flow and professionalism, the author has consciously chosen to translate Dutch sources into English in the theoretical part of the paper, this being the introduction as well as the theoretical background. As for the presentation of the data and discussion section, the author has chosen to leave collected data in the original language, Dutch, when these are directly quoted. Discussion around the data will, of course, be written in English, but in order to not tinker with the data as it is, the original answers to the survey questions will remain in Dutch. The reason for this is to maintain the original meaning of the answer and not perhaps modify this through translation.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 The Bologna Process

On 19 June 1999, 29 European Ministers of Education signed the so-called 'Bologna Declaration'. This declaration has been developed by several European countries and serves as a guideline facilitating "greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education" (Wächter, 2004, p. 265) on the continent as well as the "promotion of mobility by removing obstacles" (Wächter, 2004, p. 266), which is mainly set to attain the harmonization of HE institutions across Europe and remove barriers to make studying at a university in another European country more accessible. The declaration includes several directives which contribute to the goals, among them "adoption of a system of easily readable comparable degrees" -being the Bachelors and Masters degrees we know nowadays-, "the establishment of a system of credits, such as ECTS", and "the promotion of mobility" (The European Higher Education Area, 1999). Wächter (2004) explains the thoughts behind the aiming for structural convergence in European HE. One of the arguments relates to "the position of Europe and European higher education on a global scale" (p. 268). This underpins the fact that a global education market was developing "with 'export' of education as a trait" (p. 268) and that Europe was not at the top of this market. In order to get there Europe needed to "acquire a world-wide degree of attraction" (p. 268), and the strong heterogeneity in European HE systems was seen as an obstacle, which counterchecked "global attractiveness and competitiveness" (p. 268). Also linked to this argument for the emergence of these aims is achieving global employability. Tudor (2004) stated that "in the light of the increasingly mobile, multilingual, and multicultural nature of the European workplace, language skills are coming to assume increasing importance in terms of employability" (p. 5), so not only was the

export of knowledge a trait, but language learning also plays a role in this. The fact that through the Bologna Process, Europe was trying to secure its status on the global market of higher education by converging its HE structures does not necessarily mean that it was also striving for one homogenic culture. According to Wächter (2004), it “must be remembered that it was not totally devoid of hints as to the desirability of protecting the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems or university autonomy” (p. 268).

The convergence of European HE institutions guided by the aims of the Bologna Process also brings along challenges, especially with regard to language and language learning. Tudor (2004) also explained that the challenge of academic mobility in Europe is also a linguistic challenge. Students who study in another country need to be able to communicate with their peers and teachers. The communication between people whose native language is not English will be more difficult, because when “interaction ... takes place in a language which is not the first language of many participants, this potentially alters the communicative dynamics in a number of ways” (p. 5). On the other hand, the Bologna Process could also create a context “which is rich in opportunities for the anchoring of language learning in the daily life and practice of Higher Education in Europe” (p. 1). Being compelled to speak English could possibly contribute to the language learning and improving of proficiency. However, it should be noted that there has not yet been any research that could be found at this time which confirms this speculation.

2.2 Internationalization in higher education: language policies

In a context where different languages exist next to each other and where change is constantly in order, for instance in HE, language policy is needed to create a clear plan of usage of these languages for everybody involved in the educational environment. Jenkins

(2014) explains this process of the development of language policy as follows:

The process involved four stages: the selection of the language or variety that is to serve the high-status function, that is, the 'norm' (also known as 'status planning'), its codification in reference works such as grammars and dictionaries (or 'corpus planning'), its elaboration to render it capable of serving the full range of uses in the society in question (e.g. in science, literature, government, law, and the like), and its acceptance by the target population. (p. 72).

Noticeable here is the decision on the language or variety with the highest status. In a HE institution of a country where English is not the native language, this decision will have to be made, but under what conditions? Traditionally, language policy has been viewed as "relating to top-down language planning, and more specifically to the development and maintenance of standard language" (Jenkins, 2014). At HE institutions in non-English speaking countries both the native language and English exist next to each other, and it is not always agreed on or accepted, which language should have the highest status, or as Jenkins' (2014) book states: "Just as speed limits do not guarantee that all cars abide by them, so a language law does not guarantee observance" (Spolsky, 2004, cited in Jenkins, 2014). This applies to both the acceptance of language policies, but also to how language planning is executed. The Bologna Declaration contained hints explaining the desirability for maintaining the diversity in cultures and languages, but Philipson (2008) does not agree with the practice. He explores a paradox in this system which he interprets as "EU rhetoric proclaims support for multilingualism and cultural and linguistic diversity in official texts, and the equality of all official and working languages in the EU, but in practice there is *laissez faire*¹ in the linguistic marketplace" (p. 6).

¹ *Laissez faire*: the idea that people should be free to choose how to do things, without too much control from someone in authority (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020).

It is clear that language planning and therewith language policies bring along challenges. In HE institutions of non-English speaking countries, choosing one language with the highest status may be seen as logical or even necessary. English is a widely used academic language in sciences, and is thus more easily accessible than most other languages in the academic context. For instance, up-to-date text books and research articles are obtainable most readily of all in English (Coleman, 2006). However, it is not desirable for most HE institutions in non-English speaking countries to banish their own native language in all communication. This would set up a challenge as Kuteeva and Airey (2014) explain: “The analysis of attitudes expressed by academic staff towards the use of English in education and research problematizes university-wide language policies” (p. 545). The question is how the division between uses of different languages is to be accomplished. Every HE institution is autonomous in these decisions and every HE institution will fill in the division differently. One aspect to keep in mind in executing a language policy might be to look for the best fit within different disciplines, according to Kuteeva and Airey (2014). They believe that “disciplinary variation in English language use is not arbitrary, but rather can be seen as a product of the different knowledge structures of the disciplines” (p. 534). Using another language than your own as a medium of instruction might form a special challenge within, for instance, humanities and the social sciences (p.544). These studies are built on the creation of meaning, and it is difficult to express these in another language. Whereas in the natural sciences expressing information through another language is easier as the forms for reporting research are more standardized with less leeway given to the expression of individual, creative thought and translation does not interfere so much with the language specific cultural meanings the speaker or writer wants to convey.

2.3 English-medium teaching in European higher education

As described in the previous paragraphs internationalization has developed in Europe and its HE institutions and has brought along some challenges. This chapter will give a discourse analysis on what has already been studied regarding the consequences of internationalization and its influence on higher education, touching upon subjects such as teachers' proficiency and students' attitudes towards teachers' proficiency and influence on educational performance. Over the last few decades, there has been a noticeable increase in the teaching of university courses through the medium of English (Kuteeva & Airey, 2014). Especially in Northern European countries, such as the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden, the number of courses taught in English is high (Kuteeva & Airey, 2014; Jenkins, 2014; Coleman, 2006). This could have occurred for a number of reasons, however, as Coleman (2006) describes it: "the initial impetus typically emerges as participation in higher education exchange programmes" (p. 5).

Coleman (2006) also describes predictable challenges that the implementation of English-medium teaching brings along. A first is "inadequate language skills and the need for training of indigenous staff and students" (p.6). Even though English is a high prestige academic language which is used ubiquitously, proficiency in the language is important in order to work with it. Breetveld (2018) describes the situation in the Dutch context:

For both teachers and students for whom English is L2, their level of proficiency is important in order to express and receive knowledge. When their proficiency is low, this can reduce the quality of the learning process ... As a result, classes given in English are often less dynamic and lack depth, liveliness, and subtlety compared with their Dutch-medium equivalents (p. 10)

De Groot (2018) shares this view and adds a new dimension, distinguishing between both speaking and writing and reading and listening: “Both the expressive ability and the comprehension of students and lecturers for whom English is L2 and Dutch is L1 are compromised, more so on productive side than on the receptive side” (p. 48). Speaking and writing in English when this is not one’s native language is thus more difficult and requires more energy than reading and listening to English.

Coleman (2006) agrees with the notion that a low level of proficiency contributes to a lowering of the learning process, but also further examines the required mental processing loads when it comes to learning through an L2. He argues that teachers who have an adequate command of English are not likely to have specialist knowledge of the particular demands of university-level education through L2 and this negatively influences the already high cognitive processing loads of students. Learning through an L2 is already more challenging than it would be through an L1, because more processing of the information is needed (i.g. translation first) and the learning process will not be stimulated if the teachers’ proficiency is not sufficient. It is clear that learning through an L2 is more difficult and requires more energy of students, but the actual influence of EMI on educational performance has not yet been studied. Coleman (2006) makes a proposal which could bring both a solution and problems with it. A way of improving lecturers’ proficiency could be to hire native speakers of English, however, there is a lack of these on the international market (p.7). Substituting teachers whose L1 is not English for teachers whose L1 is English, in an educational environment where the role of English is getting bigger and bigger, does not sound fair either, as this could possibly cause unemployment among the first group.

How students perceive their teachers’ proficiency is another question, because how they rate their teachers’ proficiency might differ from the actual proficiency of the teacher.

This speculation has been confirmed by Lippi-Green (2011), Hendriks, van Meurs & Hogervorst (2016) and Rubin & Smith (1990) who studied the attitudes of students towards their lecturers' proficiency through accentedness and ethnic background. Hendriks, van Meurs & Hogervorst (2016) found that teachers with a higher level of accentedness are regarded less positively and as less intelligible by their students, than native English-speaking teachers. The study concluded: "degrees of accentedness in English influence NNE listeners' attitudinal evaluations" (p. 10). Prior research in the 1990s also showed that even perceived accentedness influences the attitudes and performance of students. Rubin & Smith (1990) looked at the ethnic background of teachers. Rubin & Smith (1990) showed students photographs of two different lecturers, one Caucasian and one with an Asian ethnic background. Both photographs were paired with the same voiceover and thus contained the same level of accent, however students perceived the lecturer with an Asian ethnic background as having a higher level of accentedness.

The literature analysis above has shown that internationalization in HE and the implementation of language policies raises both challenges and discussion. A principle of the Bologna Declaration of 1999 was improving student mobility across countries and with a growing number of international students at universities clear language policies were needed. The point of departure for most language policies was to find the language with the highest status in a particular context, but not everybody agrees with that notion. Kuteeva and Airey (2013) argued that there should also be looked at differences in language use between disciplines and finding the most suitable language within those disciplines. An issue raised among all disciplines, however, is teachers' proficiency or lack thereof. Multiple media outlets have argued that non-sufficient proficiency decreases the quality of education and quality of learning and students share this idea. These ideas should be looked at, however, as

prior research has also shown that perceived accentness and proficiency influences students' attitudes towards these subjects and therefore the perception of decreased quality of education or its possible negative influence on educational performance might get exaggerated. The following chapter of this thesis will touch upon these subjects while looking into how students perceive implemented language policy and teachers' proficiency at their university, and its possible influence on educational performance.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Question

How do students of Utrecht University, enrolled in courses with English as a medium of instruction (EMI), perceive internationalization and its influence on language policies in a Dutch university context?

Sub-questions that will contribute to answering the research question:

SQ 1: How do Dutch students feel about the current language policy at their university?

SQ 2: In what way, if any, would Dutch students like to see the language policy at their university changed?

SQ 3: How do Dutch students perceive their teachers' proficiency?

SQ 4: To what extent do Dutch students feel like internationalization influences their educational performance?

3.2 Research Design

As there is currently little known on the students' perspective on internationalization of their university, this research is student-based. This cross-sectional research is exploratory in nature, as it adds to the relatively small corpus of already existing data regarding teachers' proficiency and attitudes towards this as well as the effect of EMI in non-English speaking countries, while adding the question of how these phenomena might influence educational performance. Given the time frame of roughly ten weeks in which this research has been carried out, a single case study has been used for data collection. In this case study, Utrecht University has been chosen as a *representative or typical case* (Bryman, 2012) of HE institutions in The Netherlands. Choosing this type of case study design will add to the

reliability of the research, as it is fairly easy to replicate such research during another time period.

In order to compose an answer to the research question and its sub questions, this research has been conducted through both a literature analysis of what has already been studied in the past about perceptions of internationalization in higher education institutions (as presented above) and a questionnaire that has been disseminated among students to elicit their perception of and attitudes towards internationalization at their own university (to be presented below). The reason for choosing to compare my study to already existing data is seeing how my data contributes to that and strengthen the internal validity by seeing any similar patterns in the already existing data.

3.3 Data Collection

3.3.1 Existing Data: Literature Analysis

On the topics that are related to internationalization in a higher education context (e.g. language policy, lecturers' proficiency), different sources have been gathered in order to find out what has already been studied in this area of research and what views have been created. This analysis was summarized above within the theoretical framework of this thesis. All sources consisted of publications found via a search engine for academic articles and books, such as Google Scholar. At first sources were gathered by searching terms related to the topic, e.g. 'internationalization', 'higher education', 'language policy', and from there choosing publications. Secondly, through searching for citations of other sources within publications, links between them could be made. The collected sources consist of both published academic articles and books. Criteria for selecting these sources were based on the date of publishing. The oldest source dates back to 1990, but the focus is on more recently

published sources in order to link these studies to the current situation regarding internationalization and language policies in HE institutions.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire that has been distributed (Appendix A) consisted of two parts and only looked at internationalization within Utrecht University. This is a conscious choice made by the author, because it is more convenient to approach respondents and gather data within one's own university. The first part of the survey focused on demographics and the second part consisted of questions relating to language policy and to the proficiency of teachers and students. Respondents were asked about their age, gender and number of years enrolled at university. Respondents were also asked about the kind of study programme they are following (e.g. fully English or fully Dutch study programmes). This question was included to exclude respondents who are following a fully Dutch study programme, since these students do not have experience with courses where the medium of instruction is English. Finally, respondents were asked how they would rate their own English proficiency in both reading and writing, in order to find any relation between their attitudes towards their lecturers' proficiency and their own.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 30 items, of which 25 were questions and the other five items were introductions to the different sets of questions. The first set of questions related to the current language policy at Utrecht University. Six statements were given about different aspects of the language policy and respondents had to choose to what extent they agreed with the statements on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'completely disagree' to 'completely agree'. Two open questions were added to ask respondents if they would like to change anything about the current language policy and to elaborate on their previously given answers. The second set of questions related to lecturers'

proficiency and respondents' attitudes towards these. Again, six statements were given for which respondents could fill in to what extent they agreed on a 5-point Likert scale and the set of questions ended with the opportunity to elaborate on previously given answers. The third set of questions related to teachers' proficiency and the influence of this on educational performance, as perceived by the respondents. Here, also six statements were given for which respondents could fill in to what extent they agreed on a 5-point Likert scale and ending the set of questions with the opportunity to elaborate on previous given answers. The fourth subset related to students' preferences on language policies. Four models of language policies implemented at different universities were mapped out and respondents were asked to choose the model which had their preference. The fifth and last subset consisted of two non-obligatory open-ended questions. The first asked respondents if they would have filled in the questionnaire differently if it were written in English rather than Dutch to see if language has an effect on their interpretation of the questions. The second non-obligatory open-ended question was voluntary and asked if students had any ideas or suggestions about the language policy at Utrecht University.

Table 1: Overview survey questions

1. Demographics
2. Questions related to current language policy at UU
3. Questions related to teachers' proficiency
4. Questions related to educational performance
5. Given preference on type of language policy
6. Non-obligatory open-ended questions

The questionnaire was made by using Qualtrics, which is an online platform for creating, distributing and analysing surveys. Reasons for choosing this particular platform were that Qualtrics operates questionnaires within Utrecht University layout and the platform also distributes questionnaires via an anonymous link which contributes to the privacy of

respondents as data such as IP addresses cannot be traced. Even though Qualtrics offers options to analyse data, these were lacking for the purpose of this study, so to analyse data IBM SPSS (v.25) was used instead.

The respondents in this survey had to meet three criteria in order to be included in the research. They had to be a student currently studying at Utrecht University, enrolled in a study programme of which the language of instruction was not only Dutch, and they could not be enrolled in the BA English Language and Culture. As this study focused on internationalization and language policy, only respondents were included who have followed courses where the medium of instruction was English. The criterion about not being enrolled in the English Language and Culture BA programme was composed, because it can be assumed that teachers' proficiency in this study programme is sufficient. Since this survey was targeted at Dutch students, it has been written in Dutch.

The questionnaire was made available to be filled in for a total of sixteen days. When it closed, 43 responses were collected. Of these respondents, 9 respondents were excluded because they were enrolled in a fully Dutch study programme, and 2 other respondents were excluded due to not having fully completed the questionnaire. This led to a final pool of 32 respondents of which 16% (N=5) were enrolled in a fully English study programme, 12% (N=4) were enrolled in a multilingual study programme, and 72% (N=23) were enrolled in a Dutch study programme, but having followed courses with English as a medium of instruction.

3.3.3 Procedure

Prior to publishing and distributing the questionnaire, a pilot version was reviewed by the supervisor of this project. Questions were reformulated, added and one question was deleted due to redundancy. In order to conduct the survey and approach participants, the

questionnaire had been shared through different social media platforms, such as Facebook and Instagram including a message urging readers to share the questionnaire among their own network. At first, the questionnaire had only been shared on the Facebook page of the author which collected 19 responses. After putting out a reminder on the same page 9 more responses were collected. To increase the number of respondents the questionnaire was then also shared via Instagram and in various WhatsApp group chats, which brought the total number of responses to 43.

3.4 Data Analysis

In order to analyse data gathered by conducting the survey, first, responses which were not completed or not relevant for the current research were filtered out. The software used to analyse data was IBM SPSS (v.25). With this programme frequency tables and descriptive statistics tables have been made to gather an overview of the responses. The earliest plan was to also run a t-test in order to compare attitudes between different groups, such as students who follow a fully English study programme and students who only follow separate courses with EMI. However, the number of respondents in these groups were unbalanced, and thus the t-test could not be used as a reliable method here. In order to find patterns in the data, only the frequency tables and descriptive statistics were studied. Another part of the data analysis consisted of qualitative analysis of the data, this being the answers to the open questions in the survey. To these answers, coding has been performed to highlight the most common themes addressed in the answers (Appendix B) and link these to the outcomes of the closed questions.

After analysing the data from the survey, these results were compared to the views and results of previous studies.

4. Results

In the following section, the results from the gathered data will be discussed. First the quantitative data will be examined, and then the qualitative data. All results can be found in the Appendices section at the end of this thesis. Here, the results that are most relevant to answering the research questions will be highlighted.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis

Subsection 2 of the questionnaire (Table 2), which consisted of questions related to the current language policy at Utrecht University showed that the majority of the students did agree with the current implemented language policy. All respondents answered *eens* or *helemaal eens* when asked if they agreed with the fact that some courses have English as a Medium of Instruction. A pattern was found which showed that whenever there is a choice of language, meaning both Dutch and English are offered, students answered only with *eens* or *helemaal eens*. This was the case for question 2.1 (as shown above, $M=4.47/SD=0.507$), question 2.4: "I think it is logical that the UU-website is available in both Dutch and English" ($M=4.94/SD=0.246$), and question 2.5: "I think it is logical that official emails from the UU are written in both Dutch and English" ($M=4.84/SD=0.369$). The conditions in which only English was being offered, students did not always agree with. This was the case for question 2.2: "I think it is logical that fully English study programmes are offered" ($M=4.06/SD=0.982$), and question 2.6: "I think it is logical that messages on UU's social media platforms (Faceook/Instagram) are written in English" ($M=3.81/SD=1.091$). It should be noted, however, that this was a minority as only 2/32 respondents answered question 2.2 with *oneens* and 4 respondents answered question 2.6 with *oneens* or *helemaal oneens* (see Appendix C).

Table 2: Descriptive statistics to subsection 2 which concerned current language policy at UU.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q2.1	32	4	5	4.47	.507
Q2.2	32	2	5	4.06	.982
Q2.3	32	1	5	3.69	.896
Q2.4	32	4	5	4.94	.246
Q2.5	32	4	5	4.84	.369
Q2.6	32	1	5	3.81	1.091

Subsection 3 of the questionnaire (Table 3), which consisted of questions related to (students' attitudes towards) teachers' proficiency showed that the teachers' proficiency was rated not bad and not excellent. When the respondents were asked if they thought their teachers' proficiency in writing was sufficient, 1/32 respondents answered with *oneens*, 2/32 respondents answered with *neutraal* and 29/32 respondents answered with *eens* or *helemaal eens*. When asked if they thought their teachers' proficiency in speaking was sufficient, 3/32 respondents answered with *oneens*, 11/32 respondents answered with *neutraal* and 18/32 respondents answered with *eens* or *helemaal eens*. Students rated their teachers' proficiency in speaking (Q3.1: M=3.53/SD=0.761) thus a little lower than their teachers' proficiency in writing (Q3.2: M=3.97/SD=0.538). To the question if they had expected their teachers' proficiency to be higher than it was (Q3.3), 15/32 respondents answered with *eens* and to the question of whether they had expected their teachers' proficiency to be lower than it was (Q3.4), 23/32 respondents answered with *oneens* or *helemaal oneens* (Appendix C). Students were fairly neutral when answering question 3.5 about the level of accentedness of their teachers (M=3.25/SD=7.62), while 16/32 respondents did answer that they think a teacher is more difficult to understand when speaking with a strong accent (Q3.6, appendix C).

Table 3: Descriptive statistics to subsection 3 which concerned students' attitudes towards teachers' proficiency.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3.1	32	2	5	3.53	.761
Q3.2	32	2	5	3.97	.538
Q3.3	32	1	4	3.19	.896
Q3.4	32	1	4	2.31	.644
Q3.5	32	2	4	3.25	.762
Q3.6	32	1	4	3.19	.965

Subsection 4 of the questionnaire (Table 4), which consisted of questions related to the influence of teachers' proficiency on educational performance of students showed interesting results. 12/32 students indicated that they get distracted when a teacher speaks with a level of accentedness (Q4.1) and 20/32 students said that they get distracted when a teacher makes grammatical errors when speaking (Q4.2). However, 22/32 (for accentedness) and 21/32 (for grammatical errors) students expressed that these perceived distractions did not negatively influence their grades and therewith educational performance (Q4.3: $M=2.09/SD=0.963$, Q4.4: $M=2.09/SD=0.928$). Tying into that, only 3/32 respondents indicated that their teachers' proficiency hinders their educational performance (Appendix C).

Table 4: Descriptive statistics to subsection 4 which concerned educational performance.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4.1	32	1	4	2.94	1.014
Q4.2	32	1	5	3.59	1.073
Q4.3	32	1	4	2.09	.963
Q4.4	32	1	4	2.09	.928
Q4.5	32	1	5	3.09	.995
Q4.6	32	1	4	2.34	.827

Question 5.1 (Table 5) asked the respondents to point out their preference on language policy. 22/32 respondents indicated that they prefer a bilingual language policy, offering information in both Dutch and English. 8/32 respondents preferred a mostly monolingual

language policy, where the main language is Dutch. Only 2/32 respondents preferred a mostly or even completely monolingual language policy with English as the main language.

Table 5: Frequency table to question 5.1, asking respondents to show their preference regarding type of language policy.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Compleet Tweetalig	22	68.8	68.8	68.8
	Grotendeels Eentalig NED	8	25.0	25.0	93.8
	Grotendeels Eentalig ENG	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	Compleet Eentalig	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Respondents were also asked to rate their own English proficiency in both speaking and writing (Q1.6 & Q1.7) and on the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) scale (Q1.8). The frequency tables for these questions can be found in Appendix C. Ultimately, students rate their proficiency in speaking and writing quite high. For proficiency in writing, 7/32 respondent rated their own proficiency as *voldoende*, 13/32 respondents answered *goed*, and 11/32 respondents even rated their proficiency as *uitstekend*. For proficiency in speaking, 7/32 respondents answered *voldoende*, 16/32 respondents answered *goed*, and 8 respondents answered *uitstekend*. On the CEFR scale 15/32 students rated their proficiency as C1, which is the level required for university admission.

4.2 Qualitative Analysis

For the qualitative part of the analysis, answers to the open questions of the survey have been coded and the elaboration can be found in Appendix B. The main themes that occurred in these answers will be discussed here.

The first theme that occurred several times was about international students. 5 respondents mentioned that English is needed in order to give out information to international students and 1 respondent even stated: *“Het is belangrijk om veel in het Engels aan te bieden voor het aantrekken van internationals. De UU moet hoog aangeschreven blijven en dat helpt er dan aan mee”*. These students see English as a tool for attracting internationals and keeping the university’s reputation high. On the other hand, students also mentioned that English should not be used in order to attract international students and with that cash in more money. 2 students mentioned this and one of them stated: *“De motieven moeten wel zuiver zijn”*.

A second theme that occurred in the answers was differences in language preferences among different disciplines. 8 respondents mentioned that the language of instruction should be based on the kind of discipline it will be used in, as different languages will suit different disciplines better. For example: *“Welke taal wordt gesproken lijkt me afhankelijk van het vak. Nederlands recht doe je niet in het Engels, net zoals klinische psychologie aangezien je gaat werken met Nederlandse cliënten”*. Another argument is choosing a language which fits the context of a study best, which 2 respondents gave. They argued that studies who focus on a Dutch context should also be given in Dutch and that for studies which focus on a larger context, outside of the Netherlands, it is more suitable to use EMI.

Another theme that occurred was teacher’s proficiency. 4 respondents mentioned that teachers whose native language is not English are often more difficult to understand of which 2 respondents also said that this negatively influences the quality of education. One respondent said: *“Het is nu nogal geforceerd en soms lastig te begrijpen”*, and another respondent mentions that they think it is important that a teacher is able to express themselves equally in both Dutch and English. One respondent even said that teachers who

do not master the English language to a certain level, should not be allowed to give classes in English. On the other hand, 3 respondents stated that they had not experienced any obstacles or discontent with regard to educational performance because of their teachers' proficiency. To conclude this theme, 5 respondents suggested offering language courses for teachers to improve their proficiency.

5. Discussion & Conclusion

Discussion

The results have shown that students, over all, agree with the current language policy implemented at Utrecht University and that there are no major red flags for them. Noted should be the question as to what extent students are able to comment on the implemented language policy. In the questionnaire, different aspects of the current language policy at UU were used with regard to distribution of information, for instance language use in official e-mails and on social media. Students did not seem to have any problems with interpreting these aspects, which shows that they are to an extent aware of the current language policy. The fact that students tend to agree more easily with a condition where both Dutch and English are offered shows that they would like to keep some autonomy, with respect to what language is used. The offering of both Dutch and English would also be necessary if we look at the arguments made on language use between different disciplines. Some study programmes in different disciplines will probably only reach their full potential if information is distributed through a suitable language, like either English or Dutch. This result matches Kuteeva & Airey (2013) in their arguments on language use among different disciplines. The preference of being able to choose between languages also was made clear when students had to speak out their preference on types of language policy. The fact that 22/33 respondents preferred a completely bilingual form of language policy shows that they are aware that the use of English is necessary but they also think that it is not suitable to only use English in all contexts.

Students rated their teachers' proficiency as average. The majority specified that they did not expect their proficiency to be lower, but they did expect their proficiency to be higher. The result that students consider their teachers' proficiency in writing to be higher than their proficiency in speaking sheds a new dimension to the statements made by de Groot (2018).

De Groot (2018) stated that switching from an L1 to an L2 requires more energy on the productive side, like speaking and writing and might be perceived as being more difficult. The results in this study have shown that in this, speaking might be even more difficult than writing. This could, however, also have to do with the time frame one can think about producing the words, as this is longer when writing. The students in this study also expressed that the level of accentedness influences the degree to which they can understand a teacher. Most students also indicated their teachers to have a strong accent. This result matches the study of Hendriks, van Meurs & Hogervorst (2016) in their explanation of that students perceive non-native English-speaking teachers with a certain level of accentedness as less intelligible and even regard them less positively.

When it comes to the influence of teachers' proficiency on educational performance, a strange link has appeared. Students claim that they get distracted when a teacher speaks with a strong accent or makes grammatical errors and perceive the quality of education as low when this happens. On the other hand, however, students indicate that their teachers' proficiency does not negatively (or positively) influence their grades and with that their educational performance. This could possibly be explained by the claim made by Breetveld (2018) in which they explain that when non-native English speakers do use English as a medium of instruction, classes can be perceived as less dynamic and lacking depth, which contributes to the feeling among students that this decreases the quality of education. In this case, it is difficult to tell if the quality of education indeed decreases by using EMI as the results also showed that educational performance was not greatly affected. Media outlets speaking negatively about the implementation of English might be a result from the attitudes of students when it comes to their teachers' proficiency.

Conclusion

In conclusion, students are, over all, content with the fact that courses and distribution of information are offered in both English and Dutch, and they are aware of the necessity of English in higher education. However, they also feel that the motives for these decisions should be made clear and be well-founded and a motive should not be to attract more international students in order to receive more money. There is also a consensus among students that the suitable language of instruction differs per discipline. The fact that students agree with the implemented language policy does not take away that their attitudes towards their teachers' proficiency is not completely positive. They claim that teachers speak with a strong accent and are therefore more difficult to understand. This study also indicates that teachers make grammatical errors when speaking English. These factors cause distraction among students; however, it has not been proven that these distractions lead to lower grades or poorer educational performance. The fact that multiple media outlets speak rather negatively about the implementation of English in HE institutions, might be a result from students' attitudes towards their teachers' proficiency and them sharing these experiences.

This thesis has contributed to previously gathered data when it comes to the importance of difference between disciplines when it comes to language use. In some disciplines English might suit the context and future work field better than Dutch, so here implementation of English in HE might be seen as necessary. As an addition to the already existing data, this thesis has shown that there is at this point no proof that confirms the speculation that teachers' proficiency negatively influences students' grades and therewith their educational performance.

6. Limitations & Future Research

In this section the limitations of the current research will be laid out and explained and recommendations for future research will be made.

A first limitation is the sample size which has been used in this research. The final pool of respondents consisted of 32 people. In principle, this number of respondents is high enough in order to run statistical tests with, but a larger sample size is always something to aspire to in order to increase the validity of the research and its results. A recommendation here could also be to perform a multiple case study in the future. The current study only focused on Utrecht University as a representative sample for higher education institutions in the Netherlands, but by conducting a multiple case study among multiple HE institutions, the sample will be more varied and thus even more representative.

Another limitation is the sampling bias which perhaps has been developed. The author has distributed the questionnaire mostly among their own network as this was the easiest way to reach possible participants. In the future perhaps a more random sampling method could be used.

A last limitation is the unbalance which has been found among different groups, these groups being divided by the type of study programme respondents followed. As mentioned in the method section of this paper, a t-test could not be run as the number of respondents in each group were not equally divided. A recommendation for this would be to actively seek participants in different study programmes in order to get a balanced number in all groups.

Another recommendation for future research would be to look further into the differences between disciplines and the languages that are suitable for each of these. As presented in this paper, earlier research has touched upon this subject and the results in the

current study also showed a link between language use and disciplines. Focusing on this subject could possibly be valuable for future language planning in higher education.

A last recommendation would be to incorporate interviews with respondents in the research as well. This way a more in depth and nuanced understanding of student experiences can be acquired.

References

- Altbach, P.G., Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303542
- Beter Onderwijs Nederland. (2018). *Petitie voor taalrijk hoger onderwijs, tegen taalvershraling door verengelsing*. Retrieved from <https://www.beteronderwijsnederland.nl/nieuws/2018/05/rechtszaak/>
- Beter Onderwijs Nederland. (2018a). *Vonnis: rechter legt bal bij minister en Onderwijsinspectie*. Retrieved from <https://www.beteronderwijsnederland.nl/nieuws/2018/07/vonnis-rechter/>
- Bouma, K. (2018, June 11). 'Struggles' met de Nederlandse taal: het effect van een studie in het Engels. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/-strugglesmet-de-nederlandse-taal-het-effect-van-een-studie-in-het-engels~bb7aab09/>
- Bouma, K. (2018a, July 14). Universiteiten voor rechter gedaagd vanwege Engels. *De Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/universiteiten-voor-rechtergedaagd-vanwege-engels~befca20b/>
- Breetvelt, I. (2018). English-medium instruction in Dutch higher education: a policy reconstruction and impact study. Contribution to a special issue in honor of Gert Rijlaarsdam Making Connections: Studies of Language and Literature Education. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 18, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2018.18.03.10>
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th edition). Oxford: University Press.

Coleman, J.A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language*

Teaching, 39(1), 1-14. [https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1017](https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1017/S026144480600320X)

[/S026144480600320X](https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1017/S026144480600320X)

Groot, A. d. (2018). Welcome to the campus; forum over tweetaligheid en de verengelsing

van het universitaire onderwijs [Welcome to the campus. Forum on bilingualism and

the Anglicization of university education]. *De Psycholoog*, 53(2), 46-53. Retrieved from

[http://annettedegroot.com/content/2-publications/de-groot-2018-welcome-to-the-](http://annettedegroot.com/content/2-publications/de-groot-2018-welcome-to-the-campus-de-psycholoog.pdf)

[campus-de-psycholoog.pdf](http://annettedegroot.com/content/2-publications/de-groot-2018-welcome-to-the-campus-de-psycholoog.pdf)

Hendriks, B., Meurs, F., v., Hogervorst, N. (2016). Effects of degree of accentedness in

lecturers' Dutch-English pronunciation on Dutch students' attitudes and perceptions

of comprehensibility. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 1-17. doi:

10.1075/dujal.5.1.01hen

Huygen, F. (2017, June 28). Opinie: Engels als voertaal vernielt het hoger onderwijs. *De*

Volkskrant. Retrieved from [https://www.volkskrant.nl/columns-opinie/opinie-engels-](https://www.volkskrant.nl/columns-opinie/opinie-engels-als-voertaal-vernielthet-hoger-onderwijs~b7fd8359/)

[als-voertaal-vernielthet-hoger-onderwijs~b7fd8359/](https://www.volkskrant.nl/columns-opinie/opinie-engels-als-voertaal-vernielthet-hoger-onderwijs~b7fd8359/)

IBM Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh, Version 25.0.

Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of*

Academic English Language Policy. New York: Routledge.

Klein-Jan, G. (2017, Nov 16). Steenkolenengels bij docenten: 'Experts die details en nuances

missen. Zo jammer.' *Trouw*. Retrieved from

[https://www.trouw.nl/home/steenkolenengels-bijdocenten-experts-die-details-en-](https://www.trouw.nl/home/steenkolenengels-bijdocenten-experts-die-details-en-nuances-missen-zo-jammer-~ade0943b/)

[nuances-missen-zo-jammer-~ade0943b/](https://www.trouw.nl/home/steenkolenengels-bijdocenten-experts-die-details-en-nuances-missen-zo-jammer-~ade0943b/)

- Kuteeva, M., Airey, J. (2013). Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education*, 67, 533-549. doi: 10.1007/s10734-013-9660-6
- Lippi-Green, R. (2011). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Malakhov, A. (2015). *Policy and Language: English in the curricula and practices of higher educational institutions of the newly admitted European Union member states*. Teachers College Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.539.948&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Moore, E. (2017). Doing Understanding in Transient, Multilingual Communities in Higher Education. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 27(3), 289- 307. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1111/jola.12171>
- Philipson, R. (2008). Language Policy and Education in the European Union. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (ed. Nancy Hornberger), 1, 1-8. Retrieved from http://www.xn--sprkfrsvaret-vcv4v.se/sf/fileadmin/PDF/Langpol_education.pdf
- Sansom, M. (2018, July 7). Universiteiten zijn gewaarschuwd: verengelsing leidt tot populisme. *Trouw*. Retrieved from <https://www.trouw.nl/opinie/universiteiten-zijn-gewaarschuwdverengelsing-leidt-tot-populisme~a84db100/>
- The European Higher Education Area. (1999). *The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999: Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. Bologna: Ministerial Conference. Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/Ministerial_conferences/02/8/1999_Bologna_Declaration_English_553028.pdf

Tudor, I. (2004) The challenge of the Bologna Process for higher education language teaching in Europe [draft paper].

Wächter, B. (2004). The Bologna Process: developments and prospects. *European Journal of Education*, 39(3), 265-273. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1503854>

Wit, J.W.M. d. (2011). Globalization and Internationalisation of Higher Education. *Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, 8(2), 241-248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v8i2.1247>

Appendix A – Questionnaire

Beste respondent,

Alvast hartelijk bedankt voor het deelnemen aan deze enquête!

Het doel van dit onderzoek is om de attitudes en ervaringen van studenten tegenover en met de internationalisering en daarbij taalbeleid van de Universiteit Utrecht te peilen.

Deze enquête is alleen voor studenten die momenteel aan de Universiteit Utrecht studeren, met uitzondering van studenten van de BA English Language and Culture.

De enquête bestaat uit verschillende delen, met vragen over taalbeleid, taalbekwaamheid van docenten en de eventuele invloed hiervan op studieresultaten. Hierbij zijn er geen goede en geen slechte antwoorden, wel is het belangrijk dat je eerlijk antwoord geeft. Tevens zal er gevraagd worden om een aantal demografische gegevens in te vullen. Het invullen zal een kleine 10 minuten duren.

De enquête is volledig anoniem. De gegevens zullen met zorg worden behandeld en na afloop van het onderzoek worden deze volledig verwijderd. Deelname is geheel vrijwillig en je kunt op ieder moment stoppen of vragen overslaan. Bij het volledig invullen van de enquête ga je akkoord met deelname aan dit onderzoek.

Mocht je je na afloop alsnog willen onttrekken van het onderzoek, dan kun je altijd contact opnemen met mij via:

t.f.d.wetsteen2@students.uu.nl

Dit onderzoek is gericht op de visie van studenten op het taalbeleid van de universiteit, jouw input is dus van belang.

1- In het eerste gedeelte van deze enquête vraag ik je om een aantal demografische gegevens in te vullen.

1.1 Leeftijd

1.2 Geslacht/gender

- Man
- Vrouw
- Anders
- Zeg ik liever niet

1.3 Ik zit in jaar ... van mijn opleiding.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- Hoger dan 4
- Ik volg momenteel een Master aan de Universiteit Utrecht

1.4 Ik volg:

- Een compleet Engelstalig studieprogramma (evt. enkele vakken gevolgd met Nederlands als voertaal)
- Een meertalig studieprogramma
- Een compleet Nederlandstalig studieprogramma
- Een Nederlandstalig studieprogramma, maar ik heb een vak of meerdere vakken gevolgd waarvan de voertaal Engels is

1.5 Wanneer je bij de vorige vraag voor het laatste antwoord gekozen hebt. Hoe veel vakken heb je gevolgd waarbij de voertaal Engels is?

1.6 Hoe zou je jouw eigen Engelse taalbekwaamheid in schrijven beoordelen?

- Zeer onvoldoende
- Onvoldoende
- Voldoende
- Goed
- Uitstekend

1.7 Hoe zou je jouw eigen Engelse taalbekwaamheid in spreken beoordelen?

- Zeer onvoldoende
- Onvoldoende
- Voldoende
- Goed
- Uitstekend

1.8 Heb je een idee op welk CEFR (*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*) level jouw Engels is?

- A1 (beginner)
- A2 (basis Engels)
- B1 (gemiddeld)
- B2 (bovengemiddeld)
- C1 (gevorderd)
- C2 (vloeiend)
- Dat weet ik niet

2- Het volgende deel zal bestaan uit statements die te maken hebben met het taalbeleid van de Universiteit Utrecht.

Geef aan in hoeverre je het eens bent met deze statements

1= Helemaal oneens

2= Oneens

3= Neutraal

4= Eens

5= Helemaal eens

2.1 Ik vind het logisch dat de universiteit vakken aanbiedt waarbij de voertaal Engels is.

2.2 Ik vind het logisch dat de universiteit volledig Engelstalige studieprogramma's aanbiedt.

2.3 Ik vind het logisch dat docenten, van wie de moedertaal Nederlands is, lesgeven bij vakken waarvan de voertaal Engels is.

2.4 Ik vind het logisch dat de UU-website zowel in het Nederlands als Engels beschikbaar is.

2.5 Ik vind het logisch dat officiële e-mails vanuit de UU zowel in Nederlands als Engels geschreven zijn.

2.6 Ik vind het logisch dat berichten op de sociale media platformen van de UU (Facebook/ Instagram) in het Engels worden geschreven.

2.7 Geef hier eventueel een aanvulling op bovenstaande antwoorden.

2.8 Zou je iets willen veranderen aan het huidige taalbeleid van de UU? Zo ja, wat?

3- Het volgende deel zal bestaan uit statements die te maken hebben met de taalbekwaamheid van docenten aan de Universiteit Utrecht.

Geef aan in hoeverre je het eens bent met deze statements.

1= Helemaal oneens

2= Oneens

3= Neutraal

4= Eens

5= Helemaal eens

3.1 Over het algemeen vind ik dat het Engelse spreekniveau van mijn docent(en) goed genoeg is.

3.2 Over het algemeen vind ik dat het Engelse schrijfniveau van mijn docent(en) goed genoeg is.

3.3 Over het algemeen verwachtte ik dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) hoger zou zijn.

3.4 Over het algemeen verwachtte ik dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) lager zou zijn.

3.5 Over het algemeen heeft/hebben mijn docent(en) een sterk accent tijdens het Engels spreken.

3.6 Ik vind het lastiger om te begrijpen wat de docent zegt wanneer deze een sterk accent heeft tijdens het Engels spreken.

4- Het volgende deel zal bestaan uit statements die te maken hebben met studieresultaten.

Geef aan in hoeverre je het eens bent met deze statements.

1= Helemaal oneens

2= Oneens

3= Neutraal

4= Eens

5= Helemaal eens

4.1 Ik word tijdens de les afgeleid wanneer een docent met een accent spreekt.

4.2 Ik word tijdens de les afgeleid wanneer een docent grammaticale fouten maakt tijdens het spreken.

4.3 Ik haal lagere cijfers, wanneer ik word afgeleid door het accent van de docent.

4.4 Ik haal lagere cijfers, wanneer ik word afgeleid door grammaticale fouten die een docent maakt.

4.5 Ik heb het gevoel dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) mijn studieresultaten bevordert.

4.6 Ik heb het gevoel dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) mijn studieresultaten verhindert.

4.7 Geef hier eventueel een aanvulling op bovenstaande antwoorden.

5- In het laatste deel worden er een aantal vormen van taalbeleid binnen een universiteit op een rij gezet. Kies welke vorm jouw voorkeur heeft.

A) Compleet tweetalig

- Voertaal wordt per vak of studieprogramma bepaalt.
- Docenten, wie in het Engels lesgeven, dienen minimaal over het C1 niveau van Engelse taalbekwaamheid te beschikken.
- Alle communicatie vanuit de universiteit wordt tweetalig uitgevoerd (Nederlands & Engels)

B) Grotendeels ééntalig (Nederlands)

- Het Nederlands als officiële voertaal voor al het werk van de universiteit, zowel gesproken als geschreven. Dit geldt voor zowel lesgeven, onderzoek, administratie en communicatie.
- Op de universiteitswebsite is wel Engelse informatie beschikbaar.
- Lesgeven in Engels wordt gelimiteerd tot programma's waar er een specifieke reden is voor deze voertaal (niet-Nederlandse docenten of internationale programma's).

C) Grotendeels ééntalig (Engels)

- Engels hoofdzakelijk als voertaal tijdens lessen (met uitzondering van enkele vakken), onderzoek, aanmeldprocedures, promotiemateriaal etc.
- Universiteit verzoekt iedereen om Engels te spreken met elkaar, zowel binnen als buiten colleges. Nederlands spreken is nog wel toegestaan.

D) Compleet ééntalig (Engels)

- Engels als officiële voertaal voor al het werk van de universiteit, zowel gesproken als geschreven. Dit geldt voor zowel lesgeven, onderzoek, administratie en communicatie.
- Er worden programma's aangeboden om het academisch schrijven in Engels te verbeteren.

5.1 Mijn voorkeur gaat uit naar:

- o A) Compleet tweetalig

- B) Grotendeels ééntalig (Nederlands)
 - C) Grotendeels ééntalig (Engels)
 - D) Compleet ééntalig (Engels)
-

6.1 Denk je dat je deze enquête op een andere manier ingevuld zou hebben wanneer de vragen in het Engels gesteld waren?

- Ja
- Nee

Zo ja, op wat voor manier?

6.2 Heb je zelf ideeën over taalbeleid aan de Universiteit Utrecht die je hier zou willen delen?

Appendix B – Coded Data

The numbers behind each answer represent the respondent numbers.

Additional answers to section 2: Language policy at UU

Ik vind het heel logisch dat er engels les wordt gegeven omdat de wetenschap grotendeels engelstalig is. (4)

Zolang beide (Nederlands en Engels) worden aangeboden, zie ik alleen maar voordelen. Zo kan iedereen het begrijpen zonder dat het Nederlands ongebruikt is. (8)

NL is wel belangrijkste taal van de UU, dan zouden de berichten op sociale media dus in het NL moeten zijn of zowel EN als NL maar niet alleen EN. NL docenten die lesgeven in een Engelstalige cursus halen soms het niveau niet van het Engels, en kunnen zichzelf beter begrijpbaar maken in het NL. Ik begrijp natuurlijk wel dat er niet altijd genoeg niet-Nederlandse docenten beschikbaar zijn om Engelstalige cursussen te geven. (16)

"Ik vind het logisch dat berichten op de sociale media platformen van de UU (Facebook/Instagram) in het Engels worden geschreven." Zowel in het Nederlands als in het Engels. Helemaal eens. (17)

Er zijn ook - afgezien van corona tijden - heel veel internationals die aan de UU studeren. Niet heel gek dus dat niet alles Nederlands is in de communicatie. Bovendien zijn veel studies niet per se op Nederland gericht maar breder, bij geneeskunde of biomedisch of eigenlijk ontzettend veel studies moet je later ook engelse artikelen kunnen lezen of contact kunnen houden, dus daarin moet je getraind worden tijdens je studie. (18)

Het is belangrijk om veel in het Engels aan te bieden voor het aantrekken van internationals. De UU moet hoog aangeschreven blijven en dat helpt er dan aan mee. (26)

De UU heeft veel internationale studenten, ik denk dat het belangrijk is dat zij ook direct belangrijke informatie meekrijgen in officiële emails etc. Ook zijn veel docenten niet van Nederlandse afkomst en kunnen soms beter lesgeven in het Engels dan in het Nederlands. Daarbij is het erg handig om de jargon van het vakgebied wat je studeert in de taal mee te krijgen waar je in de toekomst waarschijnlijk het meeste mee te maken gaat krijgen, en om fatsoenlijke zoektermen te kunnen gebruiken bij het zoeken naar bronnen. (28)

Welke taal wordt gesproken lijkt me afhankelijk van het vak. Nederlands recht doe je niet in het Engels, net zoals klinische psychologie aangezien je gaat werken met Nederlandse cliënten. (30)

Would you change anything about the current language policy at UU?

Ik zou ervoor zorgen dat docenten makkelijker Engels kunnen spreken zodat het natuurlijker overkomt en makkelijker te begrijpen. Het is nu nogal geforceerd en soms lastig te begrijpen. (1)

Verplichte toets Engels voor docenten die in het Engels les (gaan) geven; docenten moeten op de een of andere manier aantonen dat hun geschreven en gesproken Engels van hoog niveau is. Als dit nog niet op peil is moet de UU cursussen aanbieden om hun Engels te verbeteren. (2)

Als docenten een cursus in het Engels geven zorgen dat ze bekwaam zijn. (3)

Science Park moet weer Uithof worden. Dat is onnodige verengelsing. (8)

Geen onnodig gebruik van Engels als voertaal van vakken. (12)

Wellicht cursussen voor nederlandse docenten die niet vloeiend engels spreken en dit wel moeten doen voor hun vak. (13)

Er moet zowel een Engels als Nederlandstalig programma aangeboden worden. (14)

Ik vind internationalisering van aantal studies/verenigingen helemaal prima. Maar het moet niet te ver gaan. Sommige studies moeten juist geen internationalisering doormaken en de voertaal Nederlands blijven om de kwaliteit van het onderwijs hoog te houden. Daarnaast moeten docenten die de taal Engels niet op een bepaald niveau behendig zijn ook geen colleges geven in het Engels. (15)

Gewoon social mediaposts in het Nederlands, hoezo moet dat in het Engels? (19)

Ik vind het zonde dat de kwaliteit van het onderwijs achteruit kan gaan als de docent zelf niet genoeg ervaring heeft in lesgeven in het Engels. Van meerdere studenten van mijn opleiding heb ik gehoord dat dit bij sommige vakken een probleem is, dan gaat je plezier en de diepgang van het vak ten koste van dat per se de colleges in het Engels worden gegeven terwijl iedereen in het vak Nederlands is. (20)

Internationalisering speelt een steeds grotere rol in de medezeggenschap. Daar zitten steeds vaker Engelse studenten hoewel de officiële voertaal nog te vaak Nederlands is. Dat maakt de communicatie niet effectief. Dat zou verbeterd moeten worden (21)

Additional answers to section 3 and 4, teachers' proficiency and influence on educational performance:

Ik vind het lastig te zeggen of mijn niveau door de docenten die Engels praten wordt verlaagd. Het kan er ook aan liggen dat de stof met de jaren natuurlijk moeilijker wordt en daardoor voor een lager niveau zorgt (1)

Ik vind het belangrijkste van een docent dat hij of zij zichzelf goed kan uiten in het engels en zijn/haar informatie net zo duidelijk kan verwoorden als in het nederlands (4)

Mijn docenten spreken en schrijven tot nu toe goed Engels en accenten zijn niet zo zwaar dat die in de wegzetten. (8)

Natuurlijk maakt de beheersing van Engels uit of een college of werkcollege beter snapt of niet. Het is alleen moeilijk om aan te geven of het echt mijn tentamen resultaten beïnvloedt. Mijn schrijfstijl doet het wel. Soms weet ik een antwoord in het Nederlands heel goed te formuleren, maar komt het in het Engels misschien minder goed over en krijg je minder punten. (14)

Ik heb nog niet meegemaakt dat een docent heel slecht Engels spreekt dus mijn studieresultaten zullen er nog niet onder lijden. (24)

Accent maakt mij niet uit. Is redelijk normaal. Echter, grammaticale fouten kunnen al gauw leiden tot andere betekenissen van zinnen. Dat is onhandig. (30)

Non-obligatory open-ended question 2, Do you have any other ideas about the language policy at UU?

Studenten die slecht Engels kunnen bij het begin van hun opleiding moeten worden geholpen om hun Engels te verbeteren (2)

Nederlands is een taal die wel behouden moet worden, in een wereld waarin steeds meer Engels wordt. Wat niet internationaal hóéft te worden, hoeft dat ook niet te worden (bijvoorbeeld de Uithof). (8)

Bij mijn studie is er een grote fout gemaakt bij het geven van informatie via de uu website. De pagina van mijn studie die informatie gaf over de mogelijkheden binnen de 3 jaar van de studie zoals welke richtingen je op kunt is letterlijk van Nederlands naar Engels vertaald. Internationale studenten dachten daardoor dat zij ook bepaalde richtingen en vakken konden kiezen. Dit was echter niet het geval omdat sommige vakken enkel in het Nederlands gegeven werden maar wel op vertaalde pagina stonden. Er is dus niet gekeken naar de inhoud van de pagina die vertaald moest worden waardoor internationale studenten voor mijn studie gekozen hebben zonder dat zij de richting op kunnen die zij zouden willen. Dit zou dus verbeterd kunnen worden! (10)

Bied zowel Engels als Nederlands aan en vermeld dit op het diploma. Dit kunnen bedrijven dan zelf meenemen tijdens de sollicitatie. (14)

Het verschilt enorm per studie wat de taalvoorkeuren zijn. Mijn bachelor was volledige op de Nederlandse context gericht, dus dan is het juist niet logisch als dan engelse taal wordt gevoerd. Maar ontzettend veel andere studies zijn breder dan Nederland, waarbij je in ieder geval de keuze moet hebben om in het engels college te volgen. (18)

Bij sommige studies biedt het voordelen om Engels te spreken, bij anderen past juist Nederlands beter. Wees hier dus flexibel in (19)

Gratis engels cursussen voor docenten en studenten uit NL en Nederlands cursussen voor internationals docenten en studenten (21)

Het is prima om communicatie tweetalig te doen. De motieven verder gebruik moeten wel zuiver zijn. Niet om meer geld te verdienen aan buitenlandse studenten, maar omdat het past bij de studie en in het latere werkveld. (30)

International students
Language for type of study
Language in the work field
Teacher's proficiency
Communication via online platforms
University reputation
Unnecessary use of English
Quality of education
International teachers
Retaining Dutch
English courses for teachers
Bilingual preference
Students' proficiency

Appendix C – Frequency Tables

Retrieved from IBM SPSS (2017).

1.4 Ik volg:

- Een compleet Engelstalig studieprogramma (evt. enkele vakken gevolgd met Nederlands als voertaal)
- Een meertalig studieprogramma
- Een compleet Nederlandstalig studieprogramma
- Een Nederlandstalig studieprogramma, maar ik heb een vak of meerdere vakken gevolgd waarvan de voertaal Engels is

Q1.4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ENG	5	15.6	15.6	15.6
	Meertalig	4	12.5	12.5	28.1
	NED, maar met vakken in Engels	23	71.9	71.9	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

1.6 Hoe zou je jouw eigen Engelse taalbekwaamheid in schrijven beoordelen?

Q1.6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	onvoldoende	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	voldoende	7	21.9	21.9	25.0
	goed	13	40.6	40.6	65.6
	uitstekend	11	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

1.7 Hoe zou je jouw eigen Engelse taalbekwaamheid in spreken beoordelen?

Q1.7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	onvoldoende	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	voldoende	7	21.9	21.9	25.0
	goed	16	50.0	50.0	75.0
	uitstekend	8	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

1.8 Heb je een idee op welk CEFR (*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*) level jouw Engels is?

Q1.8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	B1	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	B2	5	15.6	15.6	21.9
	C1	15	46.9	46.9	68.8
	C2	5	15.6	15.6	84.4
	weetniet	5	15.6	15.6	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

2.1 Ik vind het logisch dat de universiteit vakken aanbiedt waarbij de voertaal Engels is.

Q2.1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	eens	17	53.1	53.1	53.1
	helemaal eens	15	46.9	46.9	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

2.2 Ik vind het logisch dat de universiteit volledig Engelstalige studieprogramma's aanbiedt.

Q2.2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	oneens	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	neutraal	8	25.0	25.0	31.3
	eens	8	25.0	25.0	56.3
	helemaal eens	14	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

2.3 Ik vind het logisch dat docenten, van wie de moedertaal Nederlands is, lesgeven bij vakken waarvan de voertaal Engels is.

Q2.3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	oneens	2	6.3	6.3	9.4
	neutraal	7	21.9	21.9	31.3
	eens	18	56.3	56.3	87.5
	helemaal eens	4	12.5	12.5	100.0

Total	32	100.0	100.0
-------	----	-------	-------

2.4 Ik vind het logisch dat de UU-website zowel in het Nederlands als Engels beschikbaar is.

Q2.4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	eens	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	helemaal eens	30	93.8	93.8	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

2.5 Ik vind het logisch dat officiële e-mails vanuit de UU zowel in Nederlands als Engels geschreven zijn.

Q2.5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	eens	5	15.6	15.6	15.6
	helemaal eens	27	84.4	84.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

2.6 Ik vind het logisch dat berichten op de sociale media platformen van de UU (Facebook/Instagram) in het Engels worden geschreven.

Q2.6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	oneens	3	9.4	9.4	12.5
	neutraal	7	21.9	21.9	34.4
	eens	11	34.4	34.4	68.8
	helemaal eens	10	31.3	31.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

3.1 Over het algemeen vind ik dat het Engelse spreekniveau van mijn docent(en) goed genoeg is.

Q3.1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	oneens	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
	neutraal	11	34.4	34.4	43.8
	eens	16	50.0	50.0	93.8
	helemaal eens	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

3.2 Over het algemeen vind ik dat het Engelse schrijfniveau van mijn docent(en) goed genoeg is.

Q3.2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	oneens	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	neutraal	2	6.3	6.3	9.4
	eens	26	81.3	81.3	90.6
	helemaal eens	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

3.3 Over het algemeen verwachtte ik dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) hoger zou zijn.

Q3.3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	oneens	7	21.9	21.9	25.0
	neutraal	9	28.1	28.1	53.1
	eens	15	46.9	46.9	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

3.4 Over het algemeen verwachtte ik dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) lager zou zijn.

Q3.4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	oneens	22	68.8	68.8	71.9
	neutraal	7	21.9	21.9	93.8
	eens	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

3.5 Over het algemeen heeft/hebben mijn docent(en) een sterk accent tijdens het Engels spreken.

Q3.5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	oneens	6	18.8	18.8	18.8
	neutraal	12	37.5	37.5	56.3
	eens	14	43.8	43.8	100.0

Total	32	100.0	100.0
-------	----	-------	-------

3.6 Ik vind het lastiger om te begrijpen wat de docent zegt wanneer deze een sterk accent heeft tijdens het Engels spreken.

Q3.6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	oneens	6	18.8	18.8	25.0
	neutraal	8	25.0	25.0	50.0
	eens	16	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

4.1 Ik word tijdens de les afgeleid wanneer een docent met een accent spreekt.

Q4.1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
	oneens	8	25.0	25.0	34.4
	neutraal	9	28.1	28.1	62.5
	eens	12	37.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

4.2 Ik word tijdens de les afgeleid wanneer een docent grammaticale fouten maakt tijdens het spreken.

Q4.2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	oneens	5	15.6	15.6	18.8
	neutraal	6	18.8	18.8	37.5
	eens	14	43.8	43.8	81.3
	helemaal eens	6	18.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

4.3 Ik haal lagere cijfers, wanneer ik word afgeleid door het accent van de docent.

Q4.3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	10	31.3	31.3	31.3
	oneens	12	37.5	37.5	68.8
	neutraal	7	21.9	21.9	90.6
	eens	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

4.4 Ik haal lagere cijfers, wanneer ik word afgeleid door grammaticale fouten die een docent maakt.

Q4.4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	10	31.3	31.3	31.3
	oneens	11	34.4	34.4	65.6
	neutraal	9	28.1	28.1	93.8
	eens	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

4.5 Ik heb het gevoel dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) mijn studieresultaten bevordert.

Q4.5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	oneens	7	21.9	21.9	28.1
	neutraal	10	31.3	31.3	59.4
	eens	12	37.5	37.5	96.9
	helemaal eens	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

4.6 Ik heb het gevoel dat de Engelse taalbekwaamheid van mijn docent(en) mijn studieresultaten verhindert.

Q4.6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	helemaal oneens	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	oneens	16	50.0	50.0	62.5
	neutraal	9	28.1	28.1	90.6
	eens	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

5.1 Mijn voorkeur gaat uit naar:

- A) Compleet tweetalig
- B) Grotendeels ééntalig (Nederlands)
- C) Grotendeels ééntalig (Engels)
- D) Compleet ééntalig (Engels)

Q5.1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Compleet Tweetalig	22	68.8	68.8	68.8
	Grotendeels Eentalig NED	8	25.0	25.0	93.8
	Grotendeels Eentalig ENG	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	Compleet Eentalig	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Appendix D – Descriptive Statistics

Retrieved from IBM SPSS (2017).

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1.4	32	1	4	3.28	1.198
Q1.6	32	2	5	4.06	.840
Q1.7	32	2	5	3.97	.782
Q1.8	32	3	7	5.19	1.091
Q2.1	32	4	5	4.47	.507
Q2.2	32	2	5	4.06	.982
Q2.3	32	1	5	3.69	.896
Q2.4	32	4	5	4.94	.246
Q2.5	32	4	5	4.84	.369
Q2.6	32	1	5	3.81	1.091
Q3.1	32	2	5	3.53	.761
Q3.2	32	2	5	3.97	.538
Q3.3	32	1	4	3.19	.896
Q3.4	32	1	4	2.31	.644
Q3.5	32	2	4	3.25	.762
Q3.6	32	1	4	3.19	.965
Q4.1	32	1	4	2.94	1.014
Q4.2	32	1	5	3.59	1.073
Q4.3	32	1	4	2.09	.963
Q4.4	32	1	4	2.09	.928
Q4.5	32	1	5	3.09	.995
Q4.6	32	1	4	2.34	.827
Q5.1	32	1	4	1.41	.712
Valid N (listwise)	32				