HIGHER EDUCATION LANGUAGE POLICY IN EUROPE: A SNAPSHOT OF ACTION AND TRENDS

1. INTRODUCTION: LANGUAGE LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

As indicated in the European Commission's document *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-2006*, language skills play a key role in ensuring the social, cultural, and economic integration of Europe. For this reason, language learning needs to be an integral part of the education of all European citizens at all levels of education, including Higher Education (HE). The specific rationale for integrating language learning fully into HE programmes are outlined in a number of the documents posted on the *European Network for the Promotion of Language Learning among all Undergraduates* (ENLU) website. (The reader is referred to the ENLU site rubric *Documents*, and then to *Background and strategic papers*, as well as to *Task Group papers*.) The following factors, however, play a particular role.

- Employability: In the increasingly mobile and multilingual European workplace, knowledge of languages plays an important and sometimes a decisive role in the employability of graduates.

- Mobility: For students (and also academic and administrative staff) to take advantage of the possibilities for mobility offered by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), they clearly need to be proficient in languages. Indeed, the EHEA will become an effective reality only if a wide range of students and other actors in HE are able to interact and communicate effectively with colleagues in other countries.

- The demands of the knowledge-based economy: Graduates preparing themselves for the European workplace need to develop multilingual communication skills in parallel with their mainstream academic and professional training. Viewing language learning as being essentially the domain of secondary education would thus handicap students with respect to their ability to function as both academically and communicatively empowered professionals in Europe. In other words, graduates' (multilingual) communicative skills need to keep pace with their academic and professional training.

This having been said, the importance of language learning in HE is not as widely acknowledged as it is at secondary level. Furthermore, many HE institutions (HEIs) may not as yet have developed a languages for all policy. This means that they may be seeking guidelines as to what such a policy may involve, and how it may best be implemented. The Year One report of Task Group 1 – Institution-wide language policies (posted on the ENLU website under *Task Group papers*, *Benchmarks for a Higher Education Language Policy*) provides a number of reference points or benchmarks for HE language policy (HELP) development. The present paper is more descriptive in orientation, and offers a "snapshot" of current action and trends in the field of HELP on the basis of a questionnaire completed by representatives of 32 HEIs. Its goal is to contribute to our understanding of what is currently being done in the field of HELP in a number of HEIs across Europe, and to identify issues which may merit consideration by those interested or involved in HELP development.

2. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The paper is based on the results of a questionnaire completed by 32 persons who attended the launch meeting of the ENLU project held in Brussels 23-24 April, 2004. The respondents were involved in language teaching, language policy development, or institutional mangement in HEIs in the following 23 countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Switzerland, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Spain, United Kingdom.

The questionnaire consisted of three sections.

The first section, **Preliminary information** (questions 1-4), elicited information on the name of the respondent, their institution and position in their institution, and their contact details.

The second section, **Presence of an institutional languages for all policy** (questions 5-7), contains three questions relating to the presence of a language policy or plan in the respondent's institution, whether the institution would be interested in developing such a policy, and to the presence of potential obstacles to the realisation of such a policy.

The third section, **Reference points for a language policy of plan** (questions 8-12), contains questions relating to aspects of the realisation of a language policy and, in broader terms, to the strategies adopted in the respondent's institution with respect to the teaching and learning of languages.

The specific questions asked and a summary of results per question is provided in the Appendix. The paper is based on a discussion of the responses given on questions in sections 2 (Presence of an institutional languages for all policy) and 3 (Reference points for a language policy of plan) of the questionnaire.

NB. The number of responses provided does not always add up to 32, as respondents sometimes gave answers to more than one linked question, which may indicate the rather fluid nature of HELP development at the current point in time, a point which will be discussed subsequently

The 32 respondents, and the institutions in which they work, clearly represent only a very small sample. Nevertheless, given the paucity of information which is currently available on HELP development in Europe, the results serve to shed some light on ongoing action and trends in the field.

3. PRESENCE OF AN INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGES FOR ALL POLICY

The responses to question 5 show that 10 institutions had a language policy, and that 13 others were developing one. Furthermore, on question 6, a further 13 respondents stated that their institution was interested in developing such a policy. (A number of respondents who stated that their institution was developing a language policy also answered positively to the question whether their institution was interested in developing one.) However, of the 10 respondents who do mention the existence of a language policy, three introduce reservations. One says this policy is limited to just two faculties, another says "but it doesn't work and needs to be modernised", and another adds that there is a policy "in the sense that there is blanket language provision – even if the details are not clearly defined in 'policy' terms". In other words, only 7 respondents

mention the existence of a language policy without any caveats or reservations. The responses to questions 5 and 6 thus paint a somewhat varied picture of the current state of language policy development. There seems to be fairly widespread interest and a good deal of action underway, but so far this has led to the development of an explicit HELP in only a limited number of institutions.

With respect to question 7, relating to the presence of obstacles to the realisation of a language policy, 23 repondents mentioned the existence of obstacles. These are given below as they were expressed in the questionnaires.

- Have to convince decision makers / Financial problems / Rivalries between different departments / A lot of people do not see any need for a language policy
- The awareness of the whole institution has to be raised / Money and structures
- Legal / Organisational / Fear
- Some non-language faculties would not be interested / Re-organisation of curricula / Creation of a language centre / Costs
- Language classes have been cut down for the sake of some agricultural subjects but this has happened just in a couple of faculties / The modular principle could have been more appropriate
- Résistance des facultés / Financial / Peu d'importance attribué aux langues par la direction des universités
- Budget restrictions / Lack of trained teachers / Cooperation between faculties and language centre
- Lack of money at the university as a whole / Poor understanding of the role of languages for students by the professors (not so much by the authorities of the university)
- Lack of money / Staff of language departments are needed there for different reasons / The faculty of Humanities would not be able to finance all language teachers for the whole university / etc.
- Motivation / Resources
- Money / The "problem" of language credits crowding out other courses
- Lack of staff awareness of what learning outcomes are

- Funding / Which languages will be offered? / Who will teach?

- Persuading departments to offer non-language courses, ie. foreign languages other than English, due to lecturers' lack of competence in such languages / Negative attitudes of some students to a non-language course through an L2 (English, German or French) / Attitudes of colleagues both in the language centre and in the language specialist departments / Lack of expertise in how to handle the new teaching-learning situation from a pedagogical point of view

- Time, finances, credit points: i) Each faculty develops their curricula and is more interested in the academic science related courses; ii) There are still many lecturers who do not know foreign languages themselves

- Financial, mainly / Slow bureaucratic procedures, as (a language policy) will be part of the Core Curriculum and hence compulsory

- Financial / "Conservative" attitude of the teaching staff / Lack of awareness

- Traditional faculty oriented policy / Perpetuation of outdated disciplines / Key positions still occupied by outdated specialists

- Mental attitudes / Time / Must be convinced of the value

- Limited budget for running HEIs resulting in downsizing the number of teachers, programmes, facilities

- Lack of: Trust of important players / Awareness of pros and cons / Necessary involvement / Legal background, etc. etc.

- Financial restrictions / Small range of languages (only the major European langauges are taught) / Teacher training (limited number of teachers able to use a FL as the medium of instruction) / Number of credits to be assigned to language modules

The obstacles mentioned are many and varied, but it is possible to identify three main categories.

Finance / Money / Resources = 14 respondents

For example: "Financial problems", "Money and structures", "Costs", "Budget restrictions".

Attitudes / Awareness = +/- 11 respondents

For example: "Have to convince decision makers", "A lot of people do not see <u>any</u> need for a language policy", "The awareness of the whole institution has to be raised", "peu d'importance attribué aux langues par la direction des universités", "Poor understanding of the role of languages for students by the professors".

<u>Organisational / institutional obstacles</u> = +/- 12 respondents

For example: "Rivalries between different departments", "Re-organisation of curricula", "Language classes have been cut down for the sake of some agricultural subjects", "Cooperation between faculties and language centre", "Staff of language departments are needed there for different reasons", "The 'problem' of language credits crowding out other courses", "Each faculty develops their curricula and is more interested in the academic science related courses", "Slow bureaucratic procedures", "Legal background".

A few respondents also raise the question of <u>Teacher Skills</u>. For example: "Lack of trained teachers", "Lack of staff awareness of what learning outcomes are", "Persuading departments to offer non-language courses, ie. foreign languages other than English, due to lecturers' lack of competence in such languages", "Lack of awareness of how to handle the new teaching-learning situation from a pedagogical point of view", "There are still many lecturers who do not know foreign languages themselves". "Teacher training (limited number of teachers able to use a FL as the medium of instruction)". In this respect, it is interesting to note that the question of teacher skills elicits responses relating not only to language teaching staff per se, but also to content lecturers' ability to teach in another language. In this respect, it is worth noting that in question 9b 16 respondents reported that content courses were taught in another language in their institution. (cf. The discussion brief "Medium of instruction" by David Marsh in *Task Group papers*.)

The picture which emerges from this section of the questionnaire is somewhat varied. On the one hand, there is action underway or at least strong interest in the development of language policies in a majority of the institutions surveyed. On the other hand, the realisation of such a policy faces

a variety of obstacles arising out of financial restrictions, the attitudes of certain institutional actors, problems of an organisational or institutional nature, as well as teacher skills.

4. REFERENCE POINTS FOR A LANGUAGE POLICY OR PLAN

While section 2 of the questionnaire focused on the presence of an institutional languages for all policy, section 3 related to the measures being taken at institutional level to promote language learning. Section 3 therefore sought to elicit information on the practical measures that are being taken in different institutions in the field of languages for all. In this respect, it is useful to bear in mind that a language policy may emerge in a more top-down or a more bottom-up manner. In the first case, the management of a HEI may decide to take strategic action in the field of languages and then set in motion initiatives for the development and implementation of policy. In the second case, initiatives may be taken by other institutional actors to promote language learning in one way or another – the decision of a language centre to set up a self-study facility, or of a given faculty that part of its courses will be taught in another language, to cite just two examples. However, if a sufficient number of such initiatives are made, then a language policy may "emerge" at institutional level, as the combined result of an accumulation of specific decisions by a potentially wide range of institutional actors.

Section 3 was designed to gather information on initiatives of this nature, and thus to cast light on the measures which are being taken to promote language learning in the HEIs concerned, whether these measures are part of an explicitly formulated language policy of not. The specific questions asked touch on a number of potentially relevant reference points regarding both decision making and a range of other more directly pedagogical measures.

4.i Consultation and decision making structures

Question 8 relates to the structures by which decisions regarding language policy are made. 17 respondents report that in their institution such decisions are made in a language department or centre, 18 that they are made by senior mangement, 11 mention a consultatative committee, with 9 respondents mentioning other structures. Given the fact that there were only 32 respondents in

the survey, it is clear that a variety of decision making structures co-exist in a number of institutions. Indeed, 16 respondents mention the presence of two or more such structures. Institutions therefore appear to be adopting a range of strategies for organising reflection on language teaching and learning.

Given that the respondents came from 32 institutions in 23 different countries, and that considerable differences exist at both national and institutional levels in terms of managerial and decision making traditions, such diversity is presumably unsurprising. Nevertheless, it is useful to recall that only 10 respondents mention their institution having a language policy, and three of them express reservations about the rigour or effectiveness of this policy. This, taken together with the numerous obstacles mentioned by 23 repondents (question 7), might be taken as an indication that, as a whole, the structures currently in place in many institutions for developing and implementing an institution wide language policy may merit critical re-evaluation.

4.ii Definition of learning outcomes and planning of teaching-learning procedures

Question 9 relates to two fundamental aspects of language teaching – the definition of learning outcomes (what students are expected to achieve and be able to do on completion of a course of study), and the choice of teaching-learning procedures.

Question 9a, relating to the manner in which learning outcomes are defined, reveals that 18 institutions out of 32 make use of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/Languages/Language_Policy/Common_Framework_of_Reference/default.asp) even if 3 repondents express reservations ("in the language centre - not in the faculty: no homogeneous structure", "will be used", "partly"). What is striking, however, is that 26 respondents state that learning goals are defined with respect to students' future professional needs, and 29 that they are defined with respect to students' academic needs. (In both cases, certain respondents express reservations: "to a degree", "to some extent", "hopefully", "it depends on the department".) Overall, however, in a clear majority of the institutions concerned, language learning is specific purpose in orientation, relating to students' academic and / or

professional needs (combined, in a number of cases with the scales of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*).

The specific purpose orientation of much of the language teaching reported presumably reflects the will of institutions to make language learning relevant to students' needs both in the here-and-now of their academic life and with respect to their future professional needs. It would, however, be interesting to explore the basis on which the evaluation of students' academic and professional needs is made, particularly with respect to students' future professional needs. In the first instance, needs analysis in pre-experience learning situations is notoriously difficult, especially when a degree programme is not preparing students for a fairly closely defined set of professional situations. Indeed, one of the main challenges which the Bologna Process sets for HE language teachers is precisely how to prepare students for a rapidly evolving professional context within which they are very likely to encounter new challenges and new learning needs. (cf. The discussion brief "The challenge of the Bologna process for higher education language teaching in Europe" in *Task Group papers*.)

Responding to this challenge calls for reflection in at least two directions. The first relates to the process of learning, and specifically to the preparation of students for lifelong language learning. Indeed, as Mackiewicz (2002, www.fu-berlin.de/elc/docs/Mackiewicz-Valencia.pdf) points out, the broader objective of lifelong learning has particular relevance in the field of languages. The second relates to consultation with employers and, in broader terms, with representatives of the world of work, so as to identify the linguistic and communcative competences which graduates actually need in the workplace.

Question 9b, which contains 8 sub-questions relating to teaching-learning procedures, reveals that a variety of initiatives are being explored in the respondents' institutions to promote language learning in one way or another.

24 respondents report that their institution caters for the inclusion of language credits, either obligatory or optional, in students' degree programme, even if 7 of these respondents express reservations about the way in which this is done, these reservations mainly relating to the fact that

the practice is not generalised to all degree programmes. Half the respondents (16) report that some courses are taught in a language other than the students' first language; 23 report the presence of self-access learning facilities; 23 report the existence of cooperative modes of learning, half report the encouragement of project work with students from other countries or language backgrounds, and 20 report that their institution devotes a specific budget to language teaching and learning. Less positively, only 8 respondents report that their institution awards credits for independent language learning, and only 12 (with one rather laconic "we try to"), mention the explicit promotion of a culture of language learning at institutional level.

Taken together, the points raised in questions 9a and 9b show that there is a will to make language teaching relevant to students' needs, and that a variety of measures are being taken to promote language learning in many institutions. A number of questions remain, however, relating both to the way in which goals are set, and also in terms of the most effective means of promoting language learning on the pedagogical level.

4.iii Structures for pedagogical coordination

Question 10 relates to the practical organisation of language teaching at institutional level. The results show that, in the respondents' institutions, language teaching is organised most often in language teaching departments (29), with language centres (19) and non-language specialist faculties of departments (16) following. Importantly, however, different structures co-exist in a number of institutions - 21 respondents mention two or more of the three options as being operant in their own institution. Only 9 respondents mention language teaching being organised in a self-study centre, and only 5 report collaboration with non-university agencies such as the British Council or the Alliance Française.

It is unclear whether the coexistence of different institutional structures responsible for organising language teaching reflects a deliberate policy decision in the HEIs in question, or whether this is simply the legacy of former practice. This point may not, however, be without importance with respect to the development and implementation of an institutional level language policy. If an institution wishes to develop a coherent language policy, basing the realisation of

this policy in a single body offers a number of advantages (cf. *Benchmarks for a Higher Education Language Policy,* section III.2.ii) including the concentration of pedagogical and logistical resources, and focused teacher training.

4.iv Language policy related documents

Question 11 relates to the existence of language policy documents at institutional level. 11 respondents mention the existence of such documents, though one adds "But they are very unspecific. They are documents produced by the language centre – not recognised by the university yet.", and another notes "is currently being written". 17 respondents answered this question in the negative, but three respondents did add comments – "in preparation", "Not yet. But most likely will over the next few months", and "but intends to". In other words, only 9 institutions report the existence of completed and officially recognised documents, even if 4 others mention that such documents will soon be prepared.

The conclusions that can be drawn from question 10 are probably similar to those derivable from questions 5 and 6: There is action and interest in the field, but this varies considerably in terms of both level of intensity and degree of advancement across institutions.

4.v Other initiatives

The 12th and final question asked whether the respondent's institution had set up structures or undertaken initiatives in the field of languages which had not been covered by the previous questions. The following were mentioned (given as they were expressed in the questionnaire).

- A multimedia centre was set up a couple of years ago. It produces some language materials and has introduced ICT in language teaching at our university.
- Information day (le défi des langues pour les étudiants de demain) pour mettre la question des langues sur le parquet public (presse, média, etc) décideurs des universités. Groupe de travail spécialisé qui a abouti dans une commission du Rectorat composée de membres de toutes les facultés, des étudiants et des représentants du corps intermédiaire.

- Language module packet for students of all faculties. Languages module packet for professional purposes.

- There are some people aware of need for changes (Vice-President).

- For additional info see "National report on curriculum innovation in Greece" (TNP2, May 2003).

- Some experimental e-learning for first level examination of the English language.

- There is a conversation club for those students who want to come together and practise speaking skills – usually in-coming students and local students. Unfortunately, the group is not very large.

- New initiative of the Rector of the University of X: Policy in the making.

- There are visiting "lectors" (for extra-curricular classes in modern Greek, Polish, Chinese, Spanish, Italian).

- I am attempting to initiate a discussion on the need for a language policy, working together with a few colleagues. The Rector has uttered positive noises.

- Trying to set in motion a notion of languages as an "entitlement" for all undergradautes – this is in line with the University policy to set out a student entitlement statement for all areas of the student experience.

The initiatives mentioned are very varied, going from the setting up of a consultative committee to the creation of a conversation club. Once more, initiatives in the field of language teaching and in language policy development vary considerably from one institution to another in terms of both scale and focus.

5. DISCUSSION

As already indicated, the questionnaire on which this paper is based rests on a very small sample, only 32 HEIs. It cannot therefore be assumed that the picture which emerges from the questionnaire is representative of broader trends in HE in Europe. The remarks which follow need therefore to be interpreted with due consideration of the limited size of the sample. The results are presented here simply to provide some insight, even if limited in scope, into the current situation of HELP development in Europe, and to stimulate further reflection.

There would seem to be fairly widespread interest in HELP development, and there is also evidence of action being taken in a number of institutions. This action relates in some cases to the development of an explicit language policy, and in others to more immediately pedagogical initiatives. However, relatively few institutions have as yet developed a coherent language policy, and the responses to question 7 indicate that a variety of obstacles exist to the realisation of such a policy. There would therefore seem to be little place for complacency about the current state of HELP development in HEIs across Europe, which has evident implications in terms of students' preparation for the challenges outlined in the introduction to this paper. Faced with this situation, at least two avenues of reflection and action merit consideration.

The first is the need for *improved communication among HEIs in the field of HELP development*. It is difficult to avoid the impression that many HEIs are working in isolation, and are involved simultaneously in the exploration of what a HELP may be and how it can best be realised. It would be very helpful for institutions interested or involved in developing a language policy to be able to share insights and instances of good practice with other institutions. While real differences do exist between HEIs in different parts of Europe, they are preparing their students for an increasingly integrated academic and professional context. Many of the challenges facing HEIs in the field of languages are therefore likely to be similar, even if differences exist in terms of relative emphasis from one country or region to another. In the first instance, improved communication among HEIs in the field of HELP can provide insights at the strategic level of HELP development, institutions learning from one another's experience in terms of the formulation of a language policy and with respect to the setting up of the relevant enabling conditions for the effective realisation of such a policy. (cf. Section 3.2 of *Benchmarks for a Higher Education Language Policy.*) At a subsequent stage, cooperation between institutions can lead to the creation of joint initiatives in the language field.

Such initiatives can assume many different forms. One, however, could involve pooling of online language courses developed by a number of host institutions. Many HEIs might wish to offer their students learning opportunities in a potentially wide range of languages. However, setting up conventional language courses in a variety of different languages can be prohibitive in

resource terms, especially if the number of students potentially interested in learning a given language may be limited. One solution to this dilemma would be for one or more institutions with expertise in the teaching of a given language to assume the responsibility for preparing an online course in this language, the course then being offered to students in partner institutions in different countries online. Such a project could extend the range of language learning possibilities offered to students in many institutions at a reasonable cost to any one institution.

The second implication is that further work is required on *the identification of relevant benchmarks for HELP development*. HELP development in Europe needs to accommodate two sets of potentially contradictory parameters. One is an underlying communality of goals in the field of language learning. The other is the specificity of the situation of individual HEIs with respect to the development of a languages for all policy. HEIs differ from one another in a number of respects – in terms of managerial and decision making traditions, with respect to the language situation of the country or region in which they are located, and also in terms of the current situation of language learning both in HE and also at secondary level. Because of these differences it is unlikely that any one single model would be equally relevant for all institutions. At the same time, certain key parameters are likely to merit consideration by all institutions in HELP development, even if the specific choices that are made with respect to the practical realisation of these parameters may well differ from one institution to another. It is in this respect that the use of benchmarks can serve a valuable purpose by identifying those areas where strategic decisions need to be made. The Year One report of Task Group 1, Institution-wide language policies, *Benchmarks for a Higher Education Language Policy*, provides a starting point, but the benchmarks identified clearly need to be tried out and evaluated in a wide range of institutions.

In conclusion, the increasing integration of Europe, and in particular the development of the EHEA represent both a challenge and an opportunity for HEIs in the language field. They are a challenge in the sense that they call upon HEIs to accord extra attention to the role of languages in the programmes they offer to their students. At the same time, they are an opportunity in the sense that they open up new possibilities for cooperation among institutions and individuals for the exchange of insights and the development of joint initiatives. The results of the questionnaire

data suggest that such cooperation is by no means as well developed as might be wished and, consequently, that further effort is needed in building up a network of cooperation in the field of HELP.

APPENDIX

ENLU TASK FORCE 1 – LANGUAGE POLICY QUESTIONNAIRE, BRUSSELS 23-24 April 2004

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

This document summarises the results of the questionnaire data for sections 2 (Presence of an institutional language for all policy) and 3 (Reference points for a language policy or plan).

Section 2. PRESENCE OF AN INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGES FOR ALL POLICY

5. Does your institution have a language policy or language plan designed to cater for the provision of language learning for all undergraduates?

Yes = 10
No = 9
Currently being developed =13
Don't know = 1

6. If your institution does not have such a language policy or plan, would it be interested in developing one?

Yes = 13
No = 0
Don't know = 5

7. Are you aware of any obstacles which could stand in the way of the realisation of a language policy or plan?

Yes = 23
No = 3
Don't know = 4

NB. Responses included in text of the paper.

Section 3. REFERENCE POINTS FOR A LANGUAGE POLICY OR PLAN

8. Consultation and decision making structures: Are decisions regarding the provision of language learning for all undergraduates made by:

A language department or language centre?

Yes = 17
No = 9

Senior management?
Yes = 18
No = 7

A consultative committee?
Yes = 11
No = 11

NB. Number of questionnaires mentioning more than one of the decision making structures listed above = 16

9a. Learning outcomes: Are learning outcomes defined in terms of:

The scales of the Common European Framework of Reference?
Yes = 18
No = 8

Students' future professional needs?
Yes = 26
No = 1

Students' academic needs (eg. reading academic material)?
Yes = 29
No = 1

9b. Teaching-learning procedures: Which measures are taken in order to promote the learning of languages:

Inclusion of a specific number of language credits (obligatory or optional) in students' degree programme?
Yes = 24
No = 7

The awarding of credits for independent language learning (eg. obtention of recognised language certificates)?
Yes = 8
No = 22

The teaching of courses in an L2, including for non-language specialists?
Yes = 16
No = 14

Provision of self-access language learning facilities?
Yes = 23
No = 7

Organisation of cooperative modes of learning (eg. tandem learning schemes with exchange students)?
Yes = 23
No = 9

The encouragement of project work with students of other countries or language backgrounds?
Yes = 16
No = 13

The explicit promotion of a culture of language learning at institutional level?
Yes = 12
No = 18

The allocation of a specific budget to language teaching and learning?
Yes = 20
No = 9

10. Structures for pedagogical coordination: Is language teaching in your institution organised:

In a language centre?
Yes = 19
No = 8

In language teaching departments?
Yes = 29
No = 1

In a self-study centre?
Yes = 9
No = 17

In non-language specialist faculties or departments (eg. a business school or faculty of medecine)?
Yes = 16
No = 12

In collaboration with non-university language teaching institutes?
Yes = 5
No = 26

NB. Number of questionnaires mentioning language teaching being organised in <u>two or more</u> of the following: = <u>21</u>

11. <u>Has your institution produced any documents relating to its language policy</u>?

Yes = <u>11</u>
No = <u>17</u>
Don't Know = <u>3</u>

12. <u>Has your institution set up structures or undertaken initiatives in the field of languages for all which have not been covered by the questions listed above? If so, please briefly describe the structures or initiatives in question</u>:

NB. Responses included in text of the paper.