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Poklicna identiteta izobraževalcev učiteljev pri pouku v angleškem jeziku na finski univerzi

Sotiria Pappa in Josephine Moate

Čeprav obstajajo različne oblike poučevanja v angleškem jeziku (ang. English-medium instruction – EMI), so različni načini, kako lahko EMI vpliva na pedagoške dejavnosti in strokovno znanje visokošolskih učiteljev, deležni manj pozornosti. Ta študija z osebnimi in s pisnimi intervjuji z devetimi izobraževalci učiteljev na finski univerzi preučuje najpomembnejše vidike, ki jih ti zaznavajo pri svojem delu z EMI, in kako so ti vidiki povezani z razumevanjem njihove poklicne identitete. Študija teoretično temelji na medsebojno povezanih konceptih pedagoškega delovanja, pedagoškega bivanja, pedagoškega odnosa in pedagoškega jezikovnega zavedanja. Tematsko analizirani podatki so poudarili načine, na katere se pedagoško bivanje, delovanje in odnos vrtijo okrog prisotnosti in vloge tujega jezika v EMI, pa tudi sočasna razhajanja in priložnosti, ki jih EMI ustvarja. Pedagoško bivanje je bilo podlaga za usmeritev izobraževalcev učiteljev EMI v njihovo delo in različne načine, kako jezik vpliva na občutek sebe, saj so izobraževalci učitelji delili, kako poskušajo razumeti disjunkcije EMI in se nanje odzvati. V smislu pedagoškega delovanja EMI vpliva na to, kako izobraževalci učiteljev izvajajo svojo prakso in odnose, ki jih razvijajo s študenti, vendar pa je v osredju pedagoškega odnosa odnos med EMI-izobraževalci učiteljev in njihovim delovnim mestom. Upamo, da bodo ugotovitve te študije prispevale k razvoju priprave učiteljev za EMI in podprle kritične razprave o »anglizaciji« visokega šolstva.

Ključne besede: poučevanje v angleškem jeziku, EMI, Finska, visokošolsko izobraževanje, vloga jezika
Introduction

Since the 1990s, an increasing number of higher education institutions (HEIs) have offered courses and programmes with English as the medium of instruction. While internationalisation is used as a measure of academic excellence (Lasagabaster, 2018), the proliferation of English-medium instruction (EMI) has brought significant challenges with ‘large numbers of students from different cultural, educational and linguistic backgrounds’ (Jenkins & Wingate, 2015, p. 48), and staff are rarely given formal training to meet these challenges (O’Dowd, 2018). HEI educators, however, play a crucial role in sharing expert knowledge, engaging students in academic tasks and conventions, and guiding knowledge creation and critical thinking. Although different forms of EMI are recognised (Schmidt-Unterberger, 2018), the different ways in which EMI can impact the pedagogical activities and expertise of HEI educators have received less attention (Dafouz, 2018). The qualitative study reported here aims to better understand how EMI can affect HEI teachers’ pedagogical being, doing, and relating, as well as the role language plays within this complex setting.

‘EMI’ is a frequently used term and most often applied to higher education (HE). In this paper, we define EMI as ‘[t]he use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English’ (Macaro et al., 2018, p. 37). Schmidt-Unterberger (2018) has identified five different forms of EMI (see Figure 1). These forms range from courses in English for Special Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which focus on language learning, to EMI courses that focus on content with language as the tool for instruction and study. An integrated approach to content and language can also be adopted in HE in which a complementary, dual focus on content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is promoted. Identifying these different forms is useful because it recognises the range of different emphases in EMI (language, content, or both) and the different organisational formats HEIs can adopt. Pre-sessional courses, as the name implies, support language development prior to formal engagement with content. In ESP and EAP courses, academic content contextualises and informs language development, whereas in EMI the academic content is the focus of activities and evaluation.
Some HEI educators are experienced teachers before they begin EMI teaching, with established repertoires honed within the culturally, historically, and socially shaped context of HEIs (Hökkä et al., 2012). While some HEI educators who are less experienced in EMI might see it as an opportunity for professional development (Dafouz, 2018), others might feel they have little right or opportunity to say no to EMI (Wilkinson, 2018). For more experienced HEI educators, EMI requires a renegotiation of established pedagogical repertoires, as favourite examples, humour, and sensitivity to students are more difficult to realise (Moate, 2011). Moreover, HEI educators in EMI can face the challenge of taking on new responsibilities with which their colleagues are unfamiliar. Dafouz’s (2018) case study indicates that some, but not all, HEI educators are required to have a high level of language proficiency. Whatever the HEI educators’ background, however, EMI expands the responsibilities of educators with the significant shift in the availability of their pedagogical resources and an often-increased gap between students’ existing and required study skills. Although some initiatives support HEI educators to understand the intercultural and linguistic considerations of EMI better, the haphazard provision of formal support for educators and students, and little recognition of disciplinary differences at the level of policy (see Khalyapina, 2020), plus the lack of research on the professional identity implications of EMI, significantly limits what kind of support can be offered.
In this qualitative study, our specific interest is in HEI educators involved in teacher education (i.e., HEI teacher educators). The study focuses on the professional identity development of HEI teacher educators as they work through a foreign or additional language and the ways EMI requires teacher educators to renegotiate their professional identity in terms of who they are as educators, how they act as educators and the relationships that influence their work. The following section outlines the theoretical framework of the study in more detail and is followed by the research questions addressed in this study. The findings from this study will hopefully contribute to the development of EMI in teacher education and support critical discussions on the ‘Englishisation’ of HE.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Professional identity**

Identity has been defined as ‘the way a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is structured across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future’ (Norton, 2013 cited in Norton, 2016, p. 476). Recent literature further argues for (language) teachers’ identity as dynamically and discursively shaped processes of ‘being and doing, feeling and imagining’ with ‘cognitive, social, emotional, ideological and historical’ aspects (Barkhuizen, 2017, n.a.). As educators face change within their professional environment, however, conflicts can arise between teachers’ existing sense of identity and the designated identity that is anticipated with the change. Such conflicts can require significant renegotiation in the reformation of ‘work history-based constellation of teachers’ perceptions of themselves as a professional actor’ (Vähäsantanen, 2015, p. 3).

Professional identity development can be understood as a process that draws on the agency of educators and the conditions, or social resources, of the work environment. On the one hand, professional identities are broadly formed by the culturally, historically, and socially shaped context of an HEI; on the other hand, individual interests, views on teaching and learning, prospects as educators and relationships with disciplinary knowledge critically inform the ongoing process of professional identity development (Vähäsantanen, 2015).

To date, research on the professional and personal development of HEI educators in EMI has received little attention (Trent, 2017). Dafouz’s (2018) study examines HEI educators’ developing language ideologies in EMI. The participants were required to demonstrate a high level of English proficiency and attend a staff development programme as part of EMI development.
Dafouz’s findings indicate that educators resituate their identities through EMI, strengthening their competence in the English language, extending their awareness of their linguistic resources, and potentially contributing to the multilingual development of HEI. These findings point to the significance of language as part of teachers’ professional identity, although this area has received little attention even in research specifically focusing on the professional development of language educators (Ruohotie-Lyhty, 2019).

This study is theoretically premised on the Bakhtinian notions of I-for-self, I-for-others and others-for-me (Bakhtin, 1993). These interconnected relations have been developed by Moate (2013) to offer a dialogic conceptualisation of teacherhood. The conceptualisation strengthens the notion of professional identity by highlighting key aspects of what it means to be an educator. These aspects include pedagogical being, doing and relating, which are explained in more detail in the following sections. Moreover, this conceptualisation recognises the crucial role of language as a critical mediator of self, action, understanding, and relationships. Figure 2 presents this conceptualisation in relation to teacher educators in EMI.

**Pedagogical being**

Pedagogical being refers to a teacher’s sense of their professional self drawn on to form and enact pedagogical relationships with learners and other professionals. Pedagogical being goes beyond professional identity to encompass the values teachers act on to evaluate new possibilities. Pedagogical being also points to the vulnerability of relating to others and stepping beyond one’s comfort zone, and the need to reflect from different perspectives. Conceptually, pedagogical being encapsulates teachers’ understanding of their own philosophical orientation to the profession and their learners, informing their sensitivity and inclination to shoulder responsibilities in their teaching practices (Moate, 2013). This orientation informs approaches to educating student-teachers and highlights dilemmas regarding teacher educators’ choices, strategies, and actual teaching practices (Tillema & Kremer-Hayon, 2005). For instance, teacher educators in Finland deem their work important and value a research-based approach to their students’ training, a sense of community, collaboration with other teacher educators, and specialisation (Maaranen et al., 2019). Pedagogical being is dynamic, requiring teacher educators to be open to the possibility of becoming, and has affective dimensions, requiring teacher educators to invest in student-teachers’ development and choice-making, yet accept their reservations and blunders (Danielewicz, 2001). Teachers’ pedagogical being serves as an organisational framework for teachers’ pedagogical doing.
Pedagogical doing

Pedagogical doing refers to teachers’ practice enacted through words and actions in relation to students. For teacher educators, pedagogical doing involves knowingly and purposefully rendering teaching a site of inquiry for student-teachers to enable them to understand and value education in practice (Russell & Loughran, 2007). Pedagogical doing is evident in teachers’ decisions and preparations concerning resource management (e.g., classroom layout, classroom values, instructional time, teaching materials, learner assignments), use of learners’ learning repertoires (e.g., learner’s productive and receptive classroom activity), and use of talk to support learner development (Moate, 2013). Moate (2013) suggests that talk in education is ‘the most fundamental instantiation of pedagogical doing’ (p. 40) and highlights the need for teachers to recognise their responsibility for using talk well in foreign-language-mediated education. Talk presents instructions and subject-specific concepts, as well as create the space to unpack complex disciplinary knowledge and generate dialogue between teacher, student, and subject (Moate, 2013). Dialogic relations can be seen in their voluntary assistance of student-teachers, the reciprocity of teaching and the increase in learner-led activities in the EMI class (Hahl et al., 2016). Moreover, teacher educators’ focus on talk might propel student-teachers to experience classroom interactive practices as important, thus developing deeper understandings of effective pedagogy and teacher development (Edwards-Groves & Hoare, 2012). The centrality of talk should be reflected in university policies promoting EMI programmes, for example, policies about discipline-specific literacy goals and language-learning outcomes (Airey et al., 2017) or policies about appropriate staff training (Dubow & Gundermann, 2017; Lasagabaster, 2018).

Pedagogical relating

Similar to pedagogical doing, pedagogical relating is derived from pedagogical being. Pedagogical relating involves the ways in which teachers engage with the aims and conventions of educational institutions. Importantly, pedagogical relating involves forming mutually beneficial pedagogical connections with colleagues by sharing knowledge-in-practice, critically discussing differences, and adopting a longitudinal approach to professional development as a shared, rather than individual, phenomenon (Moate, 2013; Van Manen, 2008). Pedagogical relating supported by developmentally-oriented activities helps pedagogical communities to develop mutual understanding and shared practices, potentially (re)constructing the conditions of educational workplaces (Clavert et al.,
This sense-making and joint inquiry have been proposed as teacher educators’ tools to counter overly directive approaches by regulatory authorities and to become disciplinary experts rather than technicians (Bourke et al., 2018). Pedagogical relating supports the enactment of pedagogical being as responsive sensitivity and dialogue with others, rather than instrumental practice determined by institutional demands (Moate, 2013). Research suggests that teachers can mature through relationships enabling their agency and subsequently create liberatory pedagogical spaces limiting external regulatory control or demands (Simpson et al., 2018). Indeed, teacher educators’ collaboration in implementing EMI over 25 years has been seen to tackle curricular and course design challenges, strive to ensure quality and set the example for other faculties to include EMI programmes (Wilkinson, 2013).

**Pedagogical language awareness**

Pedagogical language is significant as the material realisation of pedagogical being, doing, and relating. The importance of language is highlighted in Coyle’s (2015) language triptych, which indicates (i) the need for specialised language to engage with disciplinary knowledge, (ii) how language becomes meaningful in use, and (iii) how students’ language develops through language use. Figure 2 depicts pedagogical language awareness as an extension of pedagogical doing.

**Figure 2**

*Professional identity in EMI with pedagogical language awareness as an extension of pedagogical doing*
Although current conceptualisations emphasise the practical use and development of language, in EMI, the importance of language in education (Edwards-Groves & Hoare, 2012) arguably goes beyond how and why language is used in a discipline. The extra sensitivity is understood here as pedagogical language awareness. In EMI, the extra challenge of working through a foreign language requires teachers and students to consider their responses, assumptions, and ongoing development carefully. In these processes, teachers are ‘responsible for self-authorship as a pedagogue and fundamentally responsible for the other-authorship of learners,’ which raises the question of how to do so ‘with integrity if [teachers’] relationship with the language is different’ (Moate, 2013, p. 47). In other words, teachers are expected to develop their professional identity and help learners to develop their own identity, yet trying to meet such expectations might be a compromised process when undertaken through a foreign or additional language. As content experts, teacher educators in EMI are responsible for developing student understanding of subject matter and disciplinary pedagogy, including subject-specific language (Wilkinson, 2013). Moreover, in EMI, teacher educators have to negotiate the co-presence of first and foreign languages and to help student-teachers author a more international professional identity (Dafouz, 2018). While pedagogical language awareness is important for any teacher’s professional development, it is of greater significance for teachers working through altered linguistic resources (Moate, 2013).

Research questions

In this study, we use the notions of pedagogical being, doing and relating to examine the professional identity development of EMI teacher educators. We are particularly interested in how the use of a foreign or additional language mediates a teacher’s sense of self, the active implementation of pedagogy and the relationships that affect identity development. The research questions this study addresses are:

1. How does the change in language affect HEI teacher educators’ perceptions of their work in EMI?
2. How does EMI affect teacher educators’ professional identity development?
Method

Participants

Nine EMI teacher educators (EMITEds) from a Finnish university participated in the study (two men and seven women). One participant has retired, and two are employed elsewhere. At the time of the interviews, all participants worked in teacher education and had EMI teaching duties. Most participants had different subject backgrounds (e.g., biology, art, ICT, technology) and varying teaching preparation for EMI, ranging from informal self-study to university courses (see Table 1). All prospective participants were invited through online communication based on their EMI teaching responsibilities.

Table 1
Participants and data collection

| Participants | Training                                                                 | Data collection |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| EMITEd1      | University course on EMI                                                  | November 2015   |
| EMITEd2      |                                                                           | November 2015   |
| EMITEd3      | University seminar on EMI, University course on EMI                      | November 2015   |
| EMITEd4      | University seminar on EMI                                                | November 2015   |
| EMITEd5      | University seminar on EMI                                                | September 2019  |
| EMITEd6      | Self-study                                                               | September 2019  |
| EMITEd7      |                                                                           | September 2019  |
| EMITEd8      | University course on EMI, University pedagogy course, smaller courses    | September 2019  |
| EMITEd9      |                                                                           | October 2019    |

Spoken interview •  Written interview •  Pages

Data collection

The data consists of face-to-face and written interviews. The four face-to-face interviews were conducted on university premises in November 2015 and subsequently transcribed (average 59 minutes; 21 pages, Times New Roman, font 12, single spacing). The five written responses were collected through a Webropol form distributed to prospective participants in August-September 2019 (average 2.6 pages). The Webropol form was distributed to personnel
involved in EMI in the Departments of Education, Teacher Education and Education Leadership (N = 29); however, the response rate was low. Both types of interviews were premised on open-ended questions about the experience of being a teacher educator through a foreign language so that the participants could share their thoughts and what they deem important.

The interviews followed protocols of ethical conduct of research (e.g., voluntary consent, participant anonymisation, storage and handling of data). The early interview data were complemented with further data four years later due to the increased departmental interest in EMI. Participants’ responses in English might have compromised the correctness of expression but not content. The written interviews gave participants the advantage of time to formulate their thoughts, while the spoken interviews helped to contextualise the meaning, mode of expression, and accompanying gestures.

Data analysis

The data were analysed in two phases. In phase one, the data were coded using Thematic Analysis, by which a theme was understood as an internally consistent unit that locates meaning in the data and comprises patterns of smaller, semantically bounded components (Guest et al., 2012). In phase two, each subtheme developed in the first phase was internally coded and reorganised in a theory-driven manner, i.e. according to whether codes manifested pedagogical being, doing, or relating (see Table 2). Since pedagogical language awareness was not conceptualised as a distinct aspect of EMI teacher educators’ professional identity development, we indicated which codes were connected to pedagogical language awareness within the pedagogical concept to which they belonged. The integrity of the analytical process was maintained by ensuring coded extracts corresponded with the participants’ perspectives, careful documentation of each phase and ongoing discussion between the two researchers involved in the study regarding the interpretation of the themes.
Table 2  
*Example of theme analysis for the two phases of analysis*

| Theme information | Theme 1 | Orientation to one’s work in EMI | Teaching using a foreign or additional language in practice |
|-------------------|---------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| **Subtheme b**    |         | **Teaching using a foreign or additional language in practice** |                                             |
| **Concepts**      | **Code** | **Code name** | **Participants** | **Excerpts** | **Excerpt** |
| Pedagogical being | 72      | Subject-related beliefs         | 6              | 12           | Being able to engage my student into meaningful learning, constructing knowledge and exploring. Supporting their pedagogical know-how as well as their knowledge on their main subject. Improving my own skills in teaching in higher education. (EMITEd7) |
|                    | 76      | Teacher as advisor              | 3              | 3            |                                             |
|                    | 77      | Teacher as discussant           | 2              | 3            |                                             |
|                    | 78      | Teacher as expert               | 5              | 6            |                                             |
|                    | 79      | Teacher as guide to reasoning   | 5              | 5            |                                             |
|                    | 80      | Teacher as support              | 2              | 2            |                                             |
|                    | 82      | Teaching goals in CLIL          | 2              | 2            |                                             |
|                    | 83      | Teaching goals                  | 9              | 23           |                                             |
| Pedagogical doing | 3       | An international perspective   | 2              | 6            |                                             |
|                   | 13      | Dialogic teaching               | 8              | 14           |                                             |
|                   | 81      | Teacher-student relationships through English | 6 | 10 | It would be good to demolish some walls between the language groups. At least in teacher education, which is a very national and very Finnish-medium business, English is for “the internationals” who are in their own bubbles. At the same time, Finns shout the “we’re a small nation, we need to be international” mantra. Well, apparently there are some tensions here. (EMITEd8) |
| PLA 15             |         | Difficulty of the content       | 1              | 1            |                                             |
| PLA 19             |         | English language proficiency – students | 4 | 7 |                                             |
| PLA 20             |         | English language proficiency - teacher educators | 7 | 11 |                                             |
| PLA 51             |         | International students          | 8              | 22           |                                             |
| PLA 56             |         | Need for...                     | 8              | 36           |                                             |
| PLA 71             |         | Students' subject-related knowledge | 2 | 2 |                                             |
| PLA 86             |         | Teaching through English...      | 6              | 19           |                                             |
| PLA 88             |         | Using body language             | 1              | 1            |                                             |

*Note.* PLA indicates pedagogical language awareness.

**Results**

The analysis highlighted the ways in which pedagogical being, doing, and relating revolve around the presence and role of the foreign language in EMI, as well as the concurrent disjunctures and opportunities EMI creates.
The following sections outline how pedagogical being, doing and relating each inform EMI teacher educators’ (EMITEd) orientation to their work and the different ways language impinges on the sense of self as the teacher educators share how they try to understand and respond to the disjunctures of EMI.

**Pedagogical being**

An important aspect for the EMITEds was the reorientation to their work required by EMI. Although few participants reported that the challenge of EMI changed their sense of self, a qualitative difference seemed to exist between the established teacher-self and the EMI teaching self. As EMITEd8 poignantly notes, ‘I’m not the same person. Sometimes I feel I’m the funniest and wittiest and most sophisticated in [native language], and I can never give my best side (language-wise) to the students at this university.’ The EMITEds noted a wide range of emotions ranging from enjoyment and enthusiasm, pleasant surprise, happiness or contentment, annoyance and frustration, comfort or discomfort, insecurity and regret in relation to EMI, suggesting that teaching through a foreign language is a deeply felt experience. The most notable emotion was confidence in one’s decent EMI language skills and a concomitant feeling of tolerance with the ‘EMI teacher education self’ (5/9). For instance, EMITEd3 describes the inward panic when searching for a relevant word and stopping mid-sentence, observing that ‘of course, I’m working in a foreign language, I can’t know every word, and I have a promise to forgot [sic]. […] but, of course, now I have seen that I will survive,’ which points to the self-awareness needed to maintain a healthy sense of self.

The participants’ perception of themselves as weak or imperfect users of English as teacher educators and their merciful stance towards themselves are noteworthy. Most participants believed it was understandable that, because they were foreign language speakers, they should not expect perfection when comparing themselves to students’ or colleagues’ fluency. In addition, they shared a shift in focus, moving from EMITEd1, who comments ‘that I don’t care anymore. I just try to talk,’ EMITEd2 who enjoys ‘winning the challenge’ and EMITEd3’s belief that ‘you can manage with your English’ to EMITEd8’s observation that overcoming challenges should encourage others to try and even enables you ‘to build and continuously build a new self.’

The EMI experience seems to become less stressful over time as one gets used to teaching in a foreign language (EMITEd1, EMITEd3, EMITEd4) and begins to integrate subject-related terminology in English in their research work (EMITEd3). However, the participants were aware of simplifying language for
communication (EMITEd6) and the need to be more careful (EMITEd4). Many of the aforementioned emotions were language-based, relating to vocabulary knowledge and fluency as well as what the participants could give to students. Although EMITEd2 stated she felt the same regardless of the language, she seemed to be negotiating whether she was both a subject and a language (English) teacher:

you... have to, kind of, teach, both the language and the content, so- I'm kind of only teaching content now through the language. [...] I don't, don't really see that where I find it as tool to explain what we are doing, so, yeah. But I'm not a deep CLIL teacher. I know I teacher things in English. [...] But I don't know... do I teach really language through the, and that's that, and that that, that they can read also from dictionary? [...] and we all teach in English, so we, in this sense, we are all English teachers.

In this extract, EMITEd2 seems to use pedagogical understanding as a subject expert to negotiate the role of language in EMI. Pedagogical language awareness can be seen in this negotiation as well as in the EMITEds’ acknowledgement of their need to improve and adjust to EMI and improve their competence in the language of instruction. Indeed, for most participants (8/9), the relationship between subject and language appears as a central consideration for renegotiating pedagogical responsibilities, whether by shifting from competence to 'how well [students] can [...] learn some subject through English' whilst '[t]he (subject) specific practices are the same' (EMITEd5), or by using the 'same criteria of good teaching' (EMITEd6). It is at this juncture that pedagogical being arguably transforms into pedagogical doing.

Pedagogical doing

Another aspect in EMITEds’ work was the way in which pedagogical convictions were realised in practice. The participants appeared to clearly understand their professional values as teacher educators (7/9), the goals they set for themselves as researchers (3/9; EMITEd1, EMITEd2, EMITEd 8), and their teaching philosophy (9/9). In general, they seemed aware of themselves as individuals and professionals (9/9), and the way in which EMI requires a change in practice. As EMITEd4 notes, 'I have changed lot of teaching and maybe some good thing I have left, I should maybe take more care, [laughs] care what I'm, not change a lot, change so much.' Nevertheless, as EMITEd7 shares,

language affects thinking and thus, it somewhat changes my teacherhood as well. But I see it as a positive thing. It necessitates me to try more and I think I have learnt a great deal from teaching in English [...] it sort of
makes me better as a teacher as well, because I have to be more aware of the whole teaching situation.

The participants described how EMI changes their practice with the need to prepare more carefully, give clear instructions, pay attention to students’ expression, encourage student participation, provide vocabulary in more than one language, and be sensitive to culture. Pedagogical language awareness was primarily evident as teacher educators identified the shortcomings and benefits of EMI (8/9) and noted the international dimension of the different, language-mediated context (8/9). It was further evident in acknowledging the importance of knowing students’ subject-related knowledge (2/9) and the difficulty of the content (1/9), as it affected how teacher educators would present the content.

A significant change mentioned by nearly all participants (8/9) was the presence of international students, highlighting the point that in addition to the foreign language, the different repertoires and cultural experiences of the student cohort require consideration. Moreover, many courses offered to international students are only short-term, stressing the need to meet and collaborate through effective communication, a challenge exacerbated by the EMI setting. Several EMITEds recognised that even for students competent in English, studying through a foreign language can be challenging, especially when the content is unfamiliar. The participants addressed this dilemma in different ways, for example, by recognising the value of having to “suffer” a bit, so make big efforts, to understand something in another language’ (EMITEd4). The relationship readjustments required when working through a foreign language were frustrating at times, but also something that they constantly developed and not necessarily considered a disadvantage. As one participant observes in EMI classes:

And there we have possibility to discuss really, and I don’t have right answers. Usually the students don’t have right answers, but we try to think, everybody, and, and I learn. Many times I think more than they learn. […] when you are a teacher, you have to be able to discuss about these things with your students. (EMITEd3)

Arguably, the EMI setting afforded unexpected space for co-constructing understanding through the closer teacher-student proximity (EMITEd1, EMITEd2; cf. EMITEd7). As EMITEd8 shared, ‘[t]he uncertainty in my skills made me rely much more on students’ input,’ creating a space and acknowledging resources that may not be considered when teachers are working within
their comfort zones. For the participants, the international students’ diversity in cultural and educational background infused the shared learning environment with an international outlook, a plurality of subject-related perspectives, higher student attention and more eagerness to participate in class. These observations point to the greater resources EMITEds can draw on in their pedagogical doing. Moreover, these observations prompted the participants to reflect on the importance of Finnish values in academic settings, like less formality, increased freedom in students’ learning paths and evaluation practices, pointing to the relationship with the wider HE community.

**Pedagogical relating**

Whereas pedagogical being focuses more on the sense of self and pedagogical doing addresses the realisation of pedagogical expertise, pedagogical relating acknowledges the multiplicity of relationships that inform the work and person of an educator. In this study, participants drew attention to the multifaceted nature of pedagogical relating, including the relationship with the institutional HEI community, collegial relationships and the wider vision for the provision of teacher education. For example, EMITEd3 points out:

*I’m doing in pope [sic] important job, and I know that teaching and, and— that our students will have their Master’s degrees— we will have money about that and we will have money about when our students have 50 credits a year, and that kinds of things. And I can make my own share, so that we can be sure that we will have that, that, and that.*

By agreeing to provide EMI, EMITEd3 sees benefits for herself and the wider community. Recognising that EMI can be a ‘[m]eaningful part of [one’s] everyday work’ (EMITEd5) also indicates how teacher educators orient to the demands of HE today: ‘that EMI and internationalisation should be part of our and our students daily life’ (EMITEd6). These views point to EMI as a dimension integrated into EMITEds’ professional life, encompassing students, the provision of teacher education, the wider university culture, and EMI at the university.

Participants’ responses implied how an individual sense of responsibility for engagement and development, principally towards and for students, informs their practice. Many participants welcomed opportunities for development presented by students or colleagues (6/9), and all described situations in which they sought opportunities to develop professionally. These opportunities included international teacher exchanges, independent or unofficial EMI
training, publishing in English, contacting and collaborating with or seeking advice from foreign colleagues, developing EMI courses with Finnish colleagues, and trying to renew and evaluate one’s teaching (e.g., by ‘experimenting […] with “custom-designed sessions” that I prepare based on students’ answers to a questionnaire’ – EMITEd8). These insights underline the conscientious way in which these EMITEds develop their work and the need for the community to provide development opportunities.

Collegial and wider university networks were only briefly mentioned as contexts for learning from and collaborating with Finnish and international colleagues. Whilst the participants recognised the value of exchanging expertise, engaging in dialogue and enjoying a degree of collegial proximity, the lack of an EMI community and the absence of university recognition for their EMI teaching in their salary or work plan provoked feelings of loneliness, anger, and worry. For these participants, the relationships that most directly supported their development were feedback on one’s teaching (5/9) and professional development programmes for EMI (8/9). Participants’ descriptions of feedback were connected to students and to peers (e.g., having their class observed, co-teaching), strengthened their sense of competence in EMI or their abilities as teacher educators, provided advice and support for EMI, and promoted professional development. For example, EMITEd2 explains that:

after every group we ask feedback and what we could do differently and what would help them to see things better and, that’s the only way you can really get something […] then the feedback questionnaire is the one you can read more and try to move it to a direction to something.

Regarding professional development programmes for EMI, participants were aware of the importance and availability of such programmes but, despite their benefits, considered them time-consuming and demanding. Participants noted how encouragement and confidence, improved language, theory-based insights and sensitivity to students’ cultural diversity or inquiry-based teaching models could benefit EMI. However, when developmental opportunities were limited to informal meetings or without the university adequately accounting for employees’ commitment to a workload of 15 European study credits, the participants felt that EMI teacher education was ‘not [taken] so seriously’ (EMITEd4) or deemed ‘too heavy’ (EMITEd2). For many participants, their experience seems to have been as EMITEd7’s summarises:

Back then, in 2014, it was not so common to teach in English, so we had to “seek” from the department for those teachers, who would be willing to take up this challenge. For me, it was not a scary thing, although I
recognise that my language skills are somewhat limited, and I lack more formal training. Of course, the first times teaching in English were especially good opportunities for practicing my oral skills of English, but also reflecting the differences between English and Finnish teaching.

Discussion

Teacher education is an important topic to the journal where this special issue contribution appears, although teacher education research there has largely focused on student-teachers, policies, practices and reforms (e.g., Pantić, 2012; Raiker, 2020; Smith, 2016). This study complements these foci with teacher educators’ perceptions of EMI in higher education and the implications for their professional identity development. EMI is absent from the journal’s ongoing discussion about the internationalisation of higher education (e.g., Kassaye Alemu, 2014), which suggests that academic staff have favourable attitudes towards internationalisation yet report little preference for conducting courses in foreign languages (Flander & Klem, 2014). This interview study focuses on how teacher educators at a Finnish university experienced EMI, and the findings highlight the crucial role language plays as teacher educators renegotiate their pedagogical being, doing and relating in EMI contexts.

The orientation EMITEds had towards EMI highlighted the personal and affective experience of EMI. Participants’ pedagogical being was directed by a sense of familiarity or disjuncture when teaching EMI classes and negotiating the role of language as the mediator of self, pedagogical expertise and disciplinary expertise. As language proficiency is a primary concern for HEI educators in EMI (Lasagabaster, 2018), the participants’ perceived competence as foreign language speakers has implications for their confidence and beliefs as teachers and content experts. Because beliefs direct behaviour, perspectives, choices and teaching style (Maaranen et al., 2019), making beliefs about competence explicit is critical in supporting teacher educators’ further development. The findings also underlined participants’ concern about what they could offer student-teachers while upholding pedagogical principles in their teaching and adequately adjusting language so as not to compromise communication and content delivery. A core strategy for teacher educators is to focus on their role as guides and mentors to resolve tension in their work, focusing on reconceptualising teaching strategies rather than restructuring external conditions (Tillema & Kremer-Hayon, 2005). Teacher educators’ inward orientation towards the improvement of practice might suggest that professional identity development is a personal matter (Maaranen et al., 2019). However, in an EMI setting, trying
to maintain the integrity of practice while trying to navigate different perspectives and unanticipated experiences suggests that these challenges cannot be overcome merely through mandated policies.

Pedagogical doing and pedagogical relating highlight EMITEds as professional actors who respond to the complex global trend of EMI encompassing English as the language of academia and educational revenues (see also Saarinen & Nikula, 2013). Participants’ pedagogical doing underlined the need for temporal resources, communication with students and more dialogic teaching with a diverse cohort. As Lo and Macaro (2015) note, EMI instruction requires time to transition from monologic to dialogic teacher-student interaction, and teacher educators need skills to support student-teachers’ extended verbal exchanges on the subject matter. Most importantly, EMITEds recognised certain parameters necessary for more effective teaching and advocated the international perspective that international students afford EMI classes. Some of these parameters have been reported elsewhere, with EMITEds still being able to perceive the personal, academic and added benefits of EMI (Dimova et al., 2015; Doiz et al., 2011). Pedagogical relating could be seen in how participants joined the practice of EMI teaching and were deliberately open to or pursued opportunities for professional development that others presented. In doing so, receiving feedback on one’s teaching and professional development programmes for EMI were very important, indicating the need for support for EMI teaching practices from more experienced colleagues or teacher trainers.

Participants’ pedagogical relating contrasted with other European lecturers’ low motivation to organise and deliver EMI (Doiz et al., 2011; Lasagabaster, 2018), and supported the view of Finnish teaching staff as able to work according to their teaching ambitions, professional interests and values (Vähäsantanen et al., 2020). However, participants’ regard of EMI teacher education as positive, yet demanding, in conjunction with a lack of recognition of EMI teaching on the part of the institution (e.g., organised EMI communities, financial reward, allocated working hours), further validated Finnish teaching staff’s need for sufficient time to engage in research as well as teaching activities (see Vähäsantanen et al., 2020). Although more training is needed for the challenge of EMI at universities (Lasagabaster, 2018), with more structured and focused language and language-mediated methodology (O’Dowd, 2018), universities should offer incentives for teachers beyond the appeal of EMI as an opportunity to advance one’s professional career (Doiz et al., 2011). Finally, teacher educators’ core deliberations in EMI should not be resolved as personally experienced problems (Tillema & Kremer-Hayon, 2005), but as (EMI) community challenges. This is important considering participants’ orientation
to their work aimed at benefiting student-teachers’ learning and not necessarily their own professional development. Teacher education communities need to be supported by a shared vision in EMI and, knowing what is expected of them, develop EMI syllabi meeting contemporary societal and academic needs (Maaranen et al., 2019).

**Figure 3**
*Depicting the significant presence of language in EMI professional identity development*

The significant presence of language within the professional identity development of EMI teacher educators is illustrated in Figure 3, in which pedagogical language awareness is defined in relation to the three different aspects of professional identity development rather than enacted as part of pedagogical doing alone. Thus, while pedagogical language awareness remains an important part of pedagogical doing, the findings from this study indicate the way in which language is also deeply felt and affects an educator’s sense of self. Moreover, opportunities for the development of pedagogical language awareness are connected to the wider community and the willingness of an institution to invest in EMI.
Conclusions

This study illustrated how Finnish teacher educators’ professional identity development is infused with language in EMI settings. Pedagogical language awareness was not considered an additional aspect in the analysis but as inherent to EMITEds’ professional identity development. Pedagogical language awareness connected with EMITEds’ becoming used to or feeling uncomfortable in EMI (pedagogical being) was prominent in pedagogical doing (e.g., the needs and advantages they identify in their EMI teaching, the difficulty of content, the internationality of the student population, being able to teach terminology in one’s area of expertise in both languages), and a potential meeting point for collegial development. Recognising the fundamental presence of language suggests that pedagogical language awareness is a critical area for further research and development in EMI.

Despite the small number of participants, similarities with other studies on teacher educators suggest that the issues raised by the participants reflect shared concerns faced by teacher educators. However, a larger number of participants could have revealed more group-based threads and variation in the interview data (Joffé, 2012). While code saturation was reached, future research could aim at meaning saturation for a more nuanced understanding of the EMITEds’ pedagogical understanding (Hennink et al., 2017). The amount and nature of the data is another notable limitation. The written interview data consisted of concise answers, whereas face-to-face interviews made it easier for participants to respond in greater detail. The latter might be more suited to the study of professional identity development in EMI, because it affords more spontaneous and detailed data in a conversational setting. Since professional development programmes were an important aspect of participants’ experiences in EMI, future research could include EMI teacher training programme coordinators’ perspectives, while EMITEds’ teaching can be observed before and after EMI training.
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